Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Wisconsin Application #4650WI-4

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**47**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	30
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	13

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

The State's reform agenda is presented clearly and coherently and encompasses each of the four education areas described in the ARRA, as well as improving student outcomes statewide. The State Plan Overview presented clearly delineates the State's goals as well as the organizational responsibilities that will be undertaken by the State in order to reach each of the goals. In addition, the State has presented clear accountability plans for assessing the success of its efforts toward the State's seven goals, complete with indicators for success, the frequency of use, designation of responsible party and the time frame for application. It is noteworthy that the State makes clear through the supplemental scope of work available to the six urban districts and the Wisconsin Rural Initiative that its reform agenda is designed to ensure that the needs of both urban and rural districts are supported with programmatic and financial support necessary for success.

The State's MOU, which has been used by almost all districts, primarily represents a strong commitment on the part of its participating LEAs. Local Teachers' Union signatures are representative of a commitment to discuss any relevant provisions in good faith though not an agreement to reopen or otherwise modify any existing collective bargaining agreement. As long as there are collective bargaining agreements, the representation that the union will discuss any relevant provision in good faith is a significant commitment on the part of the unions. The terms and conditions commit the State and Participating LEAs to broad implementation, collaboration and cooperation. The scope of work applicable to all Participating Districts (not including additional activities targeted to urban and rural districts) requires them to implement a significant portion of the State's Race to the Top plans. However, there is one important area in which participating LEAs are not obligated to implement all portions of the State's plan: requiring annual evaluations and using them to inform key decisions. In this section, participating LEAs are given the opportunity to commit to the implementation of optional activities with respect to the use of formative evaluation systems and, indeed, only 36.4% of Participating LEAs have committed to using evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention as proposed by the State. However, it is noteworthy that the other Participating LEAs have nonetheless made other commitments with respect to promotion of teachers.

The State has obtained substantial commitment by LEAs, with a 96.1% participation rate. For the Participating LEAs, substantial leadership commitment is demonstrated by the signatures of 100% of superintendents (or equivalent), 96.3% of school board presidents and 81% of local union presidents. The students represented by the Participating LEAs account for 98.3% of all Wisconsin students and 98.8% of the students in poverty. Therefore, the broad participation of LEAs in the State's Race to the Top application will translate into broad statewide impact. Because the six key urban districts, in which most minority students are located, not only are committed to the State's plan but also are committed to the

supplemental strategies designed to provide meaningful and relevant support to the neediest students, it is likely that the State has created the conditions to support meeting its overall goals as well as by subgroup.

The State's goals, to ensure 100% of children are proficient or on track to proficiency, to move within the top five states in NAEP student achievement, to cut the achievement gap in half by 2014, to ensure that all students have access to high quality teachers and school leadership, to halve the number of high school dropouts by 2014 and double high school graduation growth rates for at-risk populations and to increase the percentage of students are college and career ready and significantly increase the growth in college entrances are undoubtedly ambitious. They each represent a significant achievement on the part of students and staff throughout the state. For the most part, they also stand a very good chance of being achievable. Perhaps the most ambitious goal is to cut the achievement gap by half, but because most minority students are within a few districts aggressive and well-planned initiatives may be successful.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**23**
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8

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

The State has a well thought-out plan to provide leadership and support participating LEAs in providing effective and efficient operations. The time-line for implementation of pieces of the plan seems reasonable.

The plan relies upon a combination of State employees and consultants, where the State employees oversee regional consultants who will work to support LEAs to faithfully implement the programs and initiatives of the State's reform agenda. This structure is well designed to offer central oversight and authority, as well as local capacity building and support. In addition, the plan makes clear that decisions and adoption of standards, assessment, data systems, etc. will be made at the state level and both regional consultants and additional data coaches will support statewide implementation. While this structure makes sense, one concern is that in several instances, such as in assisting districts to align their local assessment systems with the model evaluation system, responsibilities seem to be shared by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction and the new Office of Education Innovation and Improvement. This kind of lack of clarity may impede smooth operation and accountability. The State plans to model its RttT accountability mechanisms on its Office of Recovery and Reinvestment, hiring an independent accountability/auditing/consulting firm to externally measure and report upon progress toward and compliance with the conditions and goals in the State's RttT grant. While this plan is based on prior success in another program, the description of the tasks and responsibilities focus almost exclusively on accountability and do not appear to include a significant focus on supporting effective and efficient implementation. It is important that the consultant be able to support implementation and not focus on accountability to the exclusion of relevant and effective implementation.

While the State does not appear to be reallocating or repurposing educational funds to support the reform agenda of RttT, it is ensuring that other educational funds -- including the Longitudinal Data System Grant, School Improvement Grant, and State Fiscal Stabilization Funds -- are aligned with the State's RttT goals around data use, evaluation and school improvement. In addition, Milwaukee's philanthropic community's leadership around creation of WINS for Children is aligned with, and part of, the State's RttT reform agenda.

The State's application speaks to the importance of and desire to ensure that capacity is built in such a way that successful reforms are continued after the grant period. One way this will be done is through the State's using funds to support the privately funded Wisconsin Initiative for Neighborhoods and Schools that Work for Children. Another way is through a significant expansion of the Response to Intervention, which has the ability to impact practice throughout the state and increase the capacity of those who are able to provide effective services even after the grant funds are no longer available.

The State has garnered support from a broad group of stakeholders, including the following:

- State and federal legislators
- Native American communities
- Business communities
- State and private universities
- Local/state professional associations

However, there are no letters of support from organizations representing:

- Parents
- Students
- Civil rights organizations
- Local education foundations
- Community-based organizations

While there are strong letters of support from the association of administrators and the Wisconsin Education Association Council, the letter of support from the American Federation of Teachers is not particularly strong.

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

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

The State has been active in efforts to create and adopt standards and assessments; in particular, the state is ready to adopt the Common Core Standards for English and mathematics, served as an early leader in the development of several different assessments, and has started to develop a new state assessment system. The State has used federal Longitudinal Data System ("LDS") grant funds to build a system interface to collect data and display it in more meaningful ways and to expand its PK-12 longitudinal data system to enable postsecondary data exchange, and is participating in a multi-state consortium that is integrating the Colorado student growth percentiles model into the state's longitudinal data system and in the University of Wisconsin's Value-Added Research Center. Efforts to increase recruitment, development and retention of effective teachers and principals include partnering with a number of leading organizations, including the Wallace Foundation, New Leaders for New Schools, Teach for America and the the New Teacher Project. In addition, the State has focused on conditions by implementing a major license reform initiative and adopting legislation that allows for the use of student test data and other factors in teacher evaluation. The State also already allows for alternative route certification programs in both rural and urban areas. The State has been working with Milwaukee Public Schools to tackle its lowest achieving schools, though - with the exception of important new legislation allowing the State Superintendent the authority to intervene in the lowest achieving schools and the creation of the Statewide System of Support - very little detail is presented with respect to specific actions or initiatives undertaken by the state in order to turn around low performing schools. There are, however, examples of actions districts have taken using ARRA funds to work on all four of the reform areas.

The State has presented data indicating that there has been progress in improving student outcomes overall and by student subgroups, as reflected in both NAEP and state assessments. While the difference in pass rates between the state assessment and NAEP suggests that the state assessment is not particularly rigorous, it is important to note that improvement has been shown on both assessments, in particular for 4th graders and in particular in mathematics. The State has made some progress in reducing achievement gaps (and in some cases, e.g., 4th grade mathematics achievement gap between Black and White students, improving at a greater rate than the nation's achievement gap), but it is neither consistent nor among all student populations for which there is an achievement gap. In addition, there are a few areas where the achievement gap has increased rather than decreased, indicating a distinct lack of progress. The

state attributes gains in mathematics achievement to particular professional development efforts and a teacher leader program in mathematics, and attributes achievement increases in several districts to a distinct set of strategies highlighted in professional literature. There is nothing specific offered to explain increases in reading performance. The State's data on graduation rates is very light, and it shows that while most subgroups have increased graduation rates very slightly over eight years, most graduation rates seem to have followed sharp increases over the period of 20-01 through 2003-04 with decreases between 2003-04 and 2008-09. In addition, the graduation rate for white students has actually decreased over the full period shown. The State has undertaken efforts to address this, but plans are not expected until this summer.

Total	125	89

B. Standards and Assessments

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

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

The State has provided the signed Memorandum of Agreement as evidence that it is part of the Council of Chief State School Officers and National Governors Association Common Core Standards; it has also provided a list of the 48 states and 3 territories that are part of the consortium. The State lists the countries against whose standards the Common Core language arts and mathematics standards have been shaped and benchmarked. As evidence that the standards will prepare students for college and career readiness, the State describes the process by which representatives of the State's university systems have confirmed that the mathematics standards represent appropriate preparation for students to enter college coursework and asserts that the same process will be used to confirm the appropriateness of the language arts standards. A similar process is proposed to ensure that the Common Core standards reflect contemporary workforce needs and thus will prepare students for career readiness. A copy of the draft standards is provided as part of the State's application.

The State provides evidence of the three year process it has been engaged in to prepare for the adoption of the Common Core standards and describes a statutory scheme by which the State Superintendent, by the existence of his right and duty to establish an assessment system and curriculum, has the right and duty to establish standards. The application states that the Superintendent intends to adopt the Common Core standards within 10 days of their final release, anticipated for July 30, 2010. Although the State's plan for implementation of the Common Core standards is comprehensive, in that it goes from providing information, to the creation of model curriculum units and units of instruction and some professional development supports, it is worth noting that it lacks specificity concerning how LEAs, and in particular principals and teachers throughout every school, will be supported to understand, supervise, and teach in alignment with the standards and who the consultants performing the work will report to within the Department of Public Instruction ("DPI").

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

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

The State is a governing member in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium, which includes 33 states and will create and implement assessments based on the Common Core standards. The application states that the Consortium will submit an application for a grant through the Race to the Top Assessment Program. The State's plan for implementation of the assessment is robust and will be carried out by a combination of DPI personnel and consultants. It includes planning, professional development (regional and summer institutes), software design, opportunities to support teachers to create assessments, summer institutes to learn and practice using the assessments, and participation in the creation of a consortium-wide item bank.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	14

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

The State has presented evidence of a multi-step plan to support the transition to high quality standards and assessments, complete with time line, designation of responsible parties and reflective of alignment with college entrance requirements, development of instructional materials, delivery of professional development to both teachers and administrators, creation of professional learning communities and connection of standards and assessments with career readiness. The plan is not, however, consistent in its details. There are far more concrete steps and time-lines for the process of ensuring alignment with college entrance than there are for efforts to support the LEAs in the extensive learning and practice teachers and administrators will need in order to effectively use the new standards and assessments. During the period while the benchmark system is being developed, districts will be expected to develop processes to use data throughout the school year using locally-developed assessment that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms (or commercially available benchmark products) but there is no detail with respect to how teachers and districts are expected to do this. It is unclear whether regional professional development institutes and on-line support (in both learning communities and the creation of a bank of resources) will be sufficient to support teachers to make the effective transition to the new standards, aligned curriculum and benchmarked assessments. Professional development for administrators is mentioned only once and does not seem sufficient to support administrators to be able to support and supervise their teachers' use of these systems.

Total	70	64

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	20

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

The State has provided evidence that it has 10 of the America COMPETES elements in place.

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

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

The State has made a great deal of data available to stakeholders, with different levels of access and information tailored to the identity of the users. Members of the public have open access to a limited amount of information, and evidence is provided in terms of usage that the public is accessing the data. Additional information is provided to teachers, administrators and district personnel, who are able to explore state testing results for individual students, alone and in combination with independent sets of data. Professional development materials and sessions are provided to support teachers and administrators to

use the system effectively. Still more information is available to a third set of users that, until now, is largely limited to Department of Public Instruction employees but is intended to be available to a greater set of users. The cross-reference to the 2009 Wisconsin Act 59 and the sharing of information it authorizes, as well as the annual summit to define research and additional staff should significantly enhance access for these users. However, it should be noted that in this section there are no specific goals, activities or time-lines provided for ensuring that this third level of access is made available to greater numbers of users, in particular researchers.

While the application describes the State's intention, through its participation in the State Collaboration: Longitudinal Data Systems, Data Visualization, Research and Development, to enable LEAD administrators and educators significantly enhanced information, there are no specific goals, activities or time-lines included as evidence of a high quality plan. Similarly, there is no concrete plan to ensure that the data support decision makers in continuous improvement.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	12
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	3
(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

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

The State plans to use the Growth Oriented Achievement Learning System dashboard as the location in which teachers can have access to all student data, in real-time and also have an array of instructional supports tailored to the information provided as a result of the data analysis. This requires a great deal of work, both by the vendor which will be selected to provide, support and deploy the computer platform and to deliver initial training of data coaches and educational consultants on the usage of the platform. While the plan and goals are substantial, there is no detail provided with respect to how and when this process will take place, who is responsible for oversight, how much professional development will be provided, etc. The only time-line provided is a brief annual description of strategy, not tasks, deliverables, etc. Assuming that this work is the same as providing the web interface for student performance data and instructional support modules -- which is important and impressive in scope -- it is too important to not have a detailed plan provided.

The State plans to hire two consultants and five data to coaches to develop and disseminate professional development instruction in four separate areas intended to increase data literacy. The plan describes which areas will be the focus in each year of the grant and who will design and deliver professional development in each of the areas. In all cases, professional development delivered by these coaches and consultants will be both in-person and online. Additional professional development will be provided for specific districts participating in the Value-Added Research Center work. While there is a fairly high-level description of the professional development to be provided in the narrative, Table 31 does a fine job of providing evidence of this being a high quality plan. In this Table are the goals, tasks, time-lines, and key responsible parties delineated for all steps of the plan. There is very little specified with respect to how administrators will be supported in this process.

The State plans to work with institutions of higher education to improve data literacy for new teachers and administrators, however, there is little more than the description of a goal provided. The only reference to this goal in the detailed Table 31 is developing standards of data literacy for new teachers and administrators. Once the standards are developed there is still much to do to ensure that new teachers and administrators will graduate with the requisite competencies.

The state's plan to use the statewide teacher identifier to evaluate the effectiveness of professional development, and tasking the consultants responsible for managing the professional development efforts,

will enable the state to analyze and continuously improve the professional development offered to increase teachers' effective use of data.

The state's plan to make data from the instructional improvement systems available to researchers is based largely on 2009 Wisconsin Act 59, which authorized not only sharing of data, but the creation of a PK-16 Longitudinal Data System of student data. In addition, the Department has established a data management position and will set an annual state education research agenda. Together these show great promise for increasing access of the data to researchers and for ensuring that the use is used for fruitful research.

Total	47	36

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**18**
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	5
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	7
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	6

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

State law allows for the establishment and operation of alternative route certification programs for both teachers and administrators. The programs can be provided by various institutions, including both institutions of higher education and other providers. While applications for approval of alternative route programs must describe how they select candidates, and some of the programs appear to be selective, neither the law nor the application provides evidence that the programs must be selective of participants. All programs must provide school-based experiences with ongoing support. Some of the programs limit the amount of coursework, but it is not clear that all programs have such limits on coursework. Upon completion, all programs result in the same level of certification within the three-tier license system as traditional programs.

The application provides evidence of the number of licenses issued for each of the past six years by each of the alternative route programs for both teachers and administrators, showing that all of the programs are in use.

Through an annual survey and supply and demand report, the state monitors and identifies teacher and principal shortages. The application for alternative route programs requires that applicants present data regarding the specific need which the program fulfills and evidence of programs responsive directly to identified geographical and content based needs is presented for both teaching and administrator programs. Both of these strategies will support the state's effort to ensure that the state is aware of shortage areas and that teachers and principals are appropriately prepared in response to the shortage areas.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**24**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	6
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	6
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	10

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

Most districts in the State measure student growth, using the state summative assessment, as well as formative assessments, standardized benchmark and summative tests, curriculum and course-based assessment and individual student work. However, as is made clear in the application, the measurement of student growth will change once the new state assessments are in place. With the exception of the description of two approaches used in the interim, there is no real presentation of the state's approach to measuring growth, nor is there a description of how the current or proposed methods will apply to students in non-tested grades or content. In fact, the great majority of responsibility for measuring student growth and selecting new evaluation systems rests at the LEA level. The State does not seem to be exercising great leadership in this area.

The application describes how student growth is, and will be, incorporated into existing evaluation systems for teachers and principals and what Participating LEAs agree to in the MOU with respect to local evaluation systems. In addition, the application describes the State's plan for adopting a model evaluation system that will include multiple criteria, include student growth as a significant factor, establish multiple rating categories, be based on Wisconsin Educator Standards and be aligned with the new assessment system. Districts will be given the option to incorporate key elements of the new model or adopt it as a whole. It is not clear whether the multiple rating categories will differentiate effectiveness in accordance with the definition of effective teacher and effective principal set forth in the Race to the Top application. It is also not clear whether comparability will be required across districts. With respect to the State's plan to design and implement the evaluation systems, there is very little detail other than the formation of a steering committee (which is inclusive of both teachers and principals), the drafting of the model evaluation system, and final publication after a period of feedback. The only information with respect to responsible parties and accountability is that the process will be monitored by OEII to ensure fidelity. There is no evidence of the State playing a strong leadership role here.

The application and the MOU provided to LEAs makes clear that annual summative evaluations are required only for probationary teachers and principals, as well as all staff in the lowest achieving schools. Non-probationary educators are subject to annual evaluations, but they are formative not summative; otherwise they receive summative evaluations only every third year. This meets the letter of the law, but minimally.

As part of their MOU commitments, Participating LEAs are required to use the results of evaluations for some, but not all of the required elements. They are required to use the results of evaluations to inform decision-making in the areas of coaching, induction support, and/or professional development. The application describes how this support is provided now, but does not provide any aspects of a plan for how this will work when the new evaluation system is in place. Participating LEAs are also committed to including formative and summative components in principal and teacher evaluation systems, conducting annual formal and summative evaluations for probationary teachers and principals, conducting annual formative evaluations, a summative evaluation in the first year, and a summative evaluation at least every third year for non-probationary teachers and principals; and implementing improvement plans for principals and teachers rated as unsatisfactory. While the State "encourages" the use of evaluations to inform compensation, promotion or advancement decisions, these activities are not required of Participating LEAs. Several LEAs have chosen to provide opportunities for advancement and additional compensation, however, these are not tied to the results of annual evaluations. The State's three-tier license system requires LEAs to use formative and summative evaluation results to inform decisions regarding tenure. With respect to non-probationary teachers and principals, removal must be with just cause. While the application states that just cause with respect to performance is primarily demonstrated via the summative evaluation process, it does not appear that this is required. Nor are the procedures leading up to decisions regarding tenure and removal provided in the application.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**19**
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	11
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	8

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

The State collects data from all districts so that the distribution of effective teachers and principals among schools in each district is clear and visible, and the State requires that any districts with educators reported as not highly qualified are enrolled in an educator preparation program working towards full licensure, provided with professional development, or can demonstrate content knowledge. In addition, the state's plan to ensure equitable distribution of educators requires additional reporting and the compilation of a statewide database (that will be publicly reported) with the number and percent of teachers and principals in each rating category at the school, district and state levels, delineated by poverty and minority population. The State's plan requires aggressiveness on the part of individual districts with respect to ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers and principals, however, the plan does not provide great detail with respect to how it will support the LEAs to ensure such equitable distribution. The State's targets for this section are ambitious; what is not clear is if they are achievable.

The State has a number of programs as part of its efforts to increase the number of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. These programs serve particular geographic areas (rural and urban) and some include monetary incentives. All are designed to, and do, prepare and support teachers for hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. Again, the State has provided solid evidence of the programs it has in place, but not a high quality plan for ensuring growth and success of its efforts to ensure that it is able to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers in these hard-to-staff areas.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**6**
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	3
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	3

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

The State has moved aggressively to move teacher education from an input-based model to a performance -based model, and it now plans to further strengthen its teacher preparation by its participation in the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium. Adding to this by linking teacher performance data to educator preparation programs is evidence of an ambitious plan to improve teacher preparation. The common employer survey that will be developed by the State will capture the employer's evaluation of each initial educator's preparation as well as student growth data for the teacher. This information will be shared with the preparing institutions and will be available to the public on the Department of Public Instruction's website. The plan includes a time-line, activities and responsible parties for the creation and rolling out of the pre-service assessment system, but none of those elements are provided for the plan to link student growth and achievement data with the teachers and principals.

The State has planned to expand several programs designed to prepare educators for urban environments and for teaching in hard-to-staff and other shortage areas. However, there is no evidence presented that the targeted programs for teachers and principals are successful at producing effective teachers. There is an implementation plan but it lacks sufficient detail to be considered a high quality plan.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**13**
(i) Providing effective support	10	7
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	6

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

The State has targeted the majority of its professional development efforts on improving induction mentoring for teachers and principals. In response to data indicating inconsistent and, at times, ineffective mentoring supports, the State has presented evidence of a high quality plan to improve mentoring for initial educators, including the creation of mentor and coaching guidelines and best practices, provision of

resources and tools, and holding mentor academies and coaching institutes. A time-line, specific activities and key parties are designated as part of a high quality plan for this professional development. Other ongoing and job-embedded professional development for teachers and principals include the Wisconsin Response to Intervention train the trainer supports,improving instructional practices around the Common Core standards, using and interpreting data from the new assessment system, using and accessing eLearning Portfolios in the data dashboard, using and interpreting data in the state longitudinal data system, and using and interpreting value-added results. With respect to all of these non-induction mentoring supports, however, there is far less detail with respect to the type of professional development that will be offered, who it will be provided by, and when it will be provided. This heavy emphasis on mentoring, as opposed to the other important professional development opportunities, is also reflected in the budget, which makes clear that the support for mentoring and coaching is the largest single budget item of all the key projects in the State's full application.

Under the terms of the State's Race to the Top MOU, Participating LEAs are required to use local data to inform currently required professional development and mentoring programs, provide regular common planning and collaboration time and require additional, targeted professional development for principals and teachers rated as "unsatisfactory." However, there is no description of how the state will collaborate with or support the Participating LEAs to ensure that this is appropriate, job-embedded or ongoing.

The state describes a robust system of evaluation to ensure that the induction support, including coaching and mentoring, is effective. There is otherwise no evidence presented of plans to measure, evaluate and continuously improve the effectiveness of the professional development supports.

Total	138	80

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

The 2009 Wisconsin Act 215 gives the State Superintendent of Education to intervene in low achieving schools and districts. In addition, the Superintendent has been given additional specific authority to intervene in districts which house any school included among the lowest 5% of public schools.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**36**
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	31

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

The State has already identified its current persistently lowest achieving schools using the federal rubric and definitions in Race to the Top. Because the data indicated that achievement in Title I schools is increasing in elementary and middle schools but declining in high schools, the State's formula provided additional weight to high schools and the five lowest achieving Title I eligible schools are high schools. An additional seven high schools not eligible for Title I were also designated as persistently lowest achieving.

Because all of the state's persistently lowest achieving schools are within the Milwaukee Public Schools, the plan to support LEAs in turning around these schools focuses wholly on the plan to support Milwaukee Public Schools. Though presumably the State would use similar strategies should other districts need support to turn around a lowest achieving school, the plan speaks only to Milwaukee. Because the schools currently all are within one district and the State has been working aggressively to support the district to improve its schools, the plan is robust and of high quality. It is also organizationally quite strong, in that it

focuses not just on the individual schools but on the district as a whole. In addition to relying on the intervention authority, particularly the additional rights given to the Commissioner to exercise in any district which includes schools in the lowest 5%, the State plans to develop a core team of leaders to coordinate and provide support around state and federal improvement requirements. In addition to hiring a State Turnaround Director and five turnaround specialists who will oversee efforts and provide on-the-ground support around key areas of needed improvement (as well as areas targeted for professional development under the definition of the "transformation" model of turning around a school), the core team will be made up people with a broad range of expertise and responsibility, designed to ensure that improvement efforts are inclusive of all students and the full school community. Although the particular expertise of outside organizations that will be called upon to support the implementation of the turnaround models is not specified, this support is an important aspect of the plan.

The State's plan to support its LEAs to turnaround its persistently lowest achieving schools also includes other community-based strategies, such as the WINS for Children program. The application provides evidence of the purpose and the strategies that are used in this program to build a healthier community including its schools.

The State has determined that four of the first twelve schools slated for turnaround will use the "closure" model. The plan does not include detail regarding reassignment of the students currently attending these schools, an important focus of the model, especially given the state's learning from its experience having previously closed 23 schools.

It should be noted that the state's plan to identify persistently lowest achieving schools and double the number of schools in which the four school intervention models will be used each year during the first three years of the grant is very aggressive, and it is unclear that those responsible for supporting the efforts of the first schools will be sufficiently far along, and have learned enough, to keep adding so many schools to their portfolios each year.

Total	50	46

F. General

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

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

The percentage of available revenues used to support elementary, secondary and public higher education for FY 2009 was slightly greater than the percentage of available revenues used to support elementary, secondary and public higher education for FY 2008.

The State's policies, as well as the interpretation of its constitution, support equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs and High Poverty Schools and other Schools.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**24**
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	5
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	4

(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	4
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	3

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

There is no cap on the number of charter schools that can be established in the State, or the number of children who can be served by charter schools. Chartering authority has been progressively extended over the years and now is held by colleges and universities, regional educational authorities and the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee.

State statutes delineate required items that must be in each petition to open a charter school, and included among the items is a description of the school's educational program, the methods by which the school will help students achieve educational goals, the governance structure for the school, and methods to ensure parental involvement. All of the items must similarly be included in the contract between the authorizer and the person who seeks to establish the school. All chartering entities must give preference to applicants who seek to establish schools to serve at-risk students and contracts must describe how the school will achieve a racial and ethnic balance reflective of the school district as a whole. The State laws regarding charter school accountability focus on the chartering entity (not the State) revoking the charter if the school is found to have violated its contract, which includes its plans for the educational program, among others. There is no sense that the State is playing a large leadership role with respect to the accountability of charter schools. While anecdotal evidence is presented regarding the closure of 67 charter schools over the past five years, including a report from the Wisconsin Charter School Association, suggesting that failure to make adequate student academic progress is among the reasons for closure, there is no specific evidence provided regarding the identification of the charter schools or the specific reasons for which they were closed. Many reasons are suggested, and it does not appear that failure to make adequate progress is among the primary reasons. In addition, the application does not make clear whether student achievement, as defined in Race to the Top, is the same criterion as is used in its decisions regarding charter school authorization, renewal and/or closure.

Charter schools are funded differently depending on whether they are authorized by districts or other chartering entities. In some districts charter school funding follows students and the schools receive the same funding as traditional schools. However, this is not required - and because the district and charter school negotiate the specific level of funding, in some the schools may not be receiving their commensurate level of financial support. The charter schools authorized by non-district chartering organizations are funded from a proportionate reduction in State school aid from all of the State's school districts. Thus, individual comparisons for the non-board charter schools were not provided. It is noteworthy that the Center for Education Reform has found that Wisconsin is among the states providing the highest rate of funding for its charter schools.

The State does not impose any facilities-related requirements on charter schools that it does not impose on traditional public schools. The State does not provide facilities aid to schools; this support is provided by the LEA. Therefore, facilities aid does not distinguished between charter schools and traditional schools. However, facilities funding is a matter of negotiation between the charter school and its authorizer, so there is no way to know the extent to which such funding will be equitable or not. The application does not suggest that the State provides any assistance with respect to facilities acquisition; it does, however, state that some charter schools may share district facilities. It is not clear whether charter schools have the ability to share in bonds, mill levies, etc.

While State Statute (Section 118.38) allows school boards to apply for a waiver to be exempt from any education related district requirement except those that concern the heath and safety of pupils, pupil discrimination, the assessment program, teacher licensure, pupil records, data collection, and financial auditis, there is no evidence provided that these waivers are equivalent to statutory authority to operate innovative, autonomous public schools as defined in Race to the Top.

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

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

The application describes several significant conditions favorable to reform or innovation that have positive and important outcomes. They include the following:

- Fully funding a community-based four-year old kindergarten program
- Establishing Model Early Learning Standards
- Restructuring the educator licensing system
- Repeal of the Qualified Economic Offer law
- Open enrollment for students throughout the state
- Wisconsin Covenant Program

Total	55	39

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

While the State has a number of initiatives aimed at improving STEM education and making it more broadly available, the overall plan does not meet the requirements of Race to the Top. While there are many important and well-planned initiatives, including the creation of the statewide STEM Advisory Committee, establishment of the STEM Academies, financial support for district innovations in STEM, increasing science and math course offerings, training to enable more teachers to teach AP STEM-related courses, expanding teacher preparation programs focused on STEM teachers, the overall plan suffers from the fact that in the majority of districts students are required only to take two science and two mathematics courses in high school. Only six urban districts have signed addenda to their MOUs which commit them to requiring three years of math and three years of science for high school graduation. This seriously undermines the likelihood that many students will be prepared for STEM-related further study, including AP courses, or careers. In addition, while the State proposes that the additional math and science credits can be earned in creative ways and through integrated and applied methods, it is not clear that they will be rigorous. There is also no effort described to addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and, in particular, women and girls - it appears only in the designation of districts participating in the effort to prepare more teachers to teach AP courses. While the districts have high minority population, there is no mention of how particularly to address the students' needs or addressing girls or women at all.

Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State's application provides evidence of a comprehensive approach to education reform. The State is well on its way to adopting high quality, internationally benchmarked Common Core standards and benchmarked assessments and has a plan for rolling them out and supporting LEAs to implement them. It

is also well on its way to meeting all of the requirements of America COMPETES and has plans to support LEAs to use the data that will be made available to improve teaching and instruction. Data will also be made available to parents, community members and researchers. Teacher and principal licensing is tied to performance, and evaluations will be created that include student growth as a significant factor. While most unions have not agreed to the broadest use of new evaluation systems, the state is moving forward and creating model evaluations. The State is also already deeply engaged in efforts to turnaround the lowest achieving schools and has set out a comprehensive and robust plan to increase staff to be able to provide significant support to the schools in turnaround status.

Total		0
Grand Total	500	354

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Wisconsin Application #4650WI-8

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**48**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	33
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10

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

(i) Wisconsin articulates a comprehensive, coherent reform agenda focused on the four education reform areas: standards and assessments, data systems, effective teachers and principals, and low-performing schools. The comprehensiveness of the plan is reflected throughout the RTT application as indicated by the linkages between the goals and activities in the state plan overview. 96% of Wisconsin's LEAs will participate in the RTT program including all of the large urban LEAs. The state reform plan, and its potential for success, is strengthened by the additional funding that will be made available to the lowest performing LEA and the larger districts.

(ii) The terms and conditions in the MOU reflect a commitment by the LEAs to implement the state RTT plan. The MOU includes language indicating that these are the minimum requirements which allows the state and the LEAs to increase the requirements over the five years. This strengthens the MOU by acknowledging that it is a floor, not a ceiling. It also allows for some local variation that could be a plus or could weaken the state plan. The concern is be the quality of state monitoring and whether or not LEA plans will be improved over time or diminished.

The scope of work descriptions follow the four reform areas mandated by RTT and LEAs must implement all or significant portions of the plan. (Note: The state has added an optional activity for LEAs allowing them to use formative evaluations to inform their decision making on National Board Certification and career ladders for teachers and principals. It is unclear, at this point, if this will strengthen or weaken WI's plan.) The signatures garnered by WI in support of the RTT plan as a whole reinforces the concern over local support for one key aspect of the plan - effective teachers and principals. While the state has signatures from all of the superintendents and 96% of the school board members, only 81% of the union representatives signed off . It should be noted that this "no signature" was apparently from many small districts. However, sign offs on individual plan elements indicate only 36% of the districts will participate in using evaluations to inform compensation, promotion, and retention. The support for this element, the signature pattern, and the possible impact of the flexibility in the scope of work raises questions about the depth of the LEA commitment to the plan.

(iii) As mentioned above, there is some variation in WI's participation across all of its districts but it does have the support of the largest districts who will benefit most from the RTT plan at the resource and support level. Given the discrepancies in achievement in WI, the plan supports its goals.

As a high performing state on NAEP and the state assessment, WI has set its most ambitious goals in the area of closing the achievement gap using NAEP as the measure. For example, WI intends to close the achievement gap by approximately 17-20% in reading and mathematics at every grade level for Black, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities.

Specific achievement targets in reading and math are less well-defined and suffer from a category named "on track to proficient." Given the high level of achievement at the state level and the projection to raise proficiency scores approximately 3 to 5% over the life of RTT, there must be additional data breakouts to explain "on track" for the highest and lowest performing districts and fully clarify the distance these districts, schools, and students need to travel. It is difficult to know why these data were not included in the application.

At the state level, the graduation rate is currently 89%; the state projection for 2013-14 is 94%. The state clearly knows the 50 school districts that account for 80% of the high school drop-outs and has targeted those districts to raise the graduation rate statewide with specific targets for American Indian, Hispanic, and Black students.

Not surprisingly, college entry rates follow the patterns of achievement and drop out statistics. The state has set an annual growth target that will increase college enrollment by 40% by 2014 which translates into approximate enrollment changes from 65% in 2010 to 70% in 2014.

WI has projected some ambitious goals for student achievement - primarily decreasing the achievement gap - and their RTT plan follows these goals. However, there still seem to be gaping holes in their expectations and services to the neediest, lowest performing students. For example, the on track to proficient category does not provide specific targets to measure improvement as a result of the RTT investment.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**26**
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	17
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	9

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

(i) WI has ensured that it has the capacity to implement RTT from the state to regional to local level. At the state level, it intends to establish an Office of Educational Innovation and Improvement reporting directly to the State Superintendent to manage the RTT program. The office will have a to-be-hired staff of seven including the director. The state has given this office broad authority to coordinate reform efforts across the agency as well as manage RTT including monitoring LEA plans. The cross agency work will be critical to ensuring that all the support systems in WI, e.g. regional support, are clearly targeted to meet RTT goals. An additional strength of the WI management plan is to provide turn around specialists to Milwaukee to oversee its reform plan. A new Director of District and School Improvement will be part of the RTT office specifically responsible for this work. This structure should have a positive impact on state implementation with a visible leadership team and new ideas. The state also intends to use RTT funds to supplement work in the following key areas: standards and assessments (9 staff), data (7 staff), teacher and principal mentoring (2 staff), and turn around (7 staff).

All of the above offices have as part of their mission to support LEAs within their particular areas. For example, the data office will have data coaches working with districts and schools. The state has also identified special services to rural areas through the regional service centers (CESAs) as well as the Turn Around Office for the lowest performing urban groups. The state will also fund a Response to Intervention Center and a community action project in Milwaukee.

An additional commendable area in WI's management plan includes contracting with an outside organization to track state administration and LEA progress. This third party review should improve state administration and local implementation.

WI plans to align funding to support RTT in the following areas: a longitudinal data system grant supports the development of a comprehensive system, a school improvement grant further supports Milwaukee efforts, and the stabilization funds will assist in completing the America Competes data elements. WI was silent on aligning other state and federal, i.e. Title 1 funds, to support the RTT plan.

The sustainability of RTT appears to rest with districts. The state intends to "encourage" them to continue these efforts. The role of the state will be to seek additional funds for projects deemed successful. This is not a proactive strategy.

(ii) Stakeholder support for this plan as evidenced by the letters of support included in the application include: AFT and NEA state officials, American Indian Tribal Officials, mayors, Chambers of Commerce, state level school administrators, and the higher education community. There were, however, few support letters from community groups who may be instrumental in extending the work of RTT.

The state also held 5 stakeholder meetings to prepare its state RTT grant and intends to establish an implementation advisory council to help keep the stakeholder support over the length of the grant.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**20**
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	15

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

(i) WI has made progress in the four education reform areas. WI began revising its standards to include international benchmarks through its work with the American Diploma Project and teams of state experts. The state data system has used a federal data grant to expand the use and usefulness of its system by adding both student growth percentiles and value added analyses. For teachers and principals, the state has changed the licensure process to a performance based system as well as supporting instructional leadership skills in principals. ARRA funds have been used to enhance the data system, increase the equitable distribution of effective teachers, and turn around low-performing schools through a Response to Intervention model, extend Title 1 services to middle and high schools, and expand parental involvement programs.

(ii) WI is a high performing state on both its own assessment and NAEP and is commended for those scores. However, underneath those scores are substantial and longstanding achievement and graduation gaps.

- Mathematics scores rose from 05-06 to 08-09. NAEP trends show a similar pattern but not as pronounced and with a few ups and downs.
- Reading achievement appears stagnant over the same period. NAEP trends show either no growth or very slight closing of the gap for some subpopulations.

WI reports a fairly constant graduation rate of 89% from 1997 through 2008. However, 80% of the state's dropouts are in 50 school districts and fall disproportionately on Black students with American Indian and Hispanic students not far behind.

WI believes the math gains stem from intense professional development, no explanation is provided for the reading scores.

As discussed in the previous section, WI has substantial achievement gaps which appear to be narrowing very slightly from 05 to 09. This is a critical issue for the state and is the focus of its RTT application. The achievement gaps for American Indian, Asian, Black and Hispanic students are <u>the</u> issue for WI and diminish their total achievement and graduation picture.

Total	**125**	**94**

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1

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

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

(I) WI participated in the Common Core State Standards initiative with 51 states and territories.

(ii) Wisconsin will fully adopt the standards by July 30, 2010. The state superintendent has the authority to adopt the standards, no other action is necessary.

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

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

(i) and (ii) WI is participating in SMARTER with 33 other states to develop and implement assessments aligned with the Common Core Standards. The consortium is submitting an application to the RTT Assessment grant program to fund the development.

While no points were deducted, it would have been useful to know what will happen in WI if the SMARTER application is not funded.

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

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

The state's implementation plan has 4 main components: online information sharing, collaborative work teams, online curricula development, and a feedback process. Responsibility for communication rests with the newly created RTT office as content level staff at the SEA funded by RTT lead the substantive model curriculum development process with K-12 educators and stakeholders. Critical support for local educators will be provided through colleges and universities, professional organizations, and regional service centers. This is an on-going process and requires a high level of coordination at the state and local level. The end date is 2013.

Two of the most important aspects of WI's plan are the model curriculum development teams and the regional professional learning communities that will move the standards into the instructional practice realm. WI also has plans to align the standards with college and career readiness expectations using higher education faculty and regional work force organizations.

The weakness in the plan is the transition to balanced assessments. While the state has articulated the involvement of local educators in the development of instructional units and exemplars of student work, further detail is needed on how WI will negotiate within the state and with the SMARTER consortium members to develop meaningful indicators for its educators.

Total	**70**	**67**

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**20**

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

WI has implemented 10 of the 12 data elements.

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

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

WI's plan to improve accessibility and use is based on three intertwined strategies: adding more data to the system, creating a dashboard to produce better reports, and increasing professional development for educators, especially teachers. The combination of these elements should better meet the data needs of Wisconsin educators. One of the critical elements that the state intends to fund is value added comparisons for an additional 100 districts which will help districts make better comparisons and judgments regarding student performance.

It is interesting to note that the current system had 14.7M viewers in 07 and 08 which indicates the interest is high and raises the question of why there was no mention of parents, community members, policy makers, or other stakeholder audiences in this section.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**13**
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	5
(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	4

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

(i) The new balanced assessment system will be the core data element educators will use to better inform teaching and learning. To these summative assessment data and the growth data (when they become available), WI intends to allow educators to upload their local assessment data to provide a complete picture of student performance. Linked to all these data will be instructional components such as videos and model units. While a system close to the one WI intends to build has been on most educators wish list for years - an easy to use linked data and resource system - it seems very ambitious in the abstract. WI has included in their plan all of the data elements necessary to inform and improve practice such as growth measures, demographic information, attendance rates, and intervention strategies. The state has also planned a phase in and feedback system to ensure that the Growth Oriented Achievement Learning System (GOALS) meets stakeholder needs. The GOALS dashboard, while appealing in the abstract, is expected to carry far more weight than may realistically be possible.

(ii) The key to the success of the GOALS dashboard is the amount and quality of the training as well as the hardware and software support across all the districts. WI has wisely planned for both on-line and face-to-face training. In addition, the state intends to start with a data literacy training program that hopefully will increase the users' comfort level as the GOALS system is created. WI's plan includes RTT funding for data coaches, using the regional centers to support local staff, and train new teachers at the pre-service level.

The state does not seem to have plans for extra assistance or support to districts or schools that may not have the capacity to use such a sophisticated system. It would have been useful to have some indication of the current data use at the local level to better assess the capacity of educators to easily move to the GOALS system.

(iii) WI intends to make data available to researchers with all the FERPA safeguards. The state will facilitate research use by having a dedicated staff person assigned to handling requests, setting an annual state level research agenda in consultation with researchers. Finally, the SEA will ask for proposals aligned with

the state's research agenda. The state does not provide parameters for the research agenda nor does it speak to the other types of research requests it will consider.		
Total	47	37

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**20**
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	6
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	7

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

(i) Wisconsin has a history of statutory routes to alternative certification for teachers and principals . The state requirements are impressive, include all the RTT required elements and add to those requirements a review of the organizations' financial resources and a follow-up plan for the graduates. Included in the RTT application is the state review tool which ensures that the alternative programs are providing a quality preparation program.

(ii) There are currently 9 teacher and 2 administrator alternative certification programs, of those 4 are in colleges and universities (one is an American Indian College), 3 in regional service agencies, 2 are not for profit and 2 are for profit organizations. From 2004 through 2009, the alternative teacher certification programs graduated 1,234 students. The programs were most used in 2007 and 2008 with enrollment dropping in 2009. During the same period, the alternative administrator programs graduated 64 students with the same trend in enrollment.

To adequately measure the use of alternative routes, it would have been useful for the state to provide data on the percent of the teacher and principal preparation candidates prepared using alternative routes compared to the total candidates in the state. In addition, it would be useful to know the percent of the current teacher and principal workforce in the state prepared though alternative programs. Without those key percentiles, it is difficult to determine the efficacy of the alternative programs.

(iii) WI prepares an annual supply and demand report that includes the number of completers in each licensure area from the state's colleges and universities as well as survey data from school districts that gathers the number of applicants per vacancy and hard to staff positions. The data are made available to the public. The major shortage area is special education, others include: math, science, and bilingual education. The application did not provide any additional analysis of these data but did indicate that they planned to upgrade the system in order to do so. WI's current process for preparing teachers and principals to fill these shortages areas is embedded in the alternative route programs and is a consideration when approving such programs. Of particular note is WI's use of the Federal loan deferment and forgiveness program. This is a very proactive approach to encourage students to teach in hard to staff areas.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**16**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	4
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	1

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

The RTT application describes WI's approach to the following:

- Induction and professional development: WI has a proactive approach to induction providing $375 to districts per educator per year for two years of induction support. This is commendable. The state is proposing as part of its RTT plan to develop mentor and coaching guidelines as well as training through the regional centers to support teachers and principals who have less than satisfactory ratings.
- Compensation, et.al.: The state will encourage districts to use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and advancement decisions. The MOU provides a list of optional activities each district may undertake and provides data on district choices. National Board certification is the overwhelming choice of 154 participating LEAs; 93 and 86 LEAs will use career ladders to promote and/or provide additional compensation of teachers and principals respectively. The RTT application did not indicate if these selections were cumulative, i.e. LEAs selecting more than one option. It should be noted that 72 schools currently offer additional compensation for National Board or Master Educator certification. Based on the evidence in the RTT application, additional compensation does not appear to be a popular idea in WI nor is it widely used.
- Tenure is on a three year period for teachers and principals.
- Removal: The RTT application includes the opportunity for a negotiated labor-management program to provide counseling and professional development program for non-performing teachers and principals.

WI articulates a preventive approach to teacher and principal retention that includes strong preparation programs and a thorough induction and support system. Without additional data on the results of the extant evaluation systems it is difficult to know the effectiveness of their apparently excellent prevention approach. However, given the lack of support for state evaluation systems the strength of the current evaluation system is in question.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**17**
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	9
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	8

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

(i) Under RTT, WI will implement an equitable distribution policy by 2011 with the participating LEAs. The plan will require annual reporting on the results of the evaluation system which will be broken out by the poverty and minority status at the school, district and state levels. These data will be used to develop technical assistance to districts as well as verify the equitable distribution. If inequitable distribution exists, the LEA must remedy it. While WI articulates a plan for reporting to the state, it does not appear as if there are remedies at the state level if inequitable distribution continues, i.e. if the district and school remedies are ineffective.

(ii) There are a number of active programs at the state level to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers in urban areas and hard-to-staff subjects. The University of Wisconsin has a pre-service program for 20 educators, in-service program focused on STEM areas, and a future teacher program for minority students. The state supports Master Teacher programs, intense recruiting for STEM areas, as well as national programs targeted to Milwaukee such as New Leaders, Teach for America, and the New Teacher Project.

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

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

(i) The SEA has the authority to monitor teacher preparation programs requiring all programs to report on completer's proficiency. While reports from 23 of the 32 in state programs have been reviewed, no results were reported in the RTT application. WI is also participating in the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC) to measure pre-service effectiveness during student teaching. The assessment is being field tested; RTT funds will expand the program to the larger teacher preparation programs which will produce comparable data and annual public reporting on teacher and principal effectiveness.

Their plan to improve the monitoring of these programs was not specific other than stating that employing districts will be surveyed on the effectiveness of the new teachers using student growth data and teacher evaluations. While the state claims these data will be comparable (currently they are not), the local teacher and principal evaluation systems discussed earlier may not produce the rigorous data necessary to link the data and provide rigorous comparable measures of effectiveness.

(ii) RTT funds will be used to expand the Institute for Urban Education at the University of Wisconsin. The program currently has 20 students, the application does not provide the number of additional candidates to be served but does indicate they will be in STEM areas. The application also mentions the Accelerated Program for Teaching Secondary School and the Math Specialist program without explaining whether or not the program will be expanded.

For principals, the state intends to work more closely with New Leaders for New schools and other programs to expand their efforts in urban areas such as Racine, Kenosha, and Beloit. No definitive numbers are included.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**13**
(i) Providing effective support	10	7
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	6

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

(i) WI has long standing mandated induction programs for teachers and principals that require individual plans and goals with both mentors and coaches to support new teachers. These programs are locally developed and implemented. The state will improve these programs by working with IHEs, professional organizations, regional units and non-profits to create professional development modules and other instructional materials identified as best practices. The SEA will provide professional development to implement the standards and assessments and use the new data system to improve instruction. Other activities will include the Response to Intervention Center.

Given the disparities in achievement within the state, a more targeted approach to meet the demands of high need students as well improving learning outcomes, may have added credibility to the proposed approach.

(ii) To their credit, WI has completed a survey (with the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center) of these programs which found the mentor program in need of improvement - an activity the state has undertaken by issuing guidelines and providing promising practices from across the state. The state will continue these activities with a 2011 completion date. Districts will need to implement these guidelines as part of their RTT allocations and to receive the state funding of $375 per initial educator.

On-going professional development will be improved with the use of the teacher identifier (2011) to better identify effective professional development. The teacher identifier will help the state and districts identify best practices in professional development and well as effective and ineffective ones. Other than identifying ineffective approaches, it was unclear if the state or districts would take any proactive action in regard to the ineffective programs. Without an articulated action step for ineffective programs, the collection of data remains just that.

WI will also better focus the State System of Support mandated by Title 1 to provide math and reading coaches.		
Total	**138**	**73**

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

(i) The SEA was recently (April, 2010) given the authority to directly intervene in low-performing schools and districts if a school district has been identified in need of improvement for four consecutive years and if the district contains a school that is among the lowest 5% of public schools. The statute requires the local school board to take a number of specific improvement actions such as using a standard curriculum, use pupil performance data to establish differentiated instruction, provide additional learning time and the like. The state may intervene in those schools to modify the districts plan after consultation with the board, district superintendent and union leadership.

This new legislation gives the SEA more authority than it had previously to intervene in schools and districts.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**33**
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	28

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

(i) Using the federal definition, WI has identified 12 high schools as persistently low-performing. All of the schools are in Milwaukee.

(ii) Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) will be the sole focus of WI's efforts to turn around persistently low-achieving schools. MPS will receive an additional $14M of RTT funding as well as the assistance of a staff of 6 to assist the district. While the state has worked with the district to improve its financial management systems and administer special education programs under the corrective action authority of Title 1, this will be the first concentrated effort to move the district forward. The targeted schools will use three of the four RTT school intervention models: restart, closure, and transformation as well as the state's Response to Intervention strategy to improve this lowest performing district.

The state will also provide community assistance through a community development project (WINS). This effort will provide additional supports for extended day/extended year programs as well incentives to improve attendance, reduce truancy, and other social services. Another MPS focused activity will be to develop a research partnership to further support these efforts. (Note: A robust evaluation did not appear to be one of the activities this research partnership would undertake, nor was it described as a critical friend. Both of these activities could strengthen the MPS program.)

While Milwaukee obviously needs to improve teaching and learning in every school, the RTT plan raises questions about what the state has been doing (or not doing) over time to solve the problems in this apparently dysfunctional LEA. It was also unclear why the state believes the approach outlined in the RTT application was going to have an impact in Milwaukee.

Total	**50**	**43**

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**6**
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	3
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	3

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

(i) State funding for education increased very slightly (1%) from 07-08 to 08-09.

(ii) State statute and policy lead to equitable funding across districts. Among its policies are equating formulas between high and low property values and a cap on how much districts are able to increase spending. Per pupil spending in districts with 20% or more students below the poverty line was $11,600 in 07-08; districts with less that 20% students below the poverty line was $10,100. Equitable funding within LEAs was not addressed.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**26**
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	4
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	4
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	4
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	6

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

(i) Wisconsin has a long history of supporting charter schools. There are no restrictions on the number of charters nor the enrollment.

(ii) Chartering authority rests mainly with local districts. Milwaukee has additional chartering authority with the University of Milwaukee, Area Technical College and the City Common Council. State statute sets guidelines for what needs to be included in the petition including student performance measures, parental involvement, as well as teacher qualifications. The state monitors charter schools with an annual survey at the district level.

At this time 206 charter schools are operating in WI. Over the past five years, authorizers have closed 67 schools which the state believes is an indication of increased accountability at the local level and the support of the SEA. Because the state does not collect data on charter school closures it is difficult to know the precise reasons.

(iii) Funding decisions are made at the local level with the district and charter school negotiating the specific level of funding. WI does not provide evidence to indicate equitable funding for charter schools but does cite a Center for Education Reform statement indicating "Wisconsin funds its charter schools at a slightly higher rate than most other states." This is not adequate to fully measure whether or not the state's charter schools receive equitable funding.

(iv) These decisions are made at the local level. The state does not provide facilities funding for public schools nor for charter schools.

(v) Virtual schools seem to be the most used innovative school in WI. It is not clear if the statutory waiver authority discussed in the RTT application meets the requirements of the RTT definition.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	**5**	**5**
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) WI has created a number of important reform conditions of which it is justifiably proud, from early childhood education, open enrollment policies, progressive licensing for teachers, and college readiness. The outcome measures included in the discussion of the early childhood initiative are impressive. Data indicate that WI pre-K children are above the national average on three of the four academic skills assessed.		
Total	55	37

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	**15**	**0**
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) WI has articulated a coordinated approach to STEM from the benchmarking of its standards to teacher development programs. The state also intends to establish four STEM Academies for high school juniors and seniors that will increase the students opportunities for enriched coursework and provide teachers with unique professional development experiences. However, WI does not address the specific requirement to address the needs of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. The state's use of the terms "all" students and "underrepresented" students does not meet the positive requirement to address the needs of women and girls.		
Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		**Yes**
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) In many areas WI has a very impressive RTT application. They have been a lead state on the Common Core of Standards and aligned assessments with an ambitious plan to use technology to improve implementation at the local level. Their data system, including GOALS, could be a lighthouse for other states to combine all aspects of a reform system into a technology based tracking system. On the other hand, the achievement disparities in the state are wide and persistent. While the turn around effort in Milwaukee is targeted and designed to focus all the state's efforts on this one district, it raises the question of why did it take so long to provide this level of assistance. There is also a lack of participation in key areas of the plan - rewarding teachers and principals - that needs further explanation.		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	351

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Wisconsin Application #4650WI-7

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**50**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	34
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12

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

(i) This introduction provides much information about what the state has already done in the four major education reform areas of ARRA, along with some of their ideas for building on these efforts. The applicant also points out areas in which major improvements are necessary, such as narrowing achievement gaps between non-white and white students. However, the seven reform goals identified by the applicant are somewhat vague (e.g., "one of the top five states in student achievement;" and "cut the achievement gap in half") and prevent this section from receiving the highest rating.

(ii) Over 98% of Wisconsin's districts have signed on to the plan, representing almost 99% of economically disadvantaged students in the state. The two issues that weaken the apparently strong district support for this proposal are the following:

- 19% of the districts signing on to participate are doing so without teacher union support, although it appears as if most such LEAs are districts with relatively low percentages of students in poverty.
- Only 36.4% of participating LEAs support Part (D)(2)(iv)(b) of the proposal, i.e., tying teacher or principal compensation to student achievement.

Other than what is mentioned above, the combination of relatively strong LEA support and a clear scope of work agreed to by the LEAs, this criterion receives a score in the high range.

(iii) For goal areas (a), (b) and (c) in this section, the applicant has provided strong data and ambitious/achievable goals that should be attained, based on fairly broad LEA participation in the overall RttT program. The data included for area (d), re student completion of at least a year's worth of college credit, is understandably weak because the state has not had a mechanism to track this information. (If funded, this data collection weakness should be corrected through upgrades of the longitudinal data system.) The eventual goal of 69.7% of high school graduates enrolling in college could be more ambitious, however.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**24**
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15

(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	9

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

(i) The proposal describes the creation of an important new WDPI department, the Office of Education Innovation and Improvement, to oversee the activities and management of RttT-funded efforts. The 2% of total RttT budget that will be earmarked for the office is reasonable, and the proposed staff of a director and six consultants assigned by region is well conceived. The timeline for creation and actions expected of the OEII is excellent.

Another 1.6% of the RttT budget is allotted for "external accountability provisions." The proposal implies that one contractor will be brought on to help initially plan the management structures that the State Superintendent will put in place, as well as to provide "auditing" and reporting throughout the grant period. (The advisability of having the same firm provide both services is questionable, given relationships that will develop during the 90-day planning period.) The proposal contains a description of the annual reports expected from the outside auditor. This ongoing information should be helpful in maintaining public confidence in the entire program and in informing the WDPI and LEAs of strengths and weaknesses of implementation. However, more detailed information is needed about the state's plan for supporting LEAs by identifying promising practices, disseminating and replicating effective practices statewide, and intervening when necessary when LEAs are not effective in using RttT funds to meet goals.

The applicant explains its intent to align its RttT activities with other initiatives already in place, some of which are funded with other federal resources. Also, in an attempt to ensure sustainability, the State Superintendent intends to use data about successful RttT projects to shape his 2013-2015 budget proposal.

A large RttT investment (4% of total WI RttT budget) will be funds for the implementation of WINS for Children in a high-need area of Milwaukee. It appears as if the applicant expects this expenditure to appreciably lift the levels of success and hope in what might be the most distressed area of the state. However, there appears to be no plan to continue funding of this project if needed once the grant period ends. This is an area of concern.

Considering the strength and concerns identified above, this criteria is rated in the middle to high range.

(ii) The collaborative method utilized by the Governor and State Superintendent and their staffs to solicit input and cooperation in creating this proposal is exceptional, leading to a wide array of constituencies and stakeholder organizations that have expressed confidence in and support of the plan. The idea of establishing an RttT Implementation Advisory Council to maintain stakeholder involvement is noteworthy. The only types of groups apparently missing at the table are grassroots organizations like civil rights organizations, CBOs and student groups. Perhaps such representation could be added if WI is awarded an RttT grant.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**17**
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	12

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

(i) In its detailed response to this criteria, the applicant has identified significant progress already made in all four education reform areas of ARRA, making clear that its RttT plan is intended to build upon important

efforts already in place. An excellent table identifies the state's ARRA K-12 education funding breakdown and how the money was used. Thus, the proposal is rated very high for this criterion.

(ii) The data presented demonstrates much improvement in mathematics achievement but no progress in reading statewide. The applicant presents information about the state's Mathematics for the New Millennium initiative and the MPS's Math Teacher Leader program as significant factors for the math gains.

On the other hand, overall reading achievement has not improved, although economically disadvantaged students and black students demonstrated small gains. (NOTE: NAEP Reading data for 07-08 and 08-09 appears to be missing, with no explanation as to why.) The proposal does not seem to include a discussion of the flat reading scores.

Graduation rates have declined in WI since 03-04, which could be a function of more stringent diploma requirement. Nevertheless, the graduation rate for black students increased somewhat, a good gap-narrowing sign.

Figure 2 displays significant improvement of black students on the 4th grade NAEP. Similar information on 8th grade math and 4th and 8th grade reading is missing.

In this section, the applicant has provided incomplete data and has shown inconsistent academic growth overall, thereby leading to a rating in the middle range of scores.

Total	125	91

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	**40**	**38**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	18

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

(i) As a member of the 48-state consortium that participated in the development of the Common Core Content Standards for ELA and Mathematics, WI participated in the revision of the initial draft and warrants high points for this criterion.

(ii) Empowered to adopt learning standards for WI, the State Superintendent intends to adopt the Common Core Content Standards for ELA and Mathematics by July 30, 2010.

The proposal presents a rollout plan that is based in large part by written, online communication to LEA leaders, school leaders and teachers, and parents. Not enough is planned to provide face-to-face training to turnkey leaders from the LEAs who will need to facilitate principals and teachers in careful analysis of the specific expectations of the new standards and how they impact instruction. While the applicant states that local districts will be involved in the creation of a WI model curriculum for PK-12, there appears to be a reliance on consultants to do the work. Because of what seems to be an overly centralized implementation plan, this section is rated high but not deserving of maximum credit.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5

(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

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

(i) As a governing member of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium, the applicant is rated extremely high on this criterion.

(ii) The SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium includes a majority of the states and earns WI the highest possible rating for this criterion.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	**20**	**15**

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

The applicant has created a carefully constructed plan to integrate the consortium's work into the state's curricula and assessment programs. Two noteworthy early endeavors are (a) high school and college faculty teams convening to analyze the new standards in relation to entry-level college course content in order to report on common competencies; and (b) collaboratively revising the Employability Skills competencies to guarantee that they reflect current workforce needs and connect with the Common Core Standards.

The proposal identifies other important professional development initiatives related to transitioning to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. Many of these involve Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that will develop model curriculum, create model units of study, engage in lesson study, and learn how to use the computer-based adaptive benchmark assessment system developed by the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium. There is not a clear explanation, however, about how these PLCs will be formed and the mechanisms to ensure that their work will translate into significant teacher understanding and ability to utilize the new tools they will be expected to use.

An apparent significant oversight is the omission from the project budget of any funds for teacher stipends for their involvement in the high school/college faculty teams and their work on curriculum development, raising the question of how serious the state is in involving teacher leaders in the projects described in this section.

While district and school leaders will ultimately have the greatest responsibility in ensuring that school personnel are fluent in the newly adopted standards and knowledgeable about the revised assessment system, this proposal does not include sufficient information about the requisite training that principals and other education administrators will receive.

With many well conceived strategies and a clear timeline to effect a successful transition to the new standards and assessments, despite some of the details that may have been left out, this section has received a rating in the high range.

Total	70	63

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**18**

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

Other than the two elements (8 & 9) that the applicant identifies as not yet meeting, it appears as if Element 5 re audit systems is also not being met yet. Although there are a number of edit systems in place, the

state has not instituted a true audit of the data to assess correctness, especially at the LEA level. Thus, with 9 of the 12 elements in place, this criterion has earned 18 points.

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

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

The state's LDS allows access on three different levels--the public, teachers and administrators, and educational researchers and other sophisticated data users. Public reports are published by the Information Network for Successful School; its website averages about 20,000 views a day, demonstrating much public use. The proposal describes enhancements aimed at providing significantly greater information to the teacher/administrator group, especially in relation to data showing student growth. The planned GOALS "dashboard" could become a useful tool for teachers down the road, as long as sufficient staff training is implemented in a strategic way.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	12
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	3
(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

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

(i) The state has an ambitious plan to create a web-based portal of student assessment data connected to "instructional support modules" that teachers can use to track individual student progress on formative assessments to assist with differentiating instruction to meet students' academic needs. The formative assessments will be an outgrowth of the state's participation in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium. While the proposal describes in a theoretical way how the GOALS "dashboard" will operate, there are no specific examples offered as to how a teacher might utilize it to "adjust instruction" to improve learning. Also, there is no information provided about similar systems in place elsewhere and the results they have promoted.

The applicant includes a four-year implementation plan involving development, piloting and expansion of use to districts statewide, but the proposal fails to explain how the 10 pilot districts will be identified for Year 2 or who will be responsible for the overall project.

An especially promising feature of the "dashboard" is the eLearning component that will allow students (and their parents) to access their own formative assessment data to identify their strengths and weakness and to access instructional material that can assist in their learning progress.

(ii) The statewide professional development needs are enormous to ensure that the GOALS system is utilized effectively at the school building and classroom levels. The description of the system promises significant tools to enable teachers to learn more about individual students' progress and instructional needs. However, without sufficient training, the potential exists for widespread teacher confusion and even fear about learning to use a new technology with brand new kinds of information to digest. It is questionable that six data coaches will be able to deliver the kind of training that will be required statewide.

The $500,000 investment in the Value-Added Research Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison will probably be money well spent. As with many terms in the world of education, *value added* has different meanings in different places. The fact that a working definition was not included in the proposal is a possible sign that the applicant is not perfectly clear on what this work will provide and how teachers will be able to use the information that will be a product of the investment.

The project budget on identifies $2.64 million to "contract with vendor to develop, deploy, and support the GOALS dashboard and eLearning interface. However, the applicant states in the proposal narrative that "education consultants hired to manage the State's professional development effort will be tasked with monitoring the effectiveness of these programs..." The narrative and budget appear to conflict somewhat on this important issue. Relying on a contractor that develops the system to also evaluate its implementation may not be a wise practice. More clarification is needed here.

Considering the almost $6 million price tag and the overly theoretical plan for the building of this system, this criterion is rated in the middle range of scoring.

(iii) The proposal explains a clear commitment and detailed plan to increase researchers' access to educational data. A 2009 state law authorized WPDI to work with IHE partners to create the new longitudinal data system, and the partners are currently negotiating MOUs that will, among other things, define security requirements and research protocols.

With LDSIII funding, WI establish a data management position. This staff member will coordinate research requests across all state agencies. Proactively, WDPI plans to promote educational research by hosting an annual Data Summit and by publishing an annual request for research proposals. It appears evident that promoting educational research is a state priority that RttT funding will support. This criteria, therefore, is rated in the very high range.

Total	47	35

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**20**
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	7
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	6

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

(i) The fact that the State Superintendent has legal authority to establish "by administrative rule the standards and procedures of approval of educator preparation programs leading to licensure," including routes that allow for providers other than institutions of higher education, warrants the highest score for this criterion. Further, the guidelines found in the Wisconsin Educator Preparation Program Approval Handbook for the Review of Wisconsin Alternative Route Programs (Appendix 19) are exemplary and provide evidence that at least four of the five elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification. (The only element that is not apparent is the limited amount of coursework required or the ability to test out of coursework.)

(ii) According to the proposal, "nine teacher and two administrator alternative route programs are operated by CESAs, non-profit agencies, public and private colleges/universities and a for-profit organization in Wisconsin." The detailed information about these programs and the number of educators who have been licensed through them leads to a very high rating for this criterion.

(iii) The state uses an annual supply and demand report to identify the shortage areas throughout WI. This report, which is available to the public, has recently identified special education as the largest shortage

area, with mathematics, science, bi-lingual, ESL and world languages also showing shortages. It appears as if greater efforts have been made regarding certifying teachers and filling vacancies geographically (urban and rural districts) than by shortage license areas.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**13**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	3
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	1
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	7

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

(i) This criterion asks the applicant to describe its plan to collaborate with LEAs to establish clear approaches to measuring student growth. In its response, the applicant has identified numerous methods being used for such efforts (e.g., MDAT, Student Growth Percentiles, Value-Added Growth, MAP, and Running Records). The proposal also states that beginning in 2010-11, districts will have to report the local growth measures they are using. However, there are no overarching principles about measuring student growth provided to the LEAs, nor a clear timeline of expectations regarding implementation. It appears as if the LEAs will require much more guidance and training on measuring student growth, which could come with the rollout effort for the GOALS "dashboard." This criterion is rating in the mid range for the reasons stated above.

(ii) & (iii) According to statute, each WI LEA "must establish specific criteria and a systematic procedure to measure the performance of licensed school personnel...and must include observation of the individual's performance. Evaluation must occur during the first year of employment and at least every third year thereafter." WPDI apparently does not know the details of its LEAs' evaluation systems since they will begin to collect such information during the 2010-11 school year.

The proposal states that the state will work collaboratively with stakeholders, including teachers and principals, to "institute interim evaluation requirements under the Race to Top MOU while collaboratively developing a model evaluation system that districts may adopt or integrate into an existing evaluation system." The use of the word *may* in the statement is noteworthy.

The current WI evaluation system for non-probationary teachers and principals requires an evaluation every three years. The MOU that districts signed added an annual formative assessment for non-probationary staff, leaving the nature of the formative assessment up to the local LEAs. The proposal lists four "significant factors" that formative evaluations include. These have to do with use of student growth and achievement data, teacher portfolio and classroom observation. However, the explanation of formative evaluation found in the proposal is not included in the MOU that districts agreed to.

As is common around the country, most of the WI LEAs use an "either/or" system to evaluate faculty, i.e., satisfactory or unsatisfactory. In this section, the applicant discussed the work of Charlotte Danielson, who created a Framework for Teaching that provides multiple rating categories for various criteria. The applicant also mentioned the Appleton School District, which appears to be moving toward multiple rating categories that differentiate effectiveness (Appendix 22). However, the proposal fails to state that this characteristic of improved evaluation is a direction in which WI will proceed.

There also is very little information provided in this section as to what kinds of data on student growth will be included in teacher and principal evaluations.

For the reasons identified above, the proposal receives low ratings for Criteria (D)(2)(ii) and (D)(2)(iii).

(iv) There does not appear to be a plan to change much about how the LEAs in WI use teacher and principal evaluations to foster professional growth, to compensate and promote teachers fairly, to make decisions about granting tenure and to remove ineffective staff, whether tenured or non-tenured.

It is important to note that the state does not permit granting tenure to principals. At the end of a principal's two-year contract, the district may decide to not renew the contract based on the principal's evaluation.

The state provides districts $375 a year for required mentoring of a new teacher. Those funds are available for a second year of mentoring for a teacher that a district wishes to retain but feels needs more assistance. More details are needed to explain how the first-year teacher's evaluation will be used to decide about the need for a second year of mentoring and to inform the work of the Year 2 mentoring process.

Since teachers in WI are only rated Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory, the requirement that a U-rated teacher be put on a Professional Development Plan is, in some respects, a punitive measure. There is no plan to create mechanisms in which the evaluation process differentiates teachers' levels of expertise and performance and will be used by teachers and their supervisors to identify appropriate staff development activities to promote all teachers' growth in specific areas.

Criterion (D)(2)(iv)(b) represents the section of the State/LEA MOU in which a significant number of LEAs are not participating. There is very little support statewide for the use of evaluations in determining compensation or promotion.

Because the overall description in (D)(2) about upgrading the teacher evaluation system was weak and there is not much evidence of intent to use the evaluation process much differently regarding decision making about teachers, Criterion (D)(2)(iv) is rated in the low range.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**16**
(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	8

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

(i) The proposal outlines an equitable distribution policy that LEAs participating in RttT will adhere to beginning Fall 2011. This involves the analysis of equitable distribution with the LEA and the collaborative development with teachers and principals of a strategy to address any such inequities for the following school year.

WI has in place a system of providing bonuses for teachers who become National Board Certified. Whereas such teachers receive $2500 a year from the state for this "Master Educator" designation, they receive $2500 more if they work in high-poverty schools. While only about 10% of the state's Master Educators currently receive the second bonus, this incentive is evidence of the applicant's intent to foster equitable distribution of highly effective teachers.

The performance measures included in this section are questionable. Throughout the table, the applicant has entered percentages of teachers who are or will be *highly effective*, but there does not appear to be any evidence in the proposal that there will be a mechanism in place to determine that teachers are highly effective. Also, the goals for increasing the percentage of highly effective teachers will, if they are met, widen the gap between high-need and low-need schools.

There are a number of recruitment, training and certification programs in place to bring a qualified workforce to the state's high-need schools. WDPI received a $2.2 million federal Transition to Teaching grant to recruit and train science, math and special education teachers to work in high-need geographic areas other than Milwaukee. For Milwaukee, New Leaders for New Schools, the New Teacher Project and Teach for America are already in place. However, it does not appear that RttT funds are being requested to support and expand these programs or to create similar new ones to address inequities in staffing.

Since the state will apparently not have a mechanism to identify highly effective teachers as defined by the application and there do not appear to be new equity-in-staffing efforts under WI's RttT plan, this criterion is rated in the mid range.

(ii) The proposal mentions two programs in place to assist districts in finding effective teachers to fill shortage area vacancies--Wisconsin Leads and the New Teacher Project. There are, however, no plans to expand these programs under RttT. Another recruitment/certification program, the Institute for Urban Education, will be expanded with $1 million of RttT funds to add a STEM cohort of candidates. This criterion is rated in the high range of scoring.

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

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

(i) This section's weakness stems from no intent by the applicant to connect student growth to teachers and principals and, therefore, no ability to connect such growth to educators' preparation programs. The applicant's response to this criterion focuses on the state's plan to have educator preparation programs significantly improve their methods of evaluating prospective teachers' and principals' preparedness for real jobs in real schools. Also, the state will implement an employer follow-up survey to report back to preparation programs on the progress of their graduates once they become teachers or principals. WDPI intends to compile this information and report publicly, but there does not appear to be funding in the RttT budget to support the project. While this section identifies important and worthwhile actions that will occur, it does not fully meet this criterion and is therefore rated in the mid range of scoring.

(ii) The applicant identifies four teacher preparation or professional development programs but mentions plans to expand only one, the Institute for Urban Education.

The proposal briefly discusses the professional development that educator preparation programs need. The applicant mentions a collaboration of WDPI, WACTE, WICTE and UW to "enact a comprehensive technical assistance and professional development program...over the next four years." However, there is no timeline offered, no funds allotted, and no mention of the personnel responsible for it to happen. Also, the proposal states that "WDPI will provide technical assistance to principal training programs...and support expansion efforts in key urban school districts." Again, there is no timeline offered, no funds allotted, and no mention of the personnel responsible for this to occur.

For the reasons stated, this criterion is scored in the middle range.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**11**
(i) Providing effective support	10	6
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	5

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

(i) The applicant focuses much of its educator development plan on supporting and improving the mentoring that new teachers and principals are required to receive. New educators are required to produce a Professional Development Plan which must pass a verification process before such educators are advanced to professional licensure. By 2011, WDPI will collaborate with appropriate groups to produce guidelines for high-quality mentoring, and districts will have to implement such guidelines to receive funding support for mentoring activities. WDPI will also create "professional development modules, tools, and

training around principal and teacher effectiveness, " to be available through an online portal. The state also intends to provide "mentor academies and coaching institutes throughout the state" and to continue its program of competitive grants to improve mentoring in high-poverty schools.

The state plans to invest $7.5 million of RttT funds to expand the work of the Wisconsin Response to Intervention Center, which utilizes a turnkey trainer approach to building districts' professional development capacities. With three percent of the entire RttT budget to be allocated for this purpose, there does not appear to be sufficient detail in the proposal about the activities and intended outcomes of this particular project. There is no information included regarding the current budget for the RtI Center and a listing of its current activities and how they will be expanded, including the percentage of LEAs directly involved in this initiative.

WI's RttT plan for adopting new standards and assessments and for expecting significantly increased use of student achievement data will of course require effective professional development for all staff, not just new teachers and administrators. Not enough of the proposal's professional development expectations are geared toward all teachers and principals. Over $9 million is earmarked for contracts to assist with improving the mentoring programs in the state whereas only $1.275 million is set aside for contracts to assist with all other PD.

This section contains good ideas for improving PD throughout the state. However, with a possible over-reliance on the RtI Center and on mentoring for new teachers, especially given the huge outlays of funds for these projects, this criterion is rated in the middle range of scoring.

(ii) The proposal discusses the use of a statewide teacher identifier and student achievement data as a way to evaluate effectiveness of various professional development programs. However, it does not provide sufficient details as to who will be responsible for creating these data reports and how specific data on teachers' individual professional development activities will be entered into the system. Thus, this criterion is rated in mid range.

Total	138	67

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

Under WI law, the State Superintendent is authorized to intervene in "chronically under-performing schools or school districts" by monitoring and enforcing compliance of state and federal law, providing necessary technical assistance and withholding state aid if necessary. A more recent law regarding low-achieving schools and districts puts specific requirement on LEAs and provides further intervention authority to the State Superintendent. Since the state meets the requirements of this criterion, it is rated very high here.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**35**
(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)

(i) This section is rated very highly since it reports on methodology that has already been approved through negotiations with USDOE as part of the application process for a School Improvement Grant. It is worth noting, however, that all of the schools designated as persistently lowest achieving are high schools. One

would expect that at least a few of the feeder schools to these high schools are low-achieving schools as well.

(ii) Since all of the identified schools are part of the Milwaukee Public School system, this section concentrates on the state's efforts to work closely with MPS to turn around the entire district and these schools in particular. Almost $4 million in RttT funds will be set aside for this purpose, to include six new WDPI positions (Turnaround Director and Turnaround Specialists) to monitor and support MPS's efforts. A well-conceived table of organization for new district leadership (Appendix 25) that includes direct involvement of the Turnaround Director demonstrates careful planning to create structures that should improve chances for success of these turnaround projects. The state will also integrate $45 million from a federal School Improvement Grant to support the re-structuring of the district and the improvement of the 12 identified schools, six of which will implement the transformation model, one the restart model, and four closures. Also, expansion of WINS for Children will focus on creating quality of life improvements in the most challenged sections of the city; these "holistic educational and family supports" should translate into greater success for Milwaukee's most troubled schools. Other than a lack of details about why specific turnaround methods for selected for particular schools and the need for more information about how these turnarounds will be implemented in the persistently lowest-achieving schools, this is an overall strong effort and is rated in the high range.

Total	50	45

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**8**
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	4
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	4

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

(i) The percentage of revenues available to the state that were used to support public education slightly increased from 2007-08 to 2008-09. This criterion, therefore, is rated in the high range.

(ii) The state has excellent policies and practices in place, especially funding formulas based on per pupil-property values, SAGE and High Poverty Aid, to ensure equitable funding between high- and low-need districts and, therefore, earns a high rating for this criterion. Only because of no apparent policies regarding equitable distribution of aid within LEAs did the applicant receive a 4 instead of a 5.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**29**
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	5
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	5
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	3

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

(i) The WI's charter school law contains no caps in the number of charter schools that can be in operation in the state; thus a high score for this criterion.

(ii) WI charter schools may be granted terms no longer than five years. The applications must include methods by which student progress will be assessed. Their contracts must include a description of how the charter schools will achieve a "racial and ethnic balance among its pupils that reflects the balance in the school district as a whole." (A noteworthy omission is balance based on numbers of LEP students, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students.) However, no data is provided as evidence that the state's charter schools have, in fact, achieved even ethnic/racial balance. A report by the Wisconsin Charter School Association is quoted as stating that six charter schools were closed last year for "poor performance," but no details on this were provided.

(iii) Specific details are provided to explain why the Center for Education Reform estimates that only ten other states fund their charter schools at a higher rate than WI.

(iv) While the state does not provide charter schools with special funds for facilities, none are provided to non-charter public schools either. However, the fact that charter schools must negotiate with their authorizers, usually a local Board of Education, for facility access might potentially lead to difficulty in identifying appropriate facilities for charter schools.

(v) The proposal does not fully address Wisconsin's approval of LEAs' operation of *innovative, autonomous public schools* (as defined in the notice). The applicant does state that WI law allows LEAs to apply for a waiver from WDPI to operate a non-charter public school that is exempt from any "education related district requirement," but there are no such examples offered by the applicant. The virtual charter schools that served 4,000 students in the 2009-10 school year are charter schools, not non-charter public schools.

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

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

The applicant identifies a number of important reforms implemented in the past decade but does not provide clear evidence that they have led to increased student achievement.

Total	55	41

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

This section of the proposal offered a number of strong endeavors that will occur in Wisconsin to emphasize science, technology, engineering and mathematics instruction (STEM). Among them are the following:

- The State Superintendent will create a STEM Advisory Council representing schools, business partners and IHEs.

- Four STEM Academies will be created in four different regions of the state.
- Funding through competitive grants will be provided to districts to implement innovative STEM education projects.
- Project Lead the Way will be expanded through matching funds to LEAs that wish to implement the program.

Preventing the proposal from fully meeting this competitive preference priority are the following:

- failing to ensure that a rigorous STEM course of study will be offered throughout the state; and
- lack of specific strategies to ensure that female students have equal access to and demonstrate success in high level STEM courses.

It is especially perplexing that if the applicant feels that graduation requirements for math and science should be increased to at least three years of study in each subject, only the six urban school districts that will be receiving extra RttT funds will be required to increase the rigor of math and science requirements. No discussion is included as to why a minimum of two years of high school math and science in the rest of the state is sufficient.

Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Wisconsin's RttT proposal reflects careful thought and planning to address all four education reform areas of ARRA. A sufficient percentage of participating LEAs should assist the state in increasing student achievement, narrowing achievement gaps and increasing graduation rates and preparation for college and careers.

Total		0

Grand Total	500	342

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Wisconsin Application #4650WI-6

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**57**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	40
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	13

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

The state presents a comprehensive and articulate reform plan including the 4 target areas of the ARRA. The state details 7 goals for impacting student achievement, with many of the outcomes being highly ambitious supported by a reform platform. Examples are 100% proficient or on track for proficiency in math and reading, being recognized as one of the top 5 states in student achievement, reducing achievements gaps by 50% by 2014, reducing dropouts by 50%, increase graduation rates for at risk populations by 100% by 2014, and finally to increase percentage of students who are career and college ready to increasing number of students attending college and maintaining college enrollment. Included in the state reform plan are the organizational and systems necessary for state wide reform implementation. The state plan includes organization reform including the creation of the Office of Education Innovation and Improvement (OEII). Through this organizational reform, key efforts like adoption of standards and assessments , longitudinal data systems connecting student, teacher, school, district and regional data to lead professional development, human capital plan for teachers and principals, systems for low achieving school identification and turnaround supports, and design for expanding STEM, will be implemented thoughtfully. All areas of the reform platform include accountability through data management and analysis.

Included in the plan is the design for capacity building at a local, regional and state level to support and expand current reform efforts as well as introduce the new ones via Race to the Top. Included are all supporting statutory regulations that enforce the reform effort statewide. The state brings to the table a variety of partners to assist with design, implementation and evaluation of the plan. The state includes in the reform agenda a variety of partners for support such as, community councils, parental organizations, businesses, institutes of higher education, non profit associations, state wide education associations, and other state and local government agencies.

The state describes building upon best practices from local, state, and regional models and will also utilize research based practices for response to intervention (RTI),for example the Wisconsin Initiative for Neighborhoods and Schools for Children, (WINS).

The state has very strong commitment from local education agencies (LEA), statewide. 425 of 440 (96%) LEAs are participating, serving 98% of all schools in the state. These LEAs serve 98.3% of the student population and 98.8 % of the student in poverty. Included in this are the state's 6 largest urban districts, which bring with them the uniqueness of urban reform challenges, including 80% of the current student achievement gaps between white and black, as well as over 50% of the state's dropouts. 81% of unions have signed on, 100% of LEA Superintendents or designee has signed, and 96.3 % of school board presidents signed. This is a powerful collaboration position across the state serving rural, suburban, urban youth of all socio economic and demographic groups.

The LEA's have made substantial commitments to support the state's reform agenda of the 4 core ARRA goals, as outlined in the MOU agreements. The state presented the MOU and it details the areas of mandatory commitment and areas of optional support. Of all the elements of state reform plans, all have signed on at 100% except for evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention (36.4%). The MOU aligns the LEA work with the Race to The Top elements. The agreements truly reflect high commitment to all portions. The analysis of the LEA data provided shows strong statewide support of the State's efforts for reform as detailed in the MOU. The MOU Overview details each participants action (The State and the LEA), including partners, timelines, detailed goals/outcomes. Included is the per pupil funding for the LEA or a minimum funding model if the LEA does not have a certain number of students in jurisdiction, as many LEA's in the state (over 50%) serve 1000 students or less. The state is poised, with LEA support and business commitment, to make a statewide impact on student achievement and the supporting reform efforts. The state reform plan includes necessary administrative, financial and field based support to attain the goals set.

State goal is 100% of students proficient or on track for proficiency on the Wisconsin Student assessments System (WSAS). Currently 77% of students are proficient in math and 82% proficient in reading. The state details the breakdown of projections by grade and content showing what percent will be proficient and what percent will be on track for proficiency. All future projections include proficiency range from 81 – 87% depending on grade and content. State will use the growth model to monitor the "on track for proficiency" sub groups.

The state is ranked 6th in Math Grade 4 and 19th in Reading Grade 4, as reported by the NAEP scores. Considering the LEA commitment and the reform platform and included partners, statewide reform in areas of math and reading across subgroups will make an impact on student achievement. Included in the ambitious plan is the goal of reducing dropouts by 50% and doubling high school graduation for at-risk populations including Native American, African American and Hispanic students. 80% of the dropout population is located in 50 of the local school systems. The state details the growth made in the student at-risk sub groups for graduation and how greater impact can be made with for groups through dropout intervention and prevention. College entrance and completion projections are based on using past growth data models, showing consistency and reliability in the ability to project accurately. The state has proactive models to engage students early for college planning (Wisconsin Covenant Pledge). In short, the State has projected to increase high school graduation by about 1,000 students per year and about increase students entering college by about 1600 per year. State Superintendent has initiated *Every Child A Graduate* - detailing the state wide inter-agency support for high school graduation.

The State has clearly shown a reform platform that exceeds the minimum standards. Areas of reform efforts also include science, social studies, reading, and STEM. The State will also expand the Response To Intervention Center – increasing the state's capabilities to assess student achievement and identify appropriate interventions (academic, social and organizational that will positively impact student growth and teacher effectiveness. This center will be critical in the support provided to the Office of Educational Innovation and Improvement (OEII) – providing technical assistance and field based support through coaches and content areas specialists.

The State did not make connections about the causes of the positive and or negative student achievements in their data analysis. Graduation rates demonstrated some positive gains as well as areas on concern regarding stagnant graduation rates and or descreasing graduation rates (white students).

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**22**
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7

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

The State has detailed the creation of the Office of Education Innovation and Improvement (OEII) as the foundation to drive the reform across the state and deep into the districts and schools. The OEII will initiate the capacity and sustainability for the Cooperative Education al Service Agencies (CESA) and the LEA through coordination of trainings, data collection and analysis, and identifying best practices and models based on regional district, school and student need. The office function is to coordinate and plan The initiatives across districts, including implementation and accountability. The office will provide expertise and technical assistance to the LEAs based on data reporting. The OEII will serve as the state center of best practices in reform.

OEII will be staffed with qualified experts to lead strategic initiatives as well as provide regionally targeted support for instructional improvement, organizational change, mentoring, and curriculum and assessments. Outside experts will be consulted to help in the development of the OEII, ensuring a comprehensive and innovative office is created.

OEII will also monitor all fiscal duties associated with the R2T grant including awarding funds and ensuring compliance with spending parameters, timelines and outcome as aligned to the reform platform and the goals agreed upon in the MOU. The State will model their efforts after the state Office of Recovery and Reinvestment (ORR). OEII will also pursue an independent audit party for audit functions – garnering public confidence for transparency as well as cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Administration.

The state has partnered with a variety of supporting organizations to ensure that reform continues. The organizations represent businesses, local and state governmental agencies, research organizations, institute of higher education, non profit educational funds and statewide educational associations. The organizations have committed to ensuring the reform has financial, human and policy support to be sustained as well as the power to make recommendations as needed for mid course changes and advise on best proactive and lesson learned. Partnerships with higher education and business communities will assist with systemic reform initiatives that will continue beyond scope of the grant project.

Additional resources have been allocated from non profit and philanthropic organizations (WINS) as well as the alignment of other additional state and federal funds. WINS is important as it sets the model for a community based partnership that provides wrap around services in the community for school support and provides additional social services to children and families to assist them in accessing educational opportunities by providing additional services.

The State has collected wide and deep support from diverse stakeholders across the state representing variety of organizations, businesses and associations. Included in the support are state legislatures, tribal nations, education associations (8 – including charter schools), business cooperatives, minority focused alliances, STEM groups (Engineers and Scientists of Milwaukee, For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology - FIRST), as well as Chambers of Commerce, higher education consortia, economic development organizations and healthcare organizations. The letters focus on support for the State's reform plan and the impact that the reform effort will have on the quality of education in public schools and the impact this will have on the local economy and the ability to develop meaningful experiences for youth in school so that their post high school decisions will be fruitful and support local economic and workforce needs. Some letters did not demonstrate deeply committed support and appeared to be more of recognition of the reform and not necessarily support for reform conditions and or plans.

The State plan has included in it key outcome goals, with associated timelines. Included are staffing needs, fiscal plan for implementation and evaluation, funding for LEA support and capacity building. The plan will impact educational progress due to the support from the LEAs and the thoughtfulness of the plan to address the specific needs of the state's student achievement. Grant funding is described down to line item elements.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**22**

(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	18

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

The State describes it historical reform efforts across the 4 ARRA elements. The state has had several reform efforts initiated in curriculum standards and assessments. The State was involved with the Common Core Standards prior to the grant competition and had engaged with The Diploma Project to have the state standards aligned to international standards. The State designed an English Language proficiency exam that is used by over 50% of states, and designed an alternative assessment for students with disabilities that is used as a model by the U.S. Department of Education. The State is a governing member of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium.

Data systems have been in place for the last 5 years - and the state has been improving the longitudinal data system annually. Partnerships have been developed with the University of Wisconsin Value Added Research Center (VARC) – a national leader in developing value added growth models for schools systems to collect data and use analysis to lead decisions about teaching and learning and climate and culture. The data management systems also lead the CESA. CESA uses the data to guide their professional development and trainings down to the student, teacher and school level. State has used a 13.8 $ million federal grant to expand and improve the LDS.

The State has been redesigning its tiered teacher certification system and administrator licenses systems to ensure that staff produce evidenced based documentation of their effectiveness based on student achievement and growth for all demographics. The state is initiating expansion of traditional and alternate recruitment strategies and certification options. The State has focused efforts in the largest urban areas (serving a disproportional number of poverty and minority students with low achievement) with The New Teacher project, Teach for America, New Leaders for New Schools. Wallace Foundation is supporting a project for leadership development in these urban areas to assist with principal development in urban settings. The state provides incentives for Master Teachers to maintain assignments in low achieving high poverty/minority schools.

The state has developed the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) to provide school based technical assistance for districts and or schools that have high priority needs or have been identified for improvements (DIFI or SIFI). Reform efforts in low achieving schools have focused on assisting sub groups of students including homeless, special education students and other unique groups of at risk youth. The State has also increased literacy across content areas, integrated 21St century Skills into the teaching and learning framework, created on line progress monitoring and early warning systems for tracking at –risk students. State has also integrated Positive Behavioral Supports (PBIS) and Responsiveness Education for All Children (REACH) to increase positive school climate and culture. Funding from Title 1 has been allocated across grade levels providing supports in middle and high schools in areas traditionally ignored.

The State has made clear gains in both nationally normed NAEP Assessments in math and reading as well on the Wisconsin Knowledge of Concepts (Examination WKCE) in reading and math. As documented major at risk sub groups (special education, limited English proficiency, students in poverty, black and Hispanic students) all increased proficient scores on the math WKCE from 2005 – 2009. Although scores fluctuated they all ultimately increased anywhere from 3.9% (all students) to 6.7% (Hispanic). All subgroups did remain 32 % to 16% below the All student category of proficiency.

The State also had gains for proficiency with NAEP assessments across all subgroups in math from 2002 – 2009 for 4th grade students. Gains ranged from 10% for all students to 9% gains for special education students. Hispanics students gain. Gains were also made across the board for 8th grade students taking NAEP math assessments. Reading scores for the WKCE were less impressive, with scores being consistently stagnant or even dropping less than .02% over time from 2002 – 2009. NAEP reading results were not consistently stagnant, in fact they dropped over time across grade and sub groups of students.

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

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

The State presents a coherent plan that connects all the longitudinal data systems together to inform teachers, schools, districts and cooperative educational Service Agencies (CESA) about the real time needs of the students. The data management, as managed by the Office of Education Innovation and Improvement (OEII), will be the leading indicators that drive a variety of instructional improvement needs. GOALS will inform staff of the success of standards and assessment implementation as well as provide data analysis tools for staff that connect to best practice strategies. GOALS will warehouse, in one spot, snapshot data for an individual child (benchmarks, growth, summative, demographic, attendance and interventions). Included in connection with GOALS is the eLearning portfolio, that will allow students and parents to access student level data, increasing opportunities for ownership and engagement from families in the learning process. Increasing student and parent engagement enhances the effectiveness of the teaching and learning environment.

GOALS will provide on line resources for staff professional development that would not need to be coordinated through a central office. Having resources available on line at anytime increases the opportunities for staff to control their learning and engagement in immediate improvement at the time of need for the student, and not having to wait until a professional day is planned, usually too late to make an impact on student leaning.

The State has established 12 regional Cooperative Educational Services Agreement, driven by data usage, these regional hubs can spend time focused on their regional service area and target training and professional development around regional needs for teachers, schools and districts. The CESA also can tap into the local communities to access additional resources through the reform effort to help design community based strategies to engage students in academic, career and college readiness.

The use of GOALS will also enable administrators to identify specific needs of children based on demographics, teachers, benchmarks, or content areas. This system will help offer supports in a way that previously was not available. The Value Added Research Center (VARC) will also support instructional improvement by demonstrating to teachers how certain lessons, strategies, and prosocial programs, like positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) can impact their student achievement. Thus demonstrating to teachers that they can and do make difference. This process will also allow teachers to share ideas, plans, projects and lessons that worked and ones that did not work.

The State will share data with research organizations. In 2009 the Wisconsin Act 59 - established into law the need for the state university system, technical college system and the independent colleges and universities to share and study their collective data to increase the effectiveness of the P-16 data system. The State has made a commitment to share data with researchers in a much broader scope than before, understanding the gain in multilevel data analysis.

The State goal is to have a data dashboard available at the classroom , school and district level to inform in real time, the needs of students across content areas, by teacher, by curriculum materials and instructional strategies.

Total	**47**	**39**

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**17**
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	6
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	5
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	6

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

Under state administrative code PI 34.17 (6) the WQEI approved the process for alternative routes for certification to be created by both institutions of higher education and independent providers. All programs must receive Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction approval and address specific staffing needs in critical areas of shortage. The State provides information on the process for application, approval and evaluation of alternative routes for certification in the Wisconsin Educator Preparation Program Approval Handbook for the Review of Wisconsin Alternative Route Programs. The alternate routes meet the criterion for incorporating 4 out of the 5 elements as stated in the definition.

The State has 9 teacher and 2 administrator alternative certification programs that are operated by a variety of IHEs, non profits, and for profits. One major area of focus is to prepare high quality educators in critical areas of shortage. The shortage areas can be in content areas, as well as in geographically remote or hard to recruit areas. The State has identified special education, STEM, bilingual, World languages and English as a Second Language (ESL) as hard to fill content areas. The alternative routes also provide for non-traditional candidates to enter the teaching field in a quick, focused and rigorous manner. Regardless of alternative route, candidate selection includes review of bachelors degree, transcripts, prior work experiences to design a path that provides for content area skills and knowledge as well as pedagogical foundations. Candidates must take Praxis II content exams and complete an 18 week teacher clinical practicum. Candidates must be assigned a mentor and complete a portfolio based on field experience and applied learning including performance based measures associated with students.

The 9 alternative teacher pathways offer a variety of options for certification in critical content and geographic areas. One program is specifically designed to prepare teachers for assignments in Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS), one program is for applicants who have an associates degree in early childhood education and can complete bachelors degree coupled with teacher certification focused on teaching at the Menominee Indian Reservation, four programs provide for alternative certification pathways for applicants with bachelors degrees pursuing content areas, one program prepares teachers in critical shortage areas and awards emergency certification and a fast track intensive program, - this is also open to certificate teachers who want to add an additional endorsement in a critical area. One program prepares career changes for critical shortage areas and has a program specifically for special education, and finally one program prepares teachers for private urban schools. A variety of operators manage these programs.

The two alterative certification pathways for school leaders offer one program specifically for preparation to lead schools in the MPS (New Leaders for New Schools), and the other is for candidates with masters degrees who want to be trained as administrators.

244 candidates completed alternative routes for teacher certification in 2009. This has been a decrease from the previous 2 years by about 70 candidates, but has increase by 84 from 2004. 6 pathways have graduated 30 or less candidates with certification, 5 pathways have graduated 81 – 425 candidates with certification, 1 program has no graduates to date and that is the one that prepares teachers for the Menominee Indian Reservation. 1,234 candidates have graduated with certification out of a possible 1430 for a certification rate of 86%. Some programs graduated as few as 1-3 candidacies, raising concern for the return on investments in these programs and the ability for expansion.

11 candidates completed principal alternative pathways in 2009. 64 candidates have earned principal certification since 2006 (no graduates prior to 2006 are documented). Graduation rate for principal candidates with certification is 100%.

The state has several means to collect and analyze staffing needs. School districts complete an annual survey detailing applicants per position and challenging positions, and or content areas to fill. The State also collects data from 32 IHEs reporting number of completers in each certification area. Part of the reform plan is to integrate into the longitudinal data system variables associated with the recruitment and retention of staff across positions and geographical locations down to the school level. The State assesses statewide shortages according to primary, secondary and regional categories and has plans to address both rural and urban needs. 4 alternate pathways address rural concerns - graduating 551 candidates , which is 43% of all educators recommended for certification from an alternative program. 4 pathways address urban needs and have graduated 250 candidates, which is 40% of all educators recommended for certification from an alternative program. The state details 4 partnerships that also are addressing specific areas of need. The Transition to Teaching initiative program is designed to prepare 100 teachers total in math, science, special education through alternative routes. The Accelerated Program for Teaching Secondary School partnership is a streamlined program for post bachelors to earn certification in a content area and English as a Second Language in 12 months. The New Teachers project created the Milwaukee Teaching Fellows with Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) and placed 40 fellows in high need areas including special education, bilingual education and math and science. Teach for America, also partnered with MPS places cohorts of teachers throughout the urban area.

The state has met the criterion, through state regulatory means, for this section by demonstrating reform conditions for alternative pathways of certification for teachers and principals. The state has confirmed in the reform plan a system for the evaluation of these pathways, and the commitment to maintain the support to continue and grow alternative pathways using the elements as defined in the Race to the Top grant.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**43**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	9
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	22

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

The State has set forth a high quality and achievable plan for the evaluation of teachers and principals through a transparent, fair and equitable process. The State has met the reform plan criterion as described in The Race to the Top. The State's Performance Evaluation System for Educators will encompass the use of a variety of student data measures in the evaluation of teachers and principals. The State has described the reform plan for teacher and principal evaluations that includes the use of student level growth data using 3 different methods. These methods are connected and will provide a comprehensive picture of individual student data. The three methods are the Multi Dimensional Analytic Tool (MDAT), Student Growth Percentiles Project, and the Value Added Growth Model.

The use of these student data collection systems will enable to state to collect individual student data and provide this data to school based staff to inform real time changes in the instructional delivery, interventions, student supports and staff professional development. These data collection projects will provide summative, formative, classwork, projects and other assessment and growth data on each student. Professional development and online resources will be developed and or enhanced to ensure that staff have the proper skills necessary to utilize the data in a meaningful manner. The state's longitudinal data systems connect with the Value Added Resource Center (VARC) to provide value added determination

based on student growth. Student Growth Percentiles will present data to staff to be reviewed at the individual student level or by a variety of subgroups including by classroom, grades, schools and districts. The VARC works with about 40 school districts (30% of state students) including Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) reporting in value added reports and professional development support. Additional funding is pledged to expand the number of districts working with VARC.

The State hosts an annual Wisconsin Response to Intervention conference for intensive training on measuring student growth and implications for instructional delivery. 152 districts use Measure Academic Progress (MAP) a commercial program for measuring student progress, others use Running Records or ThinkLink.

By state law every new teacher must have a summative evaluation and at least every third year after that. Formative evaluations will be completed annually, using multiple rating categories and also include the data collected by the three data systems mentioned above. Representatives for both employment classifications have been included in the development of evaluation systems, and have included school boards, district administrators, principals, teachers unions and the CESAs. The last two organizations will serve as a steering committee to the design, implementation and evaluation of the new systems. The state will base the new system on the Wisconsin Educator Standards, the National Board Certification and the Wisconsin Master Educator Assessment Process. It would be helpful to have some data on what the definition is for timely and constructive feedback. No parameters for either statement were included.

The state model will be adopted by 2011. Districts are required to provide training and support for staff who conduct formal evaluations. Starting 2010-2011, as detailed by federal reporting requirements, each LEA will report to the State Department of Public Instruction's system used for evaluating teachers, how the evaluations are used in relation to teacher development, pay, promotion, retention and removal, how student achievement data is used in the evaluations, and the number and percentage of teachers and each performance level, by school. This information will be publicly posted and will also include principal data.

Effectiveness.

All educator preparation programs are required to evaluate (does not describe any difference of evaluation from an observation) 6 times while in program. Clinical fields duty has been extended from 9 weeks to 18 weeks to support and better prepare new teachers in content, theory and application. The State is participating in a 5 year , 10 state partnership (The Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium -TPAC) to design, implement, and evaluate a pilot pre-service teacher performance assessment tool with rating scales for use in teacher preparation programs. 80% of all LEAs replied to a survey on using student growth in teacher and principal evaluations. 77% track student growth, but only 14% use the data for teachers' evaluation and 28% use the data for principal evaluations.

The Reform plan presents a two tiered evaluation system that incorporates student growth and next generation assessment system, formative and summative components used in teacher and principal evaluations, including annual evaluations for probationary status educators, conducting a formative evaluation annually and summative evaluation the first and 3rd year and every third year, and including performance improvement plans.

Reform plan MOU states that annual formative evaluations would be completed including student growth and achievement data , examples of students work at the local level, teacher portfolio and classroom observations. Summative evaluations are completed for probationary staff annually and for non probationary staff during the first year and every three years after. Summative evaluations will include observations, review of formative evaluation, policies and procedures, multiple rating categories and other data as determined by the state. The State will adopt a model evaluation by 2011.

The lowest performing schools, all in MPS are required to complete annual evaluations using multiple rating categories, multiple criteria including student growth as a significant part, classroom observation and professional development materials.

The State has partnered with a variety of associations and non profit organizations to coordinate and advise on model evaluation systems, ensuring that stakeholders are involved in the process including

representation of teachers and principals. The Teacher Effectiveness Forum focused on critical components for teacher and principal effectiveness and indicators and best practice. The Wallace Foundation Principal Grants awarded funds to train leaders to be prepared to lead instructional teams, effectively use data, and align pre-service training and evaluations with the Interstate Standards for Leadership and Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards.

The reform plan is committed to ensuring, through the MOU, that evaluations are used to inform decision relating to coaching, induction support and professional development. Districts are required to provide at least first year induction support including mentoring and seminars. Evaluations are also used to design targeted performance improvement plans to ensure that all resources were provided in a timely manner to support a promising professional, including instructional support, and coaching. Evaluation will also be used to identify promising educators and support them with additional trainings and opportunities to expand their professional skill set.

The reform plan has allowed for three optional commitments of compensation, promotion and retention. 154 participating LEAs (36%) have committed to opportunities to pursue advanced certification including National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), 93 LEAs have committed to career ladders and compensation for duties and compensation for teachers and 86 LEAs have agreed to the same for principals. 51 LEAs compensate for NBPTS, 11 LEAs compensate for Master Educator status, and 11 LEAs compensate for both. The participating states have opt out options on the compensation element weakening the state wide efforts for strong commitment and reform. LEAs vary on their commitment to compensation models, promotion and retention bonuses for teachers and principals . Principals do not earn tenure in the state. Advanced certifications exist for teachers but not for principals. It would be helpful if the state had provided more detailed information about the LEA support for the use of evaluations for compensation, career advancement and retention incentives. Evaluations are used for tenure decisions but only for teachers . Evaluations are used for working with in effective teachers including removal from employment.

The state details the process to be provided that addresses coaching, mentoring and induction support. The plan also included the process for intensive support for teachers in need of professional development and who do not meet satisfactory ratings. Tenure and certification status (State uses two tier certification) are also embedded in the evaluation process. The process, through multiple measures, ensures that only educators who meet the standards through evidence based practices and quantifiable data are approved for tenure and continued certification. The State offers evidence that satisfactory and unsatisfactory are their minimum standards for multiple measures.

The State outlines a clear strategy that provides for comprehensive support to train and place teachers and principals and has designed a fair and transparent evaluation process to retain and or remove educators based on their ability to meet performance evaluation standards.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**21**
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	13
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	8

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

98% of Wisconsin teachers are highly qualified under NCLB, and 91.7% of teachers in Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) are highly qualified. All LEAs must report annually status of any teachers who is not highly qualified and confirm that one of three options is implemented; enrolled in preparation program for full certification, is engaged in high quality professional development , or pass Praxis II (content area) and hold a relevant major. Starting 2010-2011 the State will be reporting teacher and principal evaluation status at the school, district and state level and will include data disaggregated by high poverty, high minority and low poverty, low minority quartiles and made available to the public.

By 2011 the State will have developed and implemented the Equitable Distribution of Effective Educators Policy. The policy will categorize teachers and principals according to summative and formative evaluation

status and experience, compared to school level student growth. These data will be compared to high poverty and high minority schools, as well as hard to staff subjects and specialty areas cross referenced geographically. Upon notification that disparities are present the LEAs must review policies and procedures to find roadblocks to recruitment, placement and retention of highly effective staff and a plan to address the roadblocks that impede highly effective teachers in critical areas.

Wisconsin Act 215 requires that district identified for improvement measure annually the distribution of highly effective teachers and principals. State defines high minority and low minority as any schools that are in the highest or lowest quartile of the student population.

The state details 6 initiatives to increase highly effective teachers and in shortage areas and specialty areas specifically special education, math, science, language instructions or other state identified critical content shortage areas or geographical regions. Institute for Urban Education has graduated 59 candidates and place 88% of them with MPS. Wisconsin Leads provides intensive supports to teachers in struggling schools. Interventions include instructional delivery , curriculum implementation, STEM, technology and best practices. Future Teacher program offers summer institutes for future teachers of color. Supports include preparation for Praxis 1, mentors, professional learning community and research support program. Urban Teacher World (UTW) provides opportunities for students in grades 6-12 to be exposed to the profession of teaching through a variety of applied learning events. The State also supports financial incentives for Master Educators – the highest ranking status of teachers in the state. Initial grant is $2000 after award of Master Educator and then for the next nine years is eligible for an annual grant of $2500 as long as assignment is teaching in state. The stipend increases to $5000 if teaching in high poverty schools (60% of student eligible for free reduced lunch). 519 staff were awarded the master educator grants. Master educators serving as administrators are not eligible for any additional compensation and the state is reviewing options to provide additional incentives for these staff.

Support for Mid Career Advancement and Retention through Transition to Teaching (SMARTT) projects focuses on individuals who have a bachelors degree but no teaching certificate. The program is completed in two years and successful graduates with a 3 year contract to teach in state are awarded a bonus of $5000 and tuition assistance. This program serves 15 high need geographic areas of the state and in fact is all of the high need districts with exception to MPS which has its own recruitment strategies.

MPS utilizes New Leaders for New Schools, The New Teacher project and Teach for America to recruit teachers and principals in hard to fill content areas, hard to staff schools or districts, and to prepare urban leaders to run schools.

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

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

The State details several methods in which they will collect and connect student data, teacher and principal data, educator preparation program data. The TPAC, including Wisconsin is designing and implementing a pilot pre service assessment to rate the effectiveness of teachers prior to permanent commitment to a district and teaching contract. This assessment can be a powerful determining factor in rating the teacher as well as being able to evaluate the preparation program from which the candidate was prepared. Several state universities are field testing pre service assessments. This allows programs to measure the effectiveness of their preparation programs and provides information to the State about what programs are most effective in specific areas and can provide leading indicators for expansion.

Surveys will be administered to districts to evaluate initial educator preparation and service, including the use of student data. The State will aggregate the data across all preparation programs and will be made

public. Reports will also be used to inform the preparation providers of areas of strengths and weaknesses so programs can be modified and become more effective.

The state will create a Supply and Demand report with data from LEAs to assist with designing effective human capital campaigns for educator recruitment. The state will also collect data on performance data for educators about their ability to obtain employment and their professional movement from initial to professional to master educator related to preparation programs.

The state will expand the Wisconsin University System's Institute for Urban Education, where urban educators are prepared to teach in high demand areas like special education, STEM and other hard to fill positions in urban education. The state also offers several additional programs to increase dual certification. Accelerated program for Teaching Secondary school enables qualified candidates to become certificated in a content area (related to the bachelors degree while adding certification for English as a Second Language - ESL (only existing program in country). Alternatives in Elementary Education provides an undergraduate degree in elementary education or middle school coupled with a choice to add ESL, special education and additional content areas like math or science. Math Specialist program provides support to math teachers in struggling schools in the Madison area schools. The State has targeted expansion of principal programs in 3 high need districts and will be working with New Leaders for New Schools and Center for New Leaders to support expansion in these urban districts. The State does not provide any projection data to use in evaluating the numbers and types of expansions that are needed.

The State has conducted reviews of preparation program since 2006. To date, the state has reviewed 23 of the 32 IHE educator preparation programs and all the alternative route programs. The program approval review process includes significant emphasis on the assessment system, use of data to inform program changes, graduate and employer follow up studies, and examining the pre-service educator portfolios.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**16**
(i) Providing effective support	10	8
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	8

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

The State provides a matching grant of up to $375 to districts to support mentoring programs for new teachers. To date over $3.3 million dollars have been granted to support mentoring since 2006-2007. The State has conducted an evaluation of induction quality, consistency and effectiveness statewide, that has assisted in guiding their reform process.

The State details the support programs for teachers/principal mentoring, coaching and other supplemental resources to increase staff effectiveness and ultimately student achievement. The first stage of educator support is the two stage professional development plan (PDP) process for new teachers. The first stage is the submission of a PDP Goal Plan, by the new teacher, to a PDP team for approval. The plan must meet high quality standards. 73% of evaluators approved the initial plan and 27% did not approve the initial plan. After the PDP is approved the next step is verification which allows the educator to advance professional licensure. 90% of evaluators approved the verification and 10% did not approve the verification. This process had enabled the districts to scrutinize the personalized professional commitment to training and permit qualified teacher to remain employed. If educators do not pass either stage they must leave the profession and cannot maintain certification.

The State created *Promising Practices in Induction as* guidelines for district to use in their support for new teachers and administrators. Each district's induction program is available to the public through the Department of Public Instruction. The state has acknowledged that during the survey's periods, feedback determined that administrator induction support was lacking. In response, the State convened a workgroup to research and design a model for administrator induction. The work group consisted of practioners and

state educational associations. The State has also partnered with the Great Lakes West Regional Comprehensive Center to conduct surveys statewide related to administrator induction.

The state has statutory requirements mandating induction programs. To ensure that these programs are effective the State is committed to developing best practices for coaching and mentoring. The State has committed to working with professional organizations and educational institutions to develop best practices and guidelines for coaches and mentors. To receive the allocated $375 dollars districts will be required, as a best practice, to implement mentoring and coaching guidelines. Regional mentoring academies and coaching institutions will be developed to serve specific needs of teachers and administrators in a given region. Tools will be made available for coaches and mentors so that on time best practices and supports can be accessed by them. Data will be a key component to all the mentoring practices to apply real time problem solving.

The State offers, annually, competitive grants for a consortium of organizations to design model programs to increase the effectiveness of mentor quality in high poverty schools, including best practices, research based interventions, professional development and funding models.

Additional teacher/administrator supports include posting resources and tools via the web for immediate access, include embedded professional development for coaches and mentors, use localized data from the schools that mentees are employed, create professional learning communities that include common planning, and increase targeted professional development for educators who are ranked as unsatisfactory. The reform plan calls for the identification of and expansion of effective professional development programs, with assistance from educational institutions, nonprofit organizations and state wide educational associations. The State recognizes the need for thoughtful professional development that is accessible in a timely fashion, uses best practices and can assist with improving teaching and learning almost immediately. Professional development capacity will be supported at the school, LEA, regional and state level to ensure numerous and qualified individuals statewide experienced with localized needs. Major emphasis is on the utilization of real student, school, district and state data in the plans.

The Response to Intervention Center, partnered with the National Staff Development Center will work with the State and Cooperative Educational Service Agreements to build capacity and promote systems change, data based decision making, problem solving, use of evidenced based research interventions for academic and social change.

The State has presented reform plan that meets the plan criterion for this section. The State has produced evidence of strategies to ensure that proper professional development will be designed and provided based on student data. The State has discussed its reform plan for ensuring that educators have common time to plan and meet at school, LEA, and state levels around best practice strategies. The State has embedded data based decision across all four the key elements of ARRA. Individual level student data is critical for professional development. The State also included in plans the process for instructional improvement systems adoption and implementation. Professional development also included addressing the needs of high risk students through staff training, noting specifically special education, dropouts, and other student sub groups.

Absent from evidence was attention to professional development specifically targeting high need at risk students. Also absent from evidence was an integrated plan to provide on going assessment of professional development to guide mid course changes and continuous improvement based on educator, school and LEA needs.

Total	**138**	**106**

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

The state has legal authority to intervene directly in the persistently lowest achieving schools and in the LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action. To date the state has 12 persistently low achieving schools that have been identified for improvement (SIFI) and are all located in the MPS. MPS is itself a district identified for improvement (DIFI). The State has intervened in both schools and the district. MPS has been under state-directed action since 2007-2008.

Article X, Section 1, of the state constitution provides authority for the State Superintendent to intervene in chronically under performing schools and or districts to monitor or enforce compliance, and provide technical assistance. The State Superintendent is also authorized to withhold State aid from DIFI, if the corrective action goals and outcomes are not consistent with the expectations and monitoring of the State Superintendent.

The State Superintendent also has been granted authority as of April 2010 to recommend and enforce changes to academic, curricular and instructional decisions.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**32**
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	27

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

The State has set forth a sound system for the identification of lowest achieving schools. 12 schools have been identified as the states persistently lowest achieving schools. All of these schools are located in the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). The State adheres to federal guides using Tier 1 and Tier 2 to distinguishing schools according to eligibility and receiving Title 1 funds (Tier1) and school eligible but not receiving Title 1 funds (Tier 2).

TIER 1: State has identified 58 Title 1 schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. The State used a variety of screening methods to rank order the schools into the lowest of the low achieving. Screening variables included: (1) Currently in need of math and reading improvement, (2) Failure to make AYP in any sub group, (3) Failure to make 5% points of progress in reading and math combined in the all-students group over 3 years, and had lowest combined reading and math scores for 2008-2009 on state assessments.

The data analysis showed clear trends of making gains in the elementary and middle schools but showed decrease in student growth and increasing achievement gaps in high schools, losing 2.4% points from 2005 -2009. Using a weighted average formula, the school identified the five lowest ranking schools, all being high schools.

TIER 2: The State identified 84 secondary schools eligible for, but not receiving Title 1 funds. The State also identified 54 Title 1 participating secondary schools in the lowest quintile in terms of reading and math and were not identified as persistently low –achieving. One school participating in Title 1 missed AYP for 2 consecutive years and was also placed in this Tier.

In summary the State identified a total of 139 potential schools, 7 were found to be persistently low achieving. To find the persistently low achieving the state established the following criteria: (1) Failure to make 5% point in reading and math in all-student group over 3 years, (2) Lowest combined reading and math state test scores in recent year (2008-2009).

The State has coordinated its efforts to support the lowest performing schools. The State has new intervention authority granting additional power over academic, curricular and teaching and learning tools, coupled with revised corrective action plans and SIG grants is able to concentrate its efforts in designing an effective plan for turning around low achieving schools.

The State concentrates its efforts in Administrative and accountability Systems, Interventions and Student Supports, Great teachers and leaders, and Community Engagement, and finally State Support. The state details exact action to be taken under each of these categories and the responsible parties. The state connects each of these corrective actions through data collection and analysis and oversight from the Office of Educational Innovation and Improvement (OEII).

Administrative and Accountability Systems:

The state established new organizational and accountability systems within the schools and the districts identified for improvement. The state provides support through assignment of a regional supervisor that coordinates all reform activities and provides technical assistance support. Regional support includes data analysis, workgroups with school based principals and central office staff, and coordinating technical assistance with internal and eternal vendors focused on the targeted areas of correction. The State had previously redesigned the oversight of special education at MPS and has shown progress in student achievement for students with disabilities.

Interventions and Supports

The state provides technical assistance to ensure that uniformity exits across the DIFI and SIFI in areas of math, literacy, and land language arts. The state supports the DIFI and SIFI in developing and implementing both a math and literacy plan that is targeted at the standards and assessments, using instructional differentiation as the interventions. The state assist the DIFI and SIFI in developing implementation plans for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) as well as response to Intervention (RTI). Both of these interventions have evidence based results impacting school climate and culture positively by reducing behavioral and academic disruptions respectively. Implementation involves the tiered approach: universal screening and interventions, small group supports and interventions, and finally individual student plans for interventions and supports. These two interventions (RTI and PBIS) are two major research based systems reforms that the State implements.

The State also provides support in academic oversight and planning. With new authority, the state can dictate instructional and other academic supports. For example in MPS, the state has implemented the following:

Special education services aligned with research based interventions, 90 minute daily instruction in literacy K-5, 60 minute daily instruction in literacy 6-8, 60 minute daily instruction in math K-8, Reading interventions in all SIFI high schools, transition supports for students entering 9thgrade. Universal screenings take place for all 9-12 grades to identify students in danger of failing courses necessary for graduation. Student progress is monitored at least three times a year to determine necessary mid course changes for students at risk. Ongoing embedded professional development is provided in academics, behavioral supports and data management, so staff can effectively utilize a variety of interventions and strategies. Universal screenings are completed in all schools for behavioral concerns.

Additional supports include extended time for at risk students (before school and after school), summer academies in literacy and math, access to community centers and after school programs for tutoring, tutoring for all SIFI Title 1 schools, supplemental educational services (this is not described in detail) in all Title 1 SIFI K-12, credit recovery .

Great teachers and Leaders

The State requires that the MPS design and implement a plan that addresses teacher assignments in areas of certification, including monitoring of teacher performance for content area knowledge and instructional delivery knowledge. The MPS must also report and monitor distribution of the highly qualified and effective teachers across the system and ensure that effective teachers and administrators are not clustered. The State also supports the addition of creating new pipelines of talent in high need areas (special education, STEM, math, literacy) gaining certification status to begin teaching in high need high poverty areas. 100% of teachers are to have assignments matching certification. All new teachers will have induction support for first year and any year after as needed.

Community Engagement

MPS has established school governance councils that must include parental, student, and community member support. MSP must also conduct a parental survey for feedback about parental involvement and or school improvement plans, and provide parenting classes and resource centers for parents. Including the Wisconsin Initiative for Neighborhood and Schools that Work for Children (WINS) – the State supports a community based approach to engaging schools in managing effective academic and social environments.

State Support

The State will award over $45 million in School Improvement Grants (SIG) for the 12 lowest schools identified. The State will assist the MPS in developing a plan for the allocation of these resources in a way that targets student growth using the key areas of the reform platform mentioned above. Included in the plan are benchmarks and outcome goals, use of evidence based practices, quality indicators and staffing needs. State support will also include the dedication of staff to manage the reform and coach district and school personnel through the reform process. Included are a Director of School and District Reform, Director of Community Relations, Special education specialist and a Title 1 coordinator. Also being hired to work statewide will be State Turnaround Director and five turnaround specialists. The MOU with MPS details very aggressive goals for reform, showing mutual commitment to educational reform.

Of the 12 lowest performing schools identified, 4 will close, 1 will not be served (per federal guidelines), 1 will restructure, 6 will transform (6 is 50% of the 12 schools, therefore they did not exceed the 50% threshold).

2 major research partners are engaged in the MPS reform to assist with data analysis, best practice recommendations, and providing direct technical assistance with the reform plan implementation. The State projects that over the next 4 years the number of schools identified as persistently low achieving will grow from 12 to 24 (2010-2011), 48 (2011-2012), 66 (2012-2013), and 80 (2013-2014).

Total	50	42

F. General

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

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

The State reports that although total revenues for elementary, secondary, and public higher education was decreased the actual percentage of total revenue increased by 1% (51% to 52%). State law dictates that the State must provide school financial assistance on a per pupil funding basis. The supreme court concluded that this per pupil funding formula provides for sufficient support to provide a sound education for all students. Over 87% of state aid to local schools is distributed on per pupil basis using a formula associate with per pupil property values. Greater share being allocated to in schools lower property values - equalizing rich and poor districts based on tax assessments of property values. The State also issues a statewide mandate on the amount any district can increase per pupil funding. For school year 2009-2010 - the supplemental increase was $200, again stabilizing equity across the state.

Quality Counts report (2009) ranked Wisconsin 8th for overall quality of school finance system. Wisconsin was ranked 3rd in per pupil sending equity using coefficient variable calculation. In per pupil spending weighted by measure to which districts meet or near national averages for expenditures the State ranked 10th. All evidence for equitable funding system for all students statewide.

2007-2008 spending for 37 school districts with more than 20% of 5-17 year olds living below poverty level, funding was $11,600 per student compared to $10,100 for 389 districts with poverty levels below 20%.

Wisconsin has a variety of supplant funding initiatives to provide equitable support for high risk students enabling schools to provide the additional in school and community services in place to close achievement gaps and to prepare children for teaching and learning.

Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE), a voluntary program awarding an additional $2,250 per student eligible for Free and Reduce Lunch (FRL). Funding must be used for reducing class size to 18 through the 3rd grade. 475 schools in 206 districts (about 40% of all elementary schools) use SAGE. 86% of elementary schools with poverty rates over 20% engage in SAGE.

High Poverty Aid: provides additional $112 per students in districts with more than 50% of students eligible for FRL. 34% of districts with child poverty rates above 20% benefit from this funding.

Preschool to Grade 5 Grants: funding provided directly to schools to improve education in preschool through 5th grade with high concentrations of poverty and low achieving students. 38 schools all from urban districts engage in this funding.

Sparsity Aid: Additional state funding for $150 per student to districts with between 20%-50% of pupils eligible for FRL, and $300 per pupil for districts with over 50% FRL and less than 725 students in district and population density of less than 10 students per square mile. 37 school districts meet the criteria, 25 districts (68%) receive the aid.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**28**
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	6
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	6
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	4
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	4

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

The state charter school law does not have any limitations on the number or type of charter schools that can be opened. There is no restriction on the number of students or the student demographics that can be served by a charter school or be served in all charter schools. The Wisconsin Charter Program was established in 1993, which empowered 10 districts to open 2 charter schools each for a total of 20. 13 schools were created. In 1995 revisions were made to the charter school law grating authority to the local school boards and eliminating the cap on total number of charter schools. In 1997 the State extended chartering authoring to two institutes of higher education and one city council in Milwaukee. In 1998, Cooperative Education Service Agreements (CESA) were authorize as charter operators in agreements with the local district. The state clearly supports the growth of diverse charter schools.

The State outlines the laws that dictate how charter schools are approved, monitored, held accountable, are reauthorized and are reviewed for closure. Charter schools authorization cannot exceed 5 years with renewal status for additional terms to not exceed 5 years. State statutes outline required items for application submission. The charter operators must detail the school education program, how they will measure student growth and progress, supports for student achievements, the school organizational structures. State law states that chartering entities must give preference to applicants who desire to serve an at risk population. Charter applicants must also describe how they will ensure a balance of student demographics in comparison to the district as a whole. Applicants must detail safety and security,

disciplinary procedures, staffing patterns and qualifications, and finally financial transparency and audit procedures.

The State was awarded $52 million from the federal Public Charter Schools program Grant (2005-2008). The State awarded 72 planning grants, 100 initial implantation grants, 115 renewal implementation grants, 21 dissemination grants and dissemination grant renewals. 91% of charter schools met highly qualified standards of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). State Superintendent created an advisory council of 22 members to asset with the development and support for highly qualified charter schools, including best practices and supports necessary to maintain existing charter schools and create new innovative charter schools. Over a 5 year period, 143 charter schools have opened, and 67 have been closed.

The State describes that funding processes do not treat charter schools differently from traditional public schools. There are two funding strategies. One is the per pupil funding follows the student, so per pupil funding for any child in the district follows the student regardless of traditional or charter school. The second strategy is a decreased per pupil funding based upon the serves that a charter may contract for with the district (special education, general services, food service, facilities' and or maintenance). It is unclear that if a charter contracts for services, and a fee is assessed, would the same fee be assessed of the traditional school for central office services. All charters are provided funding in accordance with Title 1, Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) ensuring equal shares of state and federal funds. Charters are paid directly the per pupil funding amount, and for 2009-2010 that amount was $7,775 per pupil.

Charter schools in the state receive equal funding as a traditional charter school. The state does not provide separate facilities funds for traditional or charter schools. Schools have autonomy to negotiate facility funding from their authorizing school districts The State does not detail any support for charter schools in acquiring facilities in any way other than the per pupil funding.

The State law allows maximum flexibility for local school systems to operate innovative and autonomous schools that are not charter schools.

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

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

State presents examples of other significant reform conditions that support student achievement. The State has funded Kindergarten for 4-year-olds (4K), through only state aid. This initiative sets the stage for the preparation for future success as children transition through the public school system. 80% of all districts offer the 4K program. The state has also established the Model Early Learning Standards for early childhood education to prepare students from birth through 1st grade in academic readiness and success.

The National Center for Early Development and Learning study of State Wide Early Education Programs (SWEEP) reports that of 5 state studies, Wisconsin showed 4K students achieved higher than the national average in 3 out of four academic skills. Students of poverty and non poverty benefited from the 4K – gaining academic, language and literacy, and social skills.

The State also supports the SAGE program. Participating schools agree to limit class size to 18 students in grades K-3, in exchange for an additional per pupil compensation of $2,250. Evidence based research demonstrates that this intervention has a positive impact on student outcomes. 475 schools participated. No data on the amount of funding earned through this initiative.

The State is also committed to reform for the system of educator training and certification. The State has revised teacher certification, preparation and professional development. Through the Quality Educator Initiative – teachers progress through a 3 tiered system of certification, requiring staff to demonstrate proficiency in critical areas using a multiple rating factor including student growth, instructional delivery and measured changes in student learning. Financial incentives are provided for critical content areas and for Master Teachers.

The State has also established the Urban Schools Leadership Project to prepare a cadre of high quality principals prepared for and committed to serving in the 5 urban districts of the state. State law repealed caps on teacher compensation in 2009, allowing for development of innovative compensation systems to reward high quality teachers. Wisconsin is also a leader in student choice – establishing a system for a student to be enrolled and attend any public school of their choice across the state.

Other reform innovations focus on rural education and supporting rural school systems financially and through regional networks for training, academic interventions and college and career readiness. STEM initiatives are of high priority across the state, using Project Lead the Way as a model example of successful STEM programs. Finally the state established the Wisconsin Covenant Scholars program that rewards 8th grade students who pledge to maintain above average grades and demonstrate citizenship throughout high school, by offering financial aid to them upon graduation.

Total	55	41

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State proposes to develop a STEM advisory council, consisting of representatives from regional economic development organizations, institutes of higher education, technology based business partners. The advisory council will be the central coordination hub of statewide efforts for STEM programs. This council will advise on standards, projects, partners, and workforce development needs. The advisory council will ensure that consistency and sustainability are fostered across the state ensuring equal access for all students. The council will also formalize the work already completed with current partners around STEM education. The State has developed partnerships with STEM supporters like the state Technology Council, Engineers and Scientists of Milwaukee, STEM Equity Pipeline State Leadership team, and Charter School Association.

The State has committed to the creation of four STEM academies regionally located across the state. The academies will provide a coordinated center for STEM learning, serving assigned regional areas. The centers will create projects, coursework, experiences and research capstones connecting science, technology, engineering and math. Virtual learning will be available for students in remote sites or who can't access transportation to the centers. The academies will also serve as professional development centers promoting best practices in STEM instruction and project development. Faculty in schools can access the academy staff and resources to extend the STEM experiences to school sites, expanding access for all students.

Each Academy will be linked to local businesses, industries and workforce development systems to coordinate efforts to prepare students for career and college entry. Each Academy will link to the University of Wisconsin Systems Research to Jobs Initiative. Universities will be important partners providing professional development to school staff around teaching research strategies and models.

LEAs will be encouraged to participate for competitive grants to bring STEM related programs to their district to enhance STEM opportunities. The State will expand dual credit (equivalency) earning for students in STEM – providing them opportunities to earn content and STEM credit. AP course work will be expanded in STEM programs. To increase reform movement, the state hopes to increase by 5% the number of AP STEM course completed by targeted populations traditionally underrepresented.

The State will also target undergraduate majors in STEM subjects to enter into teaching in the STEM field – increasing talent development in critical shortage areas and ensuring that higher percentage of teachers are competent in the content areas.

The State did not specifically mention targeting specific sub groups of students traditionally unexposed or denied access to AP and STEM courses. No mention was made of supporting exposure to STEM for young women and girls or for special education.

Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State has met the absolute priority. Reform plan integrates all required components and links them together building a system for educational change focused on student achievement; human capital recruitment, retention and growth; involvement of community based partners and stakeholders; attention to teacher and principal induction, support and growth; academic, behavioral and social student supports, STEM expansion, performance evaluation plans; curriculum, standards, instruction, and assessments; school turnaround and support; and finally fiscal accountability, transparency and logical funding mechanisms to ensure the reform is far reaching, of high quality and impacts across the state.

The state has set priorities in math, literacy, STEM, special education as well as closing achievement gaps across grades, subjects, demographics, and regions. Graduation and career and college readiness are common themes across all major reform areas.

The state has addressed sustainability for reform beyond 2014 and has paid attention to capacity building starting at the teacher level and progressing through the state level. Attention has been paid to staffing needs at the state and regional levels to keep reform momentum active, accurate and relevant to the needs of each student, class, school and district.

Total		0

Grand Total	500	408

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Wisconsin Application #4650WI-5

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**55**
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	37
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	13

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

(A)(1)(i) Wisconsin earned the maximum five points for articulating a reform agenda. Reasons for that high score are:

- The agenda, text and charts defined comprehensive and coherent reform elements in all four educational areas described in the ARRA and timelines for accomplishing them.
- It laid out a plan for improving student outcomes statewide with a clearly defined timeline. The plan establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that theState has proposed throughout its application. The plan connected past improvement efforts and successes to future efforts.
- The plan acknowledged that Wisconsin has very diverse needs ranging from a 78 student school district to Milwaukee with its unique urban needs and over 80,000 students.
- Wisconsin's seven goals encompass all the expectations of the RTTT program.

(A)(1)((ii) Wisconsin earned 40 points for commitment to the State's plan. Reasons for that score are:

Positives

- Wisconsin has almost universal participation among its LEAs, with 423 out of 440 participating, a 96.1 percent participation rate.
- The 423 Participating LEAs serve 98.3 percent of the 871,262 students in Wisconsin and represent 98.8 percent of the students in poverty.
- Of the 423 LEAs that are participants, 332 local unions have signed on to Wisconsin's reform plan, an 81 percent participation rate, and the State has received endorsements from both statewide teachers' unions.
- Wisconsin created funding floors that allowed each LEA sufficient funding to make reform work possible.
- Wisconsin created a second understanding with six districts with special needs, providing them additional funds and requiring additional work.

Concerns

- The LEAs signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that have clauses that seriously weaken the power of the agreements. Specifically those clauses stated:

"Nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school districts and school district employees under Federal, State, or

local laws (including applicable regulations or court orders) or under the terms of collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or other agreements between such employers and their employees.

The signature of the Local Teachers' Union Leader set forth below indicates support for the LEA's decision to be a Participating LEA and a commitment to discuss any relevant provisions in good faith. However, the signature provided and the Local Teachers' Union Leader's indication of support does not constitute an agreement by the Local Union to reopen or otherwise modify any existing collective bargaining agreement or waive its rights and protections under the Wisconsin Municipal Employment Relations Act. Any changes to the collective bargaining agreement made pursuant to this MOU shall be implemented only upon agreement of the LEA and the Local Union."

- While the Wisconsin Memo of Understanding does have those "opt-out" statements they are mitigated somewhat by supportive letters from educator organizations including the two state teacher's organization associated with NEA and AFT. Additionally the relevant charts in the RTTT proposal indicate that with the exception of (D)(2)(iv), the Wisconsin scope of work will address the major expectations of RTTT.

(A)(1)(iii) Wisconsin earned 13 of 15 possible points for how well its plan will translate into broad state-wide impact of ambitious yet achievable goals overall and by student subgroups. Reasons for the high score are:

- LEAs with 98% of students are participating in the state's Race to the Top plans and therefore incorporate a vast majority of all public school students in Wisconsin.
- Wisconsin expects to increase the percent of student reaching proficiency to reach approximately 85% in reading/language arts and mathematics on the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS). Wisconsin is starting from a high base and by the end of the grant in 2014, proficiency percentages are expected to increase approximately 4 to 5 percent. On the NAEP, Wisconsin expects to be one of the five top scoring states.
- Wisconsin has very high graduation rates usually around 89 percent. It Intends to increase high school graduation rates to around 94% by 2014. Graduation rates for Hispanic and American Indians would increase to 85% from 75% and to 80% for Blacks from 72 percent.
- Wisconsin expects that 69% percent of high school graduate will go to post-secondary education, increasing from today's rate of 65 percent.
- Wisconsin expects to decrease achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics by half. Wisconsin has very serious achievement gaps with scale score differences as high as 42 and many in the mid thirties. Wisconsin does not provide sufficient detail about how it expects to achieve this very high goal. Two points were not awarded because of the very significant achievement gaps that exist especially between Black and White students and the specific methods to close the gaps.

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

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

(A)(2)(i) Wisconsin earned 14 of 20 points for ensuring that it has the capacity to implement the proposed plan. Reasons for that score are noted below in each subsection.

(a) Wisconsin has taken positive steps to ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans through creation of an Office of Education Innovation and Improvement (OEII). The OEII staff will be experts in the field of educational reform and will be comprised of an OEII director, a program associate,

and six project consultants located throughout the state. Wisconsin will provide an additional team of five turnaround specialists dedicated to assist Milwaukee Public Schools.

The Wisconsin proposal focused most of it discussion on reporting structures and functions. The proposal had some positive steps include building on a regional system. However, it left the impression that the new OEII was another silo that had insufficient integration with the other units of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. It did not discuss how OEII's RTTT responsibilities and functions would integrate after the grant ends. The proposal also did not provide a "philosophical orientation" of how this new office would work with formal and informal partners. Two points were not added for those reasons.

(b) Wisconsin will support participating LEAs in successfully implementing the RTTT grant through its own leadership and working with many regional partners. The proposal focused most of its attention on "Standards and Assessments" and "Great Teachers and Leaders components of RTTT.

For standards and assessments, the plan is that WDPI staff will develop "online resources to include model curriculum, model units of instruction, classroom assessment strategies, and video classroom vignettes. The OEII project consultants will facilitate the provision of professional development which will occur through a combination of local and regional professional learning communities, summer institutes, and online training modules and networking."

For great teachers and leaders, OEII and partners will develop and pilot a model evaluation system for teachers and principals. This system will be based on data-driven research and best practices. "It may include: growth models, classroom observations, supervisor evaluations, analysis of classroom or school artifacts, portfolios, self-reports of practice, and multiple student achievement measures." The development of this evaluation system will be based on data-driven research and best practices in teacher and principal evaluation."

The proposal did not provide much information on the data and turning around schools components and two points were not added.

(c) Wisconsin has determined that evaluation of RTTT work will be contracted out. In its proposal it noted that it "intends to contract with an independent accountability/auditing/consulting firm or firms to externally measure and report on at least an annual basis the State's and LEAs' progress toward and compliance with the conditions and goals outlined in the state's RTTT grant and LEAs' Final Work Plans...Reviews will be conducted systemically in a transparent, standardized, organized and repetitive manner." Two point were not added because the proposal did not have sufficient information about how the evaluation results would be used.

The budget, especially the $300 per hour estimate, seemed excessive but since WDPI intends to RFP this contract, the very high estimate may prove less expensive.

(d) Wisconsin intends to use other funds to accomplish the state's plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other federal, state, and local sources so that they align with the State's Race to the Top Program. Wisconsin gives as examples using private foundation grant fund to partially pay for WINS for Children, a program that addresses social and medical needs outside of school. Additionally, Wisconsin would use other federal and state-funds to help with turnaround low-achieving schools costs. Wisconsin intends to use recently awarded State Fiscal Stabilization Funds federal funding to help pay for the longitudinal data system.

(e) Wisconsin intends to have the state superintendent review the OEII's program evaluations and prioritizing within his 2013-2015 budget proposal funding for highly effective Race to the Top interventions that cannot reasonably be sustained through the reallocation of local resources. The WINS program is a very major expenditure and the proposal did not provide evidence that this expenditure should really be an educational responsibility. Points were neither added or subtracted for WINS. This section did not have much detail on evidence of sustainability and two points were not added not because of the various programs but because Wisconsin did not provide assurances that many of the expenditures in this section, including WINS, would be sustained after the grant.

(A)(2)(ii) Wisconsin earned 8 points. The reasons for the high score were numerous support statements from a broad group of stakeholders.

- The state's teachers and principals, which include the teachers' unions or statewide teacher associations, indicated support for the RTTT proposal. Two points were not added because the MOU had the clauses noted earlier that made teacher support conditional.
- Other important stakeholders were very supportive of the proposal. The many letters from higher education entities were especially notable.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**24**
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	19

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

(A)(3)(i) Wisconsin earned the maximum five points for making progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and for strategically using its ARRA and other federal and state funding to pursue such reforms. Reasons for the high score are the examples of progress noted in each of the four areas:

Standards and Assessments

Wisconsin has been involved in standards and assessment work for a long time. Recently it was involved with the American Diploma Project (ADP). Wisconsin's standards design and writing teams have created frameworks to link the Common Core Standards' core skills and core concepts by grade level to curriculum development, teachers' lesson planning, and instructional delivery. It created an English language proficiency exam that is now used by over 50 percent of states nationally. Wisconsin is a governing state in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium.

Data Systems to Support Instruction

Wisconsin has made significant progress in expanding its statewide data systems. This work has been largely supported by a federal grant. In addition Wisconsin has been involved in some advanced data systems work to support instruction in partnership with the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the Madison school district.

Great Teachers and Leaders

Wisconsin has been involved with the Wallace Foundation, Teach for America, New Leaders for New Schools, the Institute for Urban Education, and the New Teachers Project to improve the quality of teachers and principals. Wisconsin provides incentives for Master Educators to work in high poverty schools.

Turnaround of Lowest-Achieving Schools

Wisconsin developed a Statewide System of Support (SSOS) to provide technical assistance to districts with high needs. "SSOS processes and tools are designed to enhance a district's ability to improve the effectiveness of its programs and strategies for providing support to low-achieving schools. The system also includes tools and strategies to build capacity at the local level for district-focused school improvement."

(A)(3)(ii) Wisconsin received 19 of a possible 25 points on issues associated with improving student outcomes overall and by student subgroup. Wisconsin had very good explanations for the connections between the data reported and the actions that have contributed to those results. Reasons for the allocation of points is noted in each subsection.

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

Wisconsin scored very high on both the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concept Examination (WKCE) and NAEP. From the 2002-03 to the 2009-10 school years, the percent of 4th grade students in Wisconsin scoring proficient and advanced on the WKCE went from 71.0 percent to 80.5 percent, while the percent of 8th grade students scoring proficient or advanced went from 73 percent to 78 percent. On NAEP from 2002 -03 to 2008-09, the percent of students proficient and above went from 35 percent to 45 percent (4th grade) and from 35 percent to 39 percent (8th grade). Wisconsin attributed the large gains to specific programs and professional development that was provided to teachers. Maximum points were awarded for this subsection (a) as the news is universally good.

(b) Wisconsin showed major increases in achievement for all subgroups on both NAEP and WKCE. This was especially true in mathematics where scores for Black students went from 35.7% in 2005-2006 to 44.4% in 2008-2009 of students scoring proficient on the WKCE and 8% in 2002-2003 to 11% in 2006-2007 on NAEP. Hispanics also showed improvements moving from 53.2% to 59.9 on WKCE to 13% in 2002-2003 to 22% in 2006-2007 on NAEP.

Partially because White student scores are very high, the achievement gap in Wisconsin is very large. In some cases, the gap between White students and Black students is 42% for students scoring proficient. The positive news is that achievement gaps have decreased approximately 5 percent. This is because Black and Hispanic scores have increased and not because White student scores have dropped. Points were added because all subgroups showed achievement gains and because the achievement gap is narrowing. Five points were not added because the achievement gaps remain very large and the plan to narrow it is not convincing.

(c) Increasing high school graduation rates.

Wisconsin shows an overall graduation rate of 89% considerably exceeding the national average of 69 percent. Their data indicates that high school graduation rates have improved over the last seven years for Black and Hispanic students. In 2000-2001 school year, Black graduation rates were 55.2% and increased to 66.6% in 2007-2008. For Hispanic students, the graduation rates went from 70.5% in the 2000-2001 school year to 74.9% in 2007-2008. White student graduation rates went down slightly from 94% to 92% during those years. One point was not added to the score because because White student graduation rates have dropped slightly.

Total	125	101

B. Standards and Assessments

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

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

(B)(1) (i) Wisconsin earned maximum 20 points. The reason for the high score is because it has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards by being an active member of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSS) jointly led by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association in partnership with Achieve, Inc., ACT, and the College Board. Forty-eight states are participants in this effort.

(B)(1)(ii) Wisconsin earned maximum 20 points. The reason for the high score is because In Wisconsin, the State Superintendent is empowered to officially adopt the academic standards. Within 30 days of the release of the final Common Core State Standards, the State Superintendent intends to adopt the

Common Core State Standards, anticipated by July 30, 2010. Wisconsin has a detailed plan for implementation of the standards. It will work through the regional CESA offices to provide the necessary professional development.

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

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

(B)(2)(i) Wisconsin earned the maximum five points for demonstrating its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments. The reason for this high score is that it joined the Summative Multi-state Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER BALANCE).

(B)(2)(i) Wisconsin earned the maximum five points because as of May 12, 2010, thirty-three states have joined together in the Smarter Balance Consortium to apply for the Race to the Top Comprehensive Assessment Systems Grant Application.

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

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

B)(3) WDPI will work in collaboration with its participating LEAs to implement internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation, and high-quality assessments tied to those standards. Wisconsin earned the maximum 20 points for the quality of its assessment plan. The reasons for that high score are the comprehensiveness, quality and detail of the plan. The budget for this activity seemed appropriate.

The plan has seven activities. In the proposal, each of the activities had detailed sub-activities, general timelines and the major players in each sub-activity that are detailed either in the text descriptions or in appendices.

Total	70	70

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**20**

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

Wisconsin received a score of 20 point. The reason for the high score is that Wisconsin has ten of twelve possible America Competes elements completed in it statewide longitudinal data system.

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

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

Wisconsin received the maximum five points for accessing and using student data. This high score was given because mugh of the necessary infrastructure has already been developed or is already designed. Wisconsin has an elaborate plan for providing users with the necessary training through its regional Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs). Wisconsin design features three levels of information. The state will provide a public portal called the Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS). This portal will provide information that is not student specific. A second portal with the name

Multidemensional Analytic Tool (MDAT) will provide educators and with individual and classroom student data that is appropriate to the individual educator's responsibility. A third portal will integrate with post-secondary as a P-16 student database.

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

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

(C)(3)(i) Wisconsin earned the maximum 6 points for its plan for increasing the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness. This high score was given because Wisconsin has a high quality plan to provide all teachers, principals and district administrators with role-based access system by Spring 2013. Wisconsin intends to:

- "Expand and scale the statewide Response to Intervention (RtI)Center, tripling the capacity to coordinate and provide technical assistance, professional development and data coaching services to LEAs and CESAs.
- "expand individual student growth data currently available through the LDS by enhancing the Multidimensional Analytic Tool (MDAT) and incorporating the "Colorado growth" system into the LDS by 2011."
- "Provide financial support to VARC to expand district participation and training in value-added analysis."

School districts are expected to:

- "Implement a response to intervention model that provides diagnostic and progress assessments, core instruction to all students, differentiation strategies, and interventions in reading and mathematics."
- "Use local and state-provided student growth data to set annual district and school achievement goals. Ensure regular principal and teacher review of local achievement data in professional learning communities or ensure cooperative planning time to continuously refine improvement strategies."

(C)(3)(ii) Wisconsin earned the maximum six points for the quality of its plan for supporting participating LEAs and schools in using instructional improvement systems and providing effective professional development on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement. This high score was given because Wisconsin has a high-quality detailed plan and it will use a regional support system (CESAs) that has worked well in the past. The budget was appropriate both fiscally and for its connections to the activities. The two major components are:

- WDPI working with key stakeholders will develop professional development modules and tools around data literacy and using data to improve instruction.
- WDPI working with regional CESAs, professional organizations, and non-profit organizations will provide educators training they need to utilize student growth and value-added data reports in the classroom to improve instruction.

(C)(3)(iii) Wisconsin earned the maximum six points for making the data from instructional improvement systems available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different

types of students. This high score was given because Wisconsin has a formal legal agreement (2009 Wisconsin Act 59) that established a PK-16 data exchange to facilitate greater program evaluation and educational research. The act established data exchange protocols. Additionally a data management position was established "to coordinate research requests across agencies, facilitate data exchanges, serve as a point of contact for external research partners, and review FERPA-related concerns."

Wisconsin intends to convene a "Data Summit" to determine research priorities and then work to make certain the necessary data is made available to researchers selected to study those priorities. Wisconsin will also make certain that data provided meets FERPA requirements associated with student privacy and other considerations.

Total	47	43

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

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

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

(D)(1)(i) Wisconsin earned the maximum seven points because it has legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification for teachers particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education. Wisconsin has nine teacher and two administrator alternative paths to licensure. Five of the alternative programs are not operated by higher education institutions. All are selective in accepting candidates, require mentoring or coaching. The five non-higher education sponsored alternative significantly limit the amount of courseware. Upon completion or requirements, successful candidates receive the same level of certification as traditional programs.

(D)(1) (ii)Wisconsin earned the maximum seven points because alternative routes to certification are heavily used. Wisconsin reported that between 2004 and 2009, 1,234 teachers were certified through alternative programs and of those 720 came from programs not affiliated with higher education institutions. During those same years, 64 administrators were certified from programs that were not administered by higher education institutions. Norda, Inc. a private organization had the most alternative route teacher and administrators graduate from their program.

(D)(1)(iii)Wisconsin earned the maximum seven points because it has a defined processes for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and especially because it has several strong programs for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage. The high score was given because:

Wisconsin has an annual supply and demand report of critical shortage areas for school districts and one for expected vacancies. It has another report that registers the number of "completers" in each licensure area from the 32 public and private institutions of higher education and the 11 alternative route certification programs. Supply and demand data is publicly available on the WDPI website. Eventually this information will be on the Wisconsin's Longitudinal Data System allowing more current and seamless data communication.

Wisconsin has several programs for addressing statewideshortages.

- Four alternative programs focused on urban needs identified in the state. It also has four alternative programs whose focus is meeting rural needs.

- "Loan Deferment/Forgiveness Programs" for recruitment and placement of teachers that are needed in specific locations covering particular areas of certification.
- The Transition to Teaching initiative is a competitive grant program funded by U.S. Department of Education, which provides $2.2 million over five years to train 100 mathematics, science, and special education teachers through alternative route programs.
- The Accelerated Program for Teaching Secondary School at the University of Wisconsin-Madison offers a streamlined 12-month post-baccalaureate program that trains mid-career professionals as teachers, providing them with a license in their content area as well as in English as a Second Language.
- The New Teachers Project created the Milwaukee Teaching Fellows as a partnership among the MPS, Cardinal Stritch University, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- Teach for America, a partnership with the Milwaukee Public Schools, Cardinal Stritch University, Marquette University, the Kern Family Foundation.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**29**
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	6
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	6
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	14

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

(D)(2)(i) Wisconsin earned three points for its plan to establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in the notice) and measure it for each individual student. The budget was appropriate both fiscally and to its connection with the activities. It received a middle score because:

Wisconsin is committed to using "multiple measures of student growth, including formative assessments; standardized benchmark and summative tests; curriculum- and course-based assessments and individual student work, projects and performances."

Wisconsin currently provides several student growth reports and analytical tools directly through the statewide longitudinal data system (LDS) and facilitates value-added reporting through the Value-Added Resource Center (VARC).

By 2013, it will implement the next generation assessment being developed nationally and upgrades to the State's LDS will integrate growth data from a variety of formative and summative assessments, enabling more sophisticated growth analyses and reporting tools that will be integrated into the Growth Oriented Achievement Learning System (GOALS) dashboard.

Wisconsin earned middle points because it will use locally developed or purchased evaluations to determine student growth that will be used with teacher and principal evaluation system. The proposal did not provide sufficient evidence that quality control will be insured or that there will be sufficient cross-districts comparisons.

(D)(2)(ii) Wisconsin earned 6 of 15 points for designing and implementing rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals.

(a) Wisconsin will implement and differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories. One of the four rating categories would use data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as the evaluation criteria. Low points were given because Wisconsin lets local districts determine how important student growth will be. The most significant role the State of Wisconsin will play is to provide information and criteria for developing evaluations systems but clearly the crucial decisions will be made locally. Given that student evaluations will be locally determined and given that teacher and principal evaluation systems will be locally developed, there appears to be little possibility that there will be a "Wisconsin" statewide evaluation system for teachers and principals.

(b) Wisconsin earned middle points because Wisconsin acknowledges the importance of having teachers and principals as key participants in the design and implementation of model evaluations. However because evaluations will be determined locally, it is assumed but not certain that teachers and principals will be key participants.

(D)(2)(iii) Wisconsin earned middle points because there will be annual evaluations of all teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback. Part of each evaluation for teachers and principals will be concerned with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools. However the proposal notes that formative assessments can not be used for disciplinary procedures. Summative assessments can be used to develop improvement plans but it is a local decision as to how important student growth will be on those evaluations. More problematic, those summative evaluations would take place on the first year of teaching and after that only every third year and thus not meeting the intent of the RTTT program.

(D)(2)(iv)Wisconsin earned 14 points because it will use evaluations, that consider student growth and data use at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding three of the four following factors. Specific point allocations are noted below with seven points being the maximum for each subsection.

(a) Five points were awarded because Wisconsin will use the new evaluation in developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development for both new teachers and experienced teachers. Analysis of evaluation results will be an important factor in determining professional development plans for all teacher and principals regardless of their experience.

(b) Only one point was awarded because Wisconsin indicated that it will be optional to use the new evaluations, that include student growth and use of data, in compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals. The new evaluation also will be optional in determining whether highly effective teachers and principals obtain additional compensation and/ or are given additional responsibilities.

(c) Four points were awarded because Wisconsin will use the new evaluation system, that include student growth and use of data in determining whether new teachers will be retained and whether to grant tenure after three years of highly effective evaluations to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures. However local control options will mean that each district will define how this is implemented.

(d) Four points were awarded because Wisconsin will use the new evaluation system to inform 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. Wisconsin intends to "retain only those teachers who meet clearly defined standards of effectiveness (including evidence of student growth and the use of student growth data to improve practice)." However, local districts using processes such as "Joint Labor-Management procedures" will determine how this will be implemented.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**19**
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	9
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	10

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

(D)(3)(i) Wisconsin earned nine of 15 points for its plan to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals. The criteria required developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in the notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in the notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students. This score was given because Wisconsin as a state did not see itself having a major role unless districts had deficiencies that required state overview. It does plan to create models for districts to use if they want to do so. The chart for (D)(3)(i) Performance Measures showed that there were far more effective teachers in low-poverty schools than in

high-poverty schools. The Wisconsin response seemed to imply that equitable distribution was a local district responsibility unless the LEA was under Wisconsin intervention status.

(D)(3)((ii) Wisconsin earned the maximum 10 points for its plan to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers and principals through the following programs:

- The University of Wisconsin's Institute for Urban Education prepares educators working in urban settings.
- University of Wisconsin LEADS provides early career educator support in STEM areas.
- Future Teacher Program: University of Wisconsin-White Water was designed to support students of color who want to be teachers.
- Urban Teacher World support teacher recruitment effort with 88 percent of graduates signing full time contracts in MPS.
- Recruiting for High Needs Schools Across Wisconsin. The WDPI received a $2.2 million, five-year grant award through the US Department of Education's Transition to Teaching competitive grant program to train 100 mathematics, science, and special education teachers through alternative route certification programs.
- (SMARTT) Project targets mid-career professionals, paraprofessionals, recent college graduates, and honorably discharged military personnel. Individuals must already have a bachelor's degree, but not a teaching license.
- New Leaders for New Schools is an alternative route certification program for principal licensure.
- The New Teacher Project: addresses shortage areas in MPS, specifically in the area of special education, mathematics, science, and bilingual teaching positions.
- Teach for America has a partnership with MPS, Cardinal Stritch University, Marquette University, and the Kern Family Foundation. TFA corps members are teachers of record in MPS earning a full salary from MPS, while their supplemental training is paid through the support of TFA donor funding. TFA has placed 37 corps members in MPS positions.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**6**
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	3
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	3

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

(D)(4)(i) Wisconsin earned three points for its plan to link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in the notice) data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State. The Wisconsin RTTT proposal does not address linking student achievement and student growth to teachers and principals. Instead Wisconsin will link scores on a teacher performance assessment and an employer survey to the teacher and principal preparation programs and then make that data public.

(D)(4)(ii) Wisconsin earned 3 middle points for its plan to expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals and terminating those that are unsuccessful. As noted in the previous section, Wisconsin is not using student achievement and growth to determine program quality. Instead Wisconsin intents to expand programs that address areas of teacher and principal shortages and needs.

(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)

(D)(5)(i) Wisconsin earned five points for its plan for providing professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Wisconsin received points because it provided general expectations of what the professional development experiences should provide. It also earned points for its plan to provide resources that districts could use if they chose to do so. However, there was insufficient guidance on what core content would be expected in every district plan. There also were no state wide standards or criteria of what the coaching, mentoring or professional development experience should provide either quantitatively or qualitatively. The Wisconsin proposal left the impression that there really was not a Wisconsin plan for effective professional development support but instead hundreds of district plans with varying levels of quality. Worse yet, the state did not appear ready to provide an "assessment tool" that would allow districts to determine whether they were meeting acceptable standards of quality professional development support.

The budget for this activity was appropriate both fiscally and its connection to support activities.

(D)(5) (ii) Wisconsin earned five points for its plan to measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of the professional learning supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in the notice). Wisconsin's response to measuring the effectiveness of professional learning supports was to "Annually review the effectiveness of state-sponsored professional development programs, which may include third-party assessments, participant evaluations and LEA assessments of principal and staff improvement." While the proposal did talk about the expected evaluation benefits of the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) there appeared to be no plan to provide state-wide analysis about which professional learning supports proved most effective in improving student learning.

Total	138	85

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

(E)(1)Wisconsin earned the maximum ten points because the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly BOTH in the State's persistently lowest achieving schools (as defined in the notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status. Evidence for the high score may be found in the following citations.

Under Article X, section 1 of the Wisconsin Constitution, the State Superintendent is charged with the general supervision of public instruction in Wisconsin. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction is authorized to intervene in chronically under-performing schools or school districts to monitor and enforce compliance under state and federal law as well as provide any necessary technical assistance. (Wis. Stat. § 115.28(9)) In addition, the State Superintendent is authorized to withhold State aid from a district "in which the scope and character of the work are not maintained in such a manner as to meet the State Superintendent's approval." (Wis. Stat. § 121.006) Wisconsin Act 215 established new State requirements for struggling schools and districts and granted the State Superintendent of Public Instruction substantial additional intervention authority.

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

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

(E)(2)(i) Wisconsin earned the maximum five points because it has a clear procedure for identify persistently-low achieving schools and has identified twelve schools as persistently low-achieving. The Wisconsin proposal provided the following detail.

A school was identified as "persistently low achieving" through the following criteria:

• It was currently identified for improvement in reading or mathematics.

• It had missed Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading and mathematics in any subgroup.

• It had made less than 5 percentage points worth of progress in reading and mathematics combined in the all-students group over a period up to three years, and had the lowest combined, reading and mathematics State test scores for the most recent year (2008-09).

WDPI also examined the graduation rates in the Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to identify those with a graduation rate below 60 percent over the last three years. As a result, schools were identified based on achievement and graduation rate.

Further analysis revealed a clear trend of improving achievement in elementary and middle schools, but declining achievement in high schools. Based on that data, WDPI determined that high schools (any school serving 10th grade) were in greater need of intervention, and that, per SIG guidance, more weight would be given to high schools. The following weights were assigned by school type: High School 0.452, Junior High 0.333, Middle 0.336, Elementary 0.318, Combined Elementary/Secondary 0.345.

Wisconsin has identified 12 schools as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools: *Milwaukee African American Immersion High School, Washington High School of Law, Education and Public Service, DuBois High School, Custer High School, Vincent High School, South Division, Bayview, Bradley Tech High School, D.I.A.L. High School, Foster & Williams High School, James Madison Academic Campus High School, and Montessori IB High School.* All of the schools are located in Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS).

(E)(2)((ii) Wisconsin earned maximum 35 points for supporting its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models. The reasons for the high score were the many forms of support provided the schools and district found to require intervention.

The 2009 Wisconsin Act 215, required that these twelve schools and the Milwaukee Public Schools system undergo "intervention authority and additional state improvement requirements". The corrective action plan entailed a comprehensive and cohesive framework for school improvement across all schools under the corrective action plan. The plan is lengthy, comprehensive, very detailed and shows timelines and parties responsible. Some of the interventions are noted below.

The corrective action took away some of the local school control and established common reading curriculum for schools under corrective action. MPS had to provide 60 to 90 minutes of supplemental academic support for students. It required instruction based on students' Individual Education Plans (IEP). Additionally, MPS has to provide non-proficient students attending all SIFI schools extended learning time opportunities, including:

- After School Academic Programs (ASAP), through Community Learning Centers, in reading/language arts and mathematics for K -5, 8th & 9th grades
- After-school tutoring in all Title I SIFI schools
- Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in all Title I SIFI schools, K – 12th grade

The twelve schools identified as persistently low-achieving underwent the following turn-around models:

- Six underwent the requirements of the transformation model.
- One was reorganized as a restart.
- One was classified as Tier II.
- Four were closed.

Total	50	50

F. General

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

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

(F)(1)(i) Wisconsin earned five points because Wisconsin increased the percentage (51% to 52%) of the total state revenues used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 than the percentage of the total revenues available to the state that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008. However because of very severe reductions in revenues, the total amount of actual dollars was down $350 million dollars.

(F)(1)(ii) Wisconsin earned the maximum five points because the State's policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b)within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools. Actually, Wisconsin provides an additional 15% to LEAs with high percentage (20%) of poverty students.

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

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

(F)(2) (i) Wisconsin received the maximum eight points because it has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools. Most charter schools are authorized by local boards of education but there are other authorizers. Charter school petitioners have the right to appeal to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction if their charter school request is denied. Wisconsin had 206 charter schools operating in school year 2009-2010.

(F)(2) (ii) Wisconsin received the maximum eight points because it has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools. Charter schools are assessed in the same manner as traditional public schools and students. Charter school renewals are largely driven by success in fiscal management, student enrollment and achievement.

(F)(2) (iii) Wisconsin received the maximum eight points because charter schools receive equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, state, and federal revenues. Board authorized charter schools (92%) receive identical funding and in the other 8% funding is equivalent when facilities, transportation and other costs are considered.

(F)(2) (iv) Wisconsin received the maximum eight points because it treats charter schools with similar per-pupil funding for facilities as it does other public schools. The State of Wisconsin does not provide separate

facilities funds for either traditional public schools or public charter schools as Wisconsin uses a per pupil funding formula. Educational entities. whether traditional or charter, use per-pupil expenditures for appropriate facilities. Traditional schools and charter schools must meet similar requirements for health and educational needs.

(F)(2) (v) Wisconsin received six points because it enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools. The proposal did not provide sufficient detail or examples of how this authority was being used. The two examples were of virtual schools but the proposal did not provide information about how these schools met the expectations of (F)(2)(v).

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

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

(F)(3)Wisconsin earned the maximum five points because it has a long history and numerous examples of having created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.

The Wisconsin RTTT proposal provided the following examples:

- Numerous programs focused on early childhood education.
- Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) program. The program requires participating schools to ensure class sizes of 18 to 1 in grades kindergarten through 3 in exchange for an additional $2,250 per income-eligible student.
- Project Lead the Way enhances STEM opportunities.
- Wisconsin Covenant Program promises a spot in a Wisconsin post-secondary institution and a financial aid package to 8th grade students who pledge to maintain above average grades and demonstrate good citizenship throughout their high school careers.

Total	55	53

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Wisconsin did not meet all the conditions necessary to earn the 15 points associated with emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). Wisconsin did not address the "needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics." Wisconsin did have positives in the area of STEM. Some of the STEM-related efforts of special note were:

- Creating a working group to coordinate STEM efforts around the state, strengthen ties with regional economic development partners and higher education stakeholders to align with workforce needs and promote best practices within Wisconsin schools.
- Establish four STEM academies.
- Contracting with educational institutions, professional organizations and/or non-profit organizations to provide STEM teacher on site and via virtual learning opportunities throughout the state.
- Working with educational institutions, professional organizations and/or non-profit organizations to develop and provide STEM resources and partnerships that inform best practices through support of

pilot projects, teacher development, and STEM instructional materials. These efforts will be coordinated with the STEM academies.		
Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		**Yes**
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The Wisconsin Proposal meets all the conditions of the "Absolute Priority." The State's application comprehensively and coherently addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that the State and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The State had high participation and therefore demonstrated in its application sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans. It described how the state, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. The proposal had all the required and optional charts filled out. The appendices were well organized and helped in understanding the proposal. The budgets, with the exceptions noted, were well though-out and provided additional insight. Wisconsin should be commended for its intent to issue contracts through "Request For Proposals."		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	402