



RACE TO THE TOP IN MASSACHUSETTS

STATE SCOPE OF WORK

*Submitted to U.S. Department of Education
February 9, 2012*

SECTION I – RACE TO THE TOP SUMMARY OVERVIEW

Massachusetts' Race to the Top program is driven by the core belief that the persistent variation in student outcomes stems from both discrepancies in the quality of curriculum and instruction, and unrelated out-of-school circumstances that can affect a student's ability to learn. By the end of the four-year grant, Massachusetts aims to achieve four objectives:

1. Great Teachers and Leaders: Attract, develop, and retain an effective, academically capable, diverse and culturally proficient educator workforce to ensure every student is taught by a great teacher and every school and district is led by a great leader
2. Curricular and Instructional Resources: Provide curricular and instructional resources to provide every educator with the tools necessary to promote and support student achievement.
3. Concentrated Support in Low Performing Schools: Concentrate great instruction and additional supports for educators, students, and families in our lowest performing schools and their districts to create the conditions needed for improved student achievement.
4. College and Career Readiness: Increase dramatically the number of students who graduate from high school ready for college and career.

Achieving these four ambitious objectives hinges on the development of a robust state data and information infrastructure. Through RTTT, ESE will transform its data systems so that they can efficiently deliver comprehensive, accessible, actionable, and timely data to all Massachusetts K–12 educators; invest in new technology to support the PreK–12 teaching and learning system and a more effective educator workforce; and strengthen and expand training and supports so that educators can use data to inform instructional decisions.

IA. Race to the Top Projects

The table below shows a high-level project summary of the Race to the Top program for Massachusetts, reflecting that most projects will have some level of activity during all four years of the program.

RACE TO THE TOP PROGRAM

	Activities in Years 1 – 4			
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
A) Program management and evaluation				
1. Overall project management & evaluation	X	X	X	X
a. Hire program staff	X			
b. Implement deliverology approach to strategic planning and implementation	X	X	X	X
c. Create and implement detailed project plans	X	X	X	X
d. Design and implement evaluations for all projects	X	X	X	X
e. Develop and implement reporting plans for each project	X	X	X	X
2. Hold districts accountable through existing ESE supports including reporting on grant progress	X	X	X	X
3. Hold RTTT stakeholder meetings to gather feedback on state activities	X	X	X	X
B) Standards and assessments – provide resources for curriculum and instruction and roll out a statewide teaching and learning system				
1. Implementing Common Standard and Developing Common Assessments				
a. Align all Massachusetts standards documents to the Common Core; implement and assess the new standards statewide	X	X	X	X
b. Participate in PARCC	X	X	X	X
2. Model curriculum maps and units	X	X	X	X
3. Build a digital library	X	X	X	X
4. Develop interim and formative assessments	X	X	X	X
5. Design curriculum embedded performance tasks	X	X	X	X
6. Enhance competency tracking system	X	X	X	X
7. College & career readiness				
a. Pre-AP teacher training – grants	X	X	X	X
b. STEM Early College High School (ECHS) – program/grants	X	X	X	X
c. Adopt MassCore as default curriculum and align college entrance examinations	X	X	X	X
8. Innovation schools	X	X	X	X
C) Data systems to support instruction				
1. Transform State Data System	X	X	X	X
a. Expand Educator Data Warehouse (EDW) capacity	X	X	X	X
b. Build Educator portals	X	X	X	X
c. Allow ELAR/MEPID updates	X	X	X	X
d. Enhanced Web	X	X	X	X
e. Rollout the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)	X	X	X	X
2. Data Systems & Technology for Teaching and Learning System	X	X	X	X
3. Educator supports and training for data use	X	X	X	X
D) Great teachers and leaders – building a workforce of effective educators				
1. Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	X	X	X	X
a. Create a new evaluation framework, technical assistance and implementation	X	X	X	X
b. Superintendent induction program	X	X	X	X
c. Create an improved performance-based licensure system	X	X	X	X
d. Strengthened HR systems and tools	X	X	X	X
2. Ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	X	X	X	X
a. Equitable distribution – general	X	X	X	X
b. Incentives for effective educators	X	X	X	X
c. National Board Certification grants	X	X	X	X
d. Online mentoring	X	X	X	X
e. SPED/ELL courses		X	X	X
f. U-Teach		X	X	X
g. Improved recruitment tools and resources	X	X	X	X

3.	Improve the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	X	X	X	X
4.	Professional development for educators	X	X	X	X
a.	Professional development for educators – State	X	X	X	X
b.	PLC expansion	X	X	X	X
E) Turn around the lowest achieving schools					
1.	Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the state	X	X	X	X
2.	Develop a specialized core of turnaround teacher and leader teams	X	X	X	X
3.	Build district capacity to intervene in struggling schools-operations	X	X	X	X
4.	Create wraparound zones to support struggling schools	X	X	X	X
5.	Build the capacity of proven partners to support struggling schools	X	X	X	X
6.	Develop, attract, and manage lead partners and turnaround operators to execute the restart model at Level 4 and 5 schools	X	X	X	X

IB. Race to the Top Goals and Performance Benchmarks

The table below shows the state's high-level goals and performance benchmarks for the four-year Race to the Top program. Goals and performance benchmarks are incorporated in each project, and these will be monitored to ensure the state as well as the participating LEAs are on track to achieve the outcomes it has committed to.

State goals	Current (2009)	State goal (2014)
Improve outcomes		
Accelerate the increase in overall achievement on the <u>mathematics</u> MCAS by 15%*	57% P or A	70% P or A
Accelerate the increase in overall achievement on the <u>ELA</u> MCAS by 15%*	68% P or A	75% P or A
Accelerate the increase in overall achievement on the mathematics NAEP by 15%*	G4: 252 G8: 299	G4: 271 G8: 318
Accelerate the increase in overall achievement on the reading NAEP by 15%*	G4: 239 G8: 274	G4: 251 G8: 278
Increase the percentage of students who graduate from high school within four years by 5%*	81%	85%
Increase the percentage of graduates who enroll in college within 16 months of high school graduation by 5%*	72%	75%
Increase the percentage of graduates who have completed a year of college credits within two years by 5%	51%	53%
Reduce gaps		
Reduce MCAS achievement gaps for each low performing subgroup, as measured by CPI, by 25%	--	By 25%
Reduce NAEP achievement gaps for each low performing subgroup by 25%	--	By 25%
Reduce gaps in high school graduation and college enrollment for each low performing subgroup by 15%	--	By 15%

*NAEP target date is 2015 in order to align with NAEP test administration schedule.

Performance benchmarks for districts
Increase the percentage of high school graduates who have completed MassCore (statewide, from 70% in 2010 to 85% in 2014; individual district goals will vary).
Establish an Evaluation Implementation Working Group by spring 2011.
Implement revised educator evaluation regulations by the end of SY12–13.
Implement the Common Core State Standards by the beginning of SY12–13.
Use the Education Data Warehouse to inform instruction, assessment, and operations (e.g., scheduling, staffing, professional development) by the end of SY13–14.
Create near-real-time access to student data by implementing the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) by the end of SY13–14.

Use at least one component of the teaching and learning system, other than the Education Data Warehouse, by the end of SY13–14 (*only for districts that chose developing and using the teaching & learning system in their MOU*)

Increase the percentage of teachers and principals who are rated as highly effective and reduce the percentage rated as ineffective throughout the grant period (*specific targets to be determined once the new evaluation framework is in place*)

IC. Race to the Top Program Budget

The table below outlines the budget allocation across the major assurance and project areas. This budget is being further refined as we build out the detailed plans for each project.

RACE TO THE TOP BUDGET						
P#	Project	State Budget (including fringe & indirect)				
A	Program management and evaluation	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
	Overall project management & evaluation	\$4,495,010	\$3,901,631	\$3,887,358	\$3,924,157	\$16,208,156
	Allocations to districts – grants	\$10,059,835	\$38,313,388	\$38,313,388	\$38,313,389	\$125,000,000
Project Total		\$14,554,845	\$42,215,019	\$42,200,746	\$42,237,546	\$141,208,156
B	Standards and assessments – provide resources for curriculum and instruction and rollout a statewide teaching and learning system	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
1	Implementing Common Standards and Developing Common Assessments	\$526,758	\$56,100	\$0	\$0	\$582,858
2	Model curriculum maps & units	\$857,348	\$860,871	\$853,531	\$865,267	\$3,437,017
3	Build a digital library	\$330,252	\$580,112	\$156,100	\$106,100	\$1,172,564
4	Develop interim & formative assessment system	\$1,350,135	\$807,511	\$481,244	\$490,421	\$3,129,312
5	Design curriculum embedded performance tasks	\$765,871	\$566,386	\$522,555	\$528,908	\$2,383,719
6	Enhance competency tracking system	\$0	\$56,100	\$156,100	\$56,100	\$268,300
7	Increase college & career readiness					
7a	Pre-AP program – grants	\$260,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$112,000	\$1,092,000
7b	STEM ECHS – program	\$224,640	\$159,664	\$159,664	\$113,564	\$657,532
7b	STEM ECHS – grants	\$150,000	\$260,000	\$220,000	\$90,000	\$720,000
7c	Adopt MassCore as default curriculum and align college entrance examinations	\$132,856	\$134,111	\$137,966	\$141,937	\$546,870
8	Innovation Schools	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$1,500,000
Project total		\$4,972,860	\$4,215,856	\$3,422,160	\$2,879,297	\$15,490,172
C	Data systems to support instruction	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
1	Transform state data systems					
1a	Educator Data Warehouse capacity	\$43,905	1,048,886	714,291	160,195	2,767,278
1b	Educator portals	\$330,656	\$209,168	\$474,644	\$118,600	\$1,133,067
1c	ELAR/MEPID updates	\$816,300	\$1,073,240	\$936,234	\$449,935	\$3,275,709
1d	Enhanced Web	\$1,024,311	\$806,153	\$534,640	\$0	\$2,365,104
1e	SIF	\$2,109,594	\$1,774,936	\$1,079,878	\$0	\$4,964,408
	Subtotal	\$5,124,766	\$4,912,383	\$3,739,687	\$728,730	\$14,505,566
2	Data systems & tech for T&L system					
2a	Teaching & learning system - tech side	\$2,507,511	\$5,472,811	\$2,810,019	\$1,720,271	\$12,510,612
	Subtotal	\$2,507,511	\$5,472,811	\$2,810,019	\$1,720,271	\$12,510,612
3	Educator supports for data use					
3a	Educator training on data use	\$1,352,142	\$578,468	\$1,676,212	\$1,243,012	\$4,849,833
	Subtotal	\$1,352,142	\$578,468	\$1,676,212	\$1,243,012	\$4,849,833

Project total		\$8,984,419	\$10,963,662	\$8,225,918	\$3,692,013	\$31,866,011
D	Great teachers and leaders - building a workforce of effective educators	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
	1 Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance					
	1a Eval framework & impl – program	\$4,572,100	\$2,729,900	\$2,248,800	\$2,248,800	\$11,799,600
	1a Eval framework & impl – grants	\$0	\$700,000	\$550,000	\$450,000	\$1,700,000
	1b Superintendent induction program	\$0	\$116,100	\$226,100	\$226,100	\$568,300
	1c Improved perf-based licensure system	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$2,024,400
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$5,078,200</i>	<i>\$4,052,100</i>	<i>\$3,531,000</i>	<i>\$3,431,000</i>	<i>\$16,092,300</i>
	2 Ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals					
	2a Equitable distribution – state activities	\$620,434	\$210,235	\$370,191	\$218,062	\$1,418,921
	2b Incentives for effective educators – grants	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$2,050,000	\$2,550,000
	2c National Board Certification – grants	\$62,500	\$62,500	\$62,500	\$62,500	\$250,000
	2d Online mentoring	\$0	\$416,667	\$416,667	\$416,666	\$1,250,000
	2e SPED/ELL courses – program	\$406,100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$406,100
	2e SPED/ELL courses – grants	\$0	\$800,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,600,000	\$3,600,000
	2f U-Teach	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$2,024,400
	2g Improved recruitment tools and resources – State activities	406,340	\$410,960	\$423,040	\$435,483	\$1,675,823
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$2,001,474</i>	<i>\$2,406,462</i>	<i>\$3,478,498</i>	<i>\$5,288,811</i>	<i>\$13,175,244</i>
	3 Improve the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs					
	3a Prep program effectiveness – program	\$337,756	\$495,403	\$324,445	\$274,545	\$1,432,149
	3a Prep program effectiveness – grants	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000	\$5,000,000
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$1,587,756</i>	<i>\$1,745,403</i>	<i>\$1,574,445</i>	<i>\$1,524,545</i>	<i>\$6,432,149</i>
	4 Professional development for educators					
	4a Professional development – state activities	\$1,826,644	\$1,825,039	\$1,832,261	\$1,833,387	\$7,317,331
	4b PLC expansion	\$406,100	\$206,100	\$206,100	\$0	\$818,300
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$2,232,744</i>	<i>\$2,031,139</i>	<i>\$2,038,361</i>	<i>\$1,833,387</i>	<i>\$8,135,631</i>
	Project total	\$10,900,174	\$10,235,104	\$10,622,304	\$12,077,743	\$43,835,325
E	Turn around the lowest achieving schools	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
	1 Identify persistently lowest-achieving schools in the state					
	2 Develop specialized core of turnaround teacher and leader teams	\$200,000	\$1,776,470	\$1,699,081	\$1,313,707	\$4,989,258
	3 Build district capacity to intervene in struggling schools - state activities	\$391,214	\$931,832	\$1,024,451	\$1,309,257	\$3,656,754
	4 Create wraparound zones to support struggling schools					
	4a Create wraparound zones – program	\$224,294	\$501,046	\$879,644	\$127,251	\$1,732,234
	4a Create wraparound zones – grants	\$178,000	\$354,000	\$708,000	\$0	\$1,240,000
	5 Build capacity of proven partners to support struggling schools	\$318,926	\$754,928	\$580,783	\$584,754	\$2,239,390
	6 Develop, attract, and manage lead partners and turnaround operators to execute the restart model at Level 4 and 5 schools	\$156,100	\$662,200	\$918,300	\$2,006,100	\$3,742,700
	Project total	\$1,468,534	\$4,980,476	\$5,810,258	\$5,341,069	\$17,600,336
RTTT Program Total		\$40,880,832	\$72,610,116	\$70,281,386	\$66,227,666	\$250,000,000

SECTION II – RACE TO THE TOP ACTIVITIES

A. PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION

A focus on project management and evaluation will ensure that the Race to the Top program is implemented on time and within budget and aligned to the following overall project goals and benchmarks as outlined in the Section I Overview. The key activities under this project are:

1. Overall project management and evaluation
 - a. Hire program staff
 - b. Implement deliverology approach to strategic planning and implementation
 - c. Create detailed project plans
 - d. Design & implement evaluations for all projects ensuring that each project has set goals and benchmarks
 - e. Develop reporting plans for each project
2. Hold districts accountable through existing ESE supports including reporting on grant progress
3. Hold RTTT stakeholder meetings to gather feedback on state activities

Key personnel:

Executive sponsor: Carrie Conaway, Director of Planning, Research, and Evaluation

Race to the Top program manager: Helene Bettencourt, Implementation Manager, Office of Planning and Research

Key activities and timelines:

Project	Start	End	Grant Year 2010-2011				Grant Year		
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Project management and evaluation	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1 Overall project management & evaluation	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1a Hire program staff	9/10	1/11	x	x					
1b Implement deliverology approach to strategic planning	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1c Create detailed project plans	9/10	5/11	x	x	x				
1d Design and implement evaluations for all projects	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1e Develop reporting plans for each project	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2 Hold districts accountable through existing ESE supports including reporting on grant progress	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

2a	Hold districts accountable through existing ESE supports including district review process	1/12	9/14					X		
3	Hold RTTT stakeholder meetings	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

LEA Participation:

See the separately enclosed guidelines for responses to the Year 1 Request for Proposals, which outlines the projects and timelines for LEA participation in the Race to the Top program. LEA responses to this RFP were submitted under separate cover.

Project management and evaluation are a requirement of district participation in RTTT. These requirements are delineated in the Year 1 RFP.

Budget:

A	Program management and evaluation	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
	Overall project management & evaluation	\$4,495,010	\$3,901,631	\$3,887,358	\$3,924,157	\$16,208,156
	Allocations to districts – grants	\$10,059,835	\$38,313,388	\$38,313,388	\$38,313,389	\$125,000,000
<i>Project Total</i>		\$14,554,845	\$42,215,019	\$42,200,746	\$42,237,546	\$141,208,156

Annual targets for key performance measures and/or major milestones:

- Request and approve State Scopes of Work for Year 1 – November 22, 2010
- Implement deliverology – By end of year 2010
- Hire key staff – By January 2011
- Develop project plans and evaluations – through May 2011
- Build tools for districts to report on grant progress – implement Grantium grants management system – March 2011
- Complete 16 district reviews – June 2012

B. STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Massachusetts is well poised to play a substantial role in the development of a new common college and career readiness assessment system based on common standards in English language arts and mathematics. In four years we will be prepared to administer this assessment in place of our current state assessments in those subjects. The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), in place since 1998, is the state's valid and reliable, standards-based, customized state assessment system. Our experienced assessment staff has expertise in psychometrics and test subject matter content and is both committed and eager to play a major role in the design, development, and implementation of the next generation common assessment system that the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC) will create.

Massachusetts's standards and assessments are among the best in the nation. Yet achievement gaps persist, in part because we have not sufficiently invested in curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessment tools needed to improve teaching and learning. Among our participating districts, 242 (nearly 90%) of them agree and have committed to helping us to build a comprehensive PreK–12 teaching and learning system. As the system components are developed, a statewide professional development initiative facilitated through our six regional Readiness Centers and District and School Assistance Centers (DSAC) will provide a “train-the-trainer” model to enable district leaders to disseminate resources and tools in their districts. Use of this standards-based teaching and learning system will be mandated for Level 3 districts (those that have one or more schools in the lowest 20% of performance on MCAS), unless they can show that they already have a system of comparable scope and quality in place. Many of these tools will also be useful in helping educators to demonstrate their students' performance and growth for the purpose of evaluation.

Massachusetts has increased its four-year cohort high school graduation rate from 79.9% for the 2006 cohort to 81.5% for the 2009 cohort and has increased the percentage of high school graduates going on to higher education consistently each year for seven straight years, from 64.2% in 2003 to 72.0% in 2009. During this same time period, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education has added a requirement that students who score *Needs Improvement* on our required high school exit tests demonstrate proficiency before graduation, added science to the battery of high school exit tests, and adopted MassCore as a recommended high school program of studies. These new requirements notwithstanding, we continue to have too many students, especially low-income and minority students, who are not ready for college and careers when they graduate from high school. We aim to reduce this variation in outcomes through four related strategies:

- Prepare more students for success after high school through exposure to rigorous curricula and college-level work, particularly in STEM fields.
- MassCore as the default curriculum for all high school students in the Commonwealth and align public 4-year college entrance requirements with MassCore.
- Build tools to monitor vocational students' progress toward career readiness.
- Assist students in making smart postsecondary choices through improved guidance and counseling

Another component to improve graduation rates and to ensure students are ready to pursue higher education or obtain a career that provides a wage that an individual and his/her family can live on is to provide different types of learning environments that capitalize on best practices from the charters while keeping funding within the district. The Innovation Schools initiative, a key component of the groundbreaking education legislation that Governor Patrick signed in January 2010, provides educators and other stakeholders across the state with the exciting opportunity to create new in-district schools that will leverage the lessons learned from the state's top performing charter schools while keeping school funding within districts. These unique schools—which may be established by superintendents, school committees, teachers, parents, colleges and universities, charter school operators and others—will operate with increased autonomy and flexibility in the areas of curriculum, budget, school schedule and calendar, staffing (including waivers from or exemptions to collective bargaining agreements), school district policies, and professional development. In exchange for greater authority to establish the school conditions that will lead to improved teaching and learning, the operators of Innovation Schools will be held accountable for meeting annual benchmarks for student achievement and school performance.

These initiatives are broken down into the eight major projects:

1. Implementing Common Standards and Developing Common Assessments
 - a. Align all Massachusetts standards documents to the Common Core; implement and assess the new standards statewide
 - b. Participate in PARCC
2. Model curriculum maps and units
3. Build a digital library
4. Develop interim and formative assessments
5. Design curriculum-embedded performance tasks
6. Enhance competency tracking system
7. College and career readiness
 - a. Pre-AP teacher training
 - b. STEM Early College High Schools
 - c. Adopt MassCore as default curriculum and align college entrance examinations
8. Innovation schools

Key Personnel:

- 1) Implement Common Core State Standards and develop common assessments
 - a) Align standards documents and implement statewide (Julia Phelps)
 - b) Participate in PARCC (Bob Bickerton)

Develop a teaching and learning system (Bob Bickerton and Julia Phelps)

- 2) Develop model curriculum maps and units (Julia Phelps)
- 3) Build a digital library (Julia Phelps)
- 4) Develop interim and formative assessments (Bob Bickerton)
- 5) Design curriculum-embedded performance tasks (Bob Bickerton and Julia Phelps)

- 6) Enhance competency tracking system (Bob Bickerton and John Bynoe)
- 7) Increase college & career readiness (John Bynoe)
- 8) Provide support for Innovation Schools (Jeff Wulfson)

Key activities and timelines:

Project	Start	End	Grant Year 2010-2011				Grant Year		
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Standards and assessments	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1 Implementing common core standards and developing common assessments	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
a. Align all Massachusetts standards documents to the Common Core; implement and assess the new standards statewide	9/10	8/12	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
b. Participate in PARCC	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2 Model curriculum maps and units	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3 Build a digital library	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
4 Develop interim and formative assessment system	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
5 Design curriculum embedded performance tasks	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
6 Enhance competency tracking system (EDW)	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
7 Increase college and career readiness	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
a. Pre-AP program	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
b. STEM Early College High Schools	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
c. Adopt MassCore as default curriculum and align college entrance examinations	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
8 Innovation Schools	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

LEA Participation:

LEA participation in this area is linked to their scope of work through projects 2A-Aligning curriculum to the Common Core Standards, 4-Increase college and career readiness (6 possible projects), and 5-Help develop and implement a statewide teaching and learning system (6 possible projects). Participation in 2A is required for all districts. Participation in district projects 4A and 5A is required for those districts that elected this area in their Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

LEA participation covers all four years of the program. See the separately enclosed guidelines for responses to the Year 1 Request for Proposals, which outlines the projects and timelines for LEA participation in the Race to the Top program. LEA responses to this RFP were submitted under separate cover.

Budget:

Standards and assessments		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
1	Implementing common core standards and developing common assessments	\$526,758	\$56,100	\$0	\$0	\$582,858
2	Model curriculum maps & units	\$857,348	\$860,871	\$853,531	\$865,267	\$3,437,017
3	Build a digital library	\$330,252	\$580,112	\$156,100	\$106,100	\$1,172,564
4	Develop interim and formative assessment system	\$1,350,135	\$807,511	\$481,244	\$490,421	\$3,129,312
5	Design curriculum embedded performance tasks	\$765,871	\$566,386	\$522,555	\$528,908	\$2,383,719
6	Enhance competency tracking system	\$0	\$56,100	\$156,100	\$56,100	\$268,300
7	Increase college & career readiness					
7a	Pre-AP program – grants	\$260,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$112,000	\$1,092,000
7b	STEM ECHS – program	\$224,640	\$159,664	\$159,664	\$113,564	\$657,532
7b	STEM ECHS – grants	\$150,000	\$260,000	\$220,000	\$90,000	\$720,000
7c	Adopt MassCore as default curriculum and align college entrance examinations	\$132,856	\$134,111	\$137,966	\$141,937	\$546,870
8	Innovation Schools	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$1,500,000
	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$4,972,860</i>	<i>\$4,215,856</i>	<i>\$3,422,160</i>	<i>\$2,879,297</i>	<i>\$15,490,172</i>

Annual targets for key performance measures and/or major milestones:

1. Implementing common core standards and developing common assessments

Years 1 and 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hire independent panel of experts to review Common Core Standards and present results to the Board: June 2010 ▪ Board vote on adopting Common Core Standards before August 2, 2010 ▪ Receive recommendations from Curriculum Framework Review Panels to Board on adding unique MA standards and solicitation of public comment: September and October 2010 ▪ Board vote on adding any additional standards to the Common Core Standards: December 2010; full documents are the new Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for ELA and Mathematics ▪ Post of new standards on website, integrate into ESE standards database, align assessment items to new Common Core Standards: January to June 2011 ▪ Complete aligning district curricula to Common Core Standards by June 2012

1b. Participate in PARCC

Year 1	Years 2 to 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ With other governing states, submit PARCC application for USED funds in June 2010. ▪ Assuming funding, begin work on design of system: September to December 2010 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop, pilot, and set standards for PARCC assessments in English language arts and mathematics ▪ Continue to administer MCAS in ELA and mathematics, making the transition to PARCC by including on MCAS items that are aligned to both ▪ Continue to administer MCAS in science at grades 5, 8, and high school, developing new assessment items as needed to align with new state standards or, if Common Core Standards are developed for science, making a similar transition as for ELA and math ▪ Implement MCAS history assessments at grades 5, 7, and high school (pending state funding) ▪ PARCC assessments in ELA and mathematics replace MCAS in 2014-2015 school year

2. Model curriculum maps and units

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Align curriculum maps for ELA and mathematics with Common Core standard ▪ Build curriculum maps with educators ▪ Disseminate Common Core Standards (CCS) through regional roundtables, webinars, and statewide curriculum summits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Align English language proficiency standards for English language learners to Common Core ELA standards ▪ Revise science standards; add literacy standards from CCS to history/social science, health, and arts ▪ Publish model curriculum maps (one for each content area; ELA, math, science, history/social studies) ▪ Pilot additional units linked to resources in the digital library ▪ Conduct roundtables, webinars, and summits to discuss CCS implementation in schools, goals and structure of PARCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Align academic strand of career/vocational technical standards to CCS ▪ Publish curriculum units and continue to publish additional model curriculum maps ▪ Conduct roundtables, webinars, and summits to present formative and interim assessments, curriculum resources ▪ Launch train-the-trainer model for implementing the model curriculum through DSACs and professional learning communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Align foreign languages standards to CCS ▪ Standards-based model curricula will be adopted in all Level 3 districts ▪ Conduct roundtables, webinars, and summits on the transition to PARCC ▪ Continue train-the-trainer on model curriculum implementation ▪ Publish curriculum units and continue to publish additional model curriculum maps

3. Build a digital library

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand WGBH Teacher’s Domain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand digital library to include videos of effective teaching practices and a social media environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand digital library to include links to Massachusetts museums and cultural institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to add and improve resources in the Digital Library

4. Develop interim and formative assessments¹

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Collect requirements and design system for interim assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch development of interim assessment tools for ELA and math grades 3–8 • Support LEA implementation of interim assessments • Purchase, develop, and/or configure assessment system • Pilot online assessment system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Online formative and interim assessment system fully operational; extensive PD available on using the system to improve student achievement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Online interim and formative assessment system in use in all Level 3 districts ▪ Continue to provide PD on using the system to improve student achievement

5. Design curriculum-embedded performance tasks

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop, solicit, and review, curriculum-embedded performance tasks ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publish tasks with student work samples ▪ Continue to solicit and review, curriculum-embedded performance tasks; begin pilot-testing tasks ▪ Pilot electronic submission of student work and scores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue previous work on curriculum-embedded performance tasks and add statewide field tests, matrix-sampled tasks, score auditing, and publication of required tasks in Year 4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue previous work on curriculum-embedded performance tasks

6. Enhance competency tracking system

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contractor hired to implement enhancements to the Competency Tracking System 	Enhanced Competency Tracking System fully operational

7. College and career readiness

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LEAs and college partnerships chosen for STEM ECHS; planning phase begins ▪ Intermediary(ies) chosen to support start-up of ECHS ▪ ESE identifies lead partner(s) in providing pre-AP training; 1,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ STEM ECHSs enroll the first cohort of students ▪ Year 2 of pre-AP training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ STEM ECHSs enroll the second cohort of students; first class of students graduates with college credit ▪ Year 3 of pre-AP training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ STEM ECHSs enroll third cohort; second class of students graduates with college credit

¹ Massachusetts is willing to lead a consortium of states interested in building or adapting an existing online interim/formative assessment system and will be exploring options with members of PARCC.

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
educators receive first year of training			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEAs use RTTT funds to implement MassCore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEAs use RTTT funds to implement MassCore BESE and BHE vote on default curriculum, college admission requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEAs use RTTT funds to implement MassCore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEAs use RTTT funds to implement MassCore
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First cohort of high schools and colleges join and use YourPlanforCollege for college and career planning LEAs use RTTT funds to provide PD for counselors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second cohort joins YourPlanforCollege; portal expanded to include a middle school module LEAs use RTTT funds to provide PD for counselors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEAs use RTTT funds to provide PD for counselors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEAs use RTTT funds to provide PD for counselors All high school students in Massachusetts have a college and career plan

8. Innovation schools

The activities and performance benchmarks under this project will focus on providing planning and research grants and then follow-on implementation grants to districts and schools that wish to explore and then implement an Innovation School.

Any district is eligible to use their local RTTT funds to support planning and implementation activities, with no selection or additional application process.

Planning and implementation grants using state RTTT funds will also be distributed through competitive grant processes to participating districts. ESE anticipates supporting the establishment of two cohorts of Innovation Schools: one cohort that will begin planning in SY10–11 and another that will begin in SY11–12.

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline	End of SY 2010–11	End of SY 2011–12	End of SY 2012–13	End of SY 2013–14
% of LEAs implementing the Common Core Standards	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	100%
% of Massachusetts standards documents aligned to the Common Core	0%	22%	44%	67%	100%
% of grades and subjects with at least one model curriculum unit	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
Number of state published model curriculum maps	0	0	4	8	12
Number of curriculum embedded performance tasks developed	n/a	25	50	75	100

% of LEAs participating in the teaching and learning system project that are using one or more component of the teaching and learning system, other than the EDW (<i>also a performance measure for C2</i>)	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	90%
% of participating LEAs using the interim / formative assessment system	n/a	n/a	35%	75%	75%
% of participating LEAs using curriculum-embedded performance tasks	n/a	n/a	20%	50%	75%
% of high school graduates successfully completing MassCore	50%	55%	65%	75%	85%
Number of Early College High Schools (ECHS) established as a direct result of Race to the Top funding	n/a	n/a	6	6	6
Number of teachers participating in pre-AP training	n/a	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
MassCore established as the default curriculum and aligned with four-year college entrance requirements	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	✓
% of high school students with a plan on <i>YourPlanforCollege.com</i> or a similar college and career readiness planning tool	n/a	10%	35%	50%	75%

C. DATA SYSTEMS TO SUPPORT INSTRUCTION

Massachusetts anticipated the rapidly growing importance of high quality data to inform policy and decisions at the beginning of the prior decade. Since that time, we have made significant progress in building more comprehensive data systems, primarily at state expense. Now, to achieve our vision of education reform and reduce the variation in student outcomes, we must enhance our strategic and timely use of data and information to better support teaching and learning and educational policy decisions. Without reliable data about our students, educators, and services, we remain limited in our ability to deliver effective interventions when and where they are most needed. To that end we aim to build a system over the next four years that will enable all 80,000 K–12 educators to use data to inform their decision-making and target instruction; link data from the ESE to the Departments of Early Education and Care and Higher Education; provide near real time data to policy leaders, district and school administrators and teachers; and improve the usability of the ESE public data profiles.

The Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF), a common education data-sharing protocol, facilitates the delivery of “near real time” data to Education Data Warehouse (EDW) users. Building upon work already completed under an earlier Longitudinal Data Systems grant, ESE will work with LEAs to procure the services of a reliable SIF vendor capable of rolling out SIF statewide. By the end of four years, every LEA will transmit data from SIS, HR, and other LEA data systems to ESE through SIF. We will integrate the collection of School Safety and Discipline Report (SSDR) data into ESE’s SIF infrastructure and establish a foundation for future cross-agency data integration that provides data to support the vision of the Readiness Passport. We will also work with vendors and the Department of Early Education and Care to implement SIF solutions that will ultimately allow for seamless integration of PreK–12 data, and also enable their participation in the teaching and learning system described in Section B3.

ESE will work with LEAs to provide an integrated technology and data platform that supports the adoption and implementation of the state’s instructional improvement system in every school and classroom. Many Massachusetts LEAs are experienced users of currently available instructional improvement systems, particularly for formative and interim assessment. We will build upon their knowledge and experience as we develop and implement a more comprehensively integrated system for all to access. ESE support and training is particularly critical for many smaller and mid-size LEAs to take advantage of the new system and to benefit from economies of scale. ESE must also make more information available to researchers, so that we can continuously assess the impact of the system on student performance and identify best practices and priorities for improvement.

We will provide educators with comprehensive training to support the effective use of the data systems developed to support the PreK-12 teaching and learning system. The training curriculum will include modules for each system: data dashboards, the EDW, the digital library, and the teaching and learning system. Training participants will view the training modules as one cohesive and seamless training system built upon the District Data Toolkit already delivered by ESE.

The key projects under this initiative are:

1. Transform State Data System
 - a. Expand educator data warehouse (EDW) capacity
 - b. Build educator portals
 - c. Allow ELAR/MEPID updates
 - d. Enhanced web
 - e. Rollout the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)
2. Data systems and technology for teaching and learning system
 - a. Teaching and learning system - technology side
3. Educator supports and training for Data Use
 - a. Educator training on data use

Key Personnel:

Executive Sponsor: Jeff Wulfson, Deputy Commissioner

Key activities and timelines:

Project	Start	End	Grant Year 2010-2011				Grant Year		
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Data systems to support instruction	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1 Transform State Data System									
<i>a. Expand EDW capacity</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>b. Build educator portals</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>c. Allow ELAR/MEPID updates</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>d. Enhanced web</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>e. Roll out the SIF</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2 Data systems and technology for T&L System									
<i>a. Teaching and learning system - technology side</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3 Educator supports for data use									
<i>a. Educator training on data use</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

LEA Participation:

LEA participation in this area is linked to the district scopes of work through projects in assurance area 3: Use data to inform instruction. LEAs must agree to implement the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) in one of the four years of the program. Participation in other projects associated with this assurance area is not mandatory and district participation could span all four years.

See the separately enclosed guidelines for responses to the Year 1 Request for Proposals, which outlines the projects and timelines for LEA participation in the Race to the Top program. LEA responses to this RFP were submitted under separate cover.

Budget:

C	Data systems to support instruction	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
1	Transform state data systems					
1a	Educator Data Warehouse capacity	843,905	\$1,048,886	\$714,291	\$160,195	\$2,767,278
1b	Educator portals	\$330,656	\$209,168	\$474,644	\$118,600	\$1,133,067
1c	ELAR/MEPID updates	\$816,300	\$1,073,240	\$936,234	\$449,935	\$3,275,709
1d	Enhanced Web	\$1,024,311	\$806,153	\$534,640	\$0	\$2,365,104
1e	SIF	\$2,109,594	\$1,774,936	\$1,079,878	\$0	\$4,964,408
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$5,124,766</i>	<i>\$4,912,383</i>	<i>\$3,739,687</i>	<i>\$728,730</i>	<i>\$14,505,566</i>
2	Data systems & tech for T&L system					
2a	Teaching & learning system - tech side	\$2,507,511	\$5,472,811	\$2,810,019	\$1,720,271	\$12,510,612
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$2,507,511</i>	<i>\$5,472,811</i>	<i>\$2,810,019</i>	<i>\$1,720,271</i>	<i>\$12,510,612</i>
3	Educator supports for data use					
3a	Educator training on data use	\$1,352,142	\$578,468	\$1,676,212	\$1,243,012	\$4,849,833
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$1,352,142</i>	<i>\$578,468</i>	<i>\$1,676,212</i>	<i>\$1,243,012</i>	<i>\$4,849,833</i>
Project total		\$8,984,419	\$10,963,662	\$8,225,918	\$3,692,013	\$31,866,011

Annual targets for key performance measures and/or major milestones:

1. Transform State Data System

Strategy	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Add data and reports the EDW to better support the needs of its 80,000 users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate dashboard software Reengineer the Educator Data Warehouse (through SLDS funding) to mitigate problems with performance and reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research requirements for educator dashboards Analyze requirements for additional data sets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build dashboards Design and implement additional data sets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roll out dashboards Roll out reports based on additional data sets

Strategy	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Improve the usability and efficiency of ESE's public data Profiles		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect and evaluate user preferences and finalize web design Redesign navigation and validate prototype with sample users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-architect and streamline data flows into Profiles Migrate 60% of Profiles features 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Migrate remaining 40% of Profiles features Continue to implement changes based on user feedback
Increase the timeliness and accuracy of data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement SIF in 82 LEAs Update MA SIF profile 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement SIF in an additional 24 LEAs Gather requirements for additional discipline data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement SIF in an additional 112 LEAs Pilot collection of discipline data through SIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roll out collection of discipline data through SIF

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Number of data sets available in EDW	3	3	4	5	6
Percent of districts using EDW data to improve instruction, assessment, and operations	40%	55%	75%	90%	100%
Percent increase in Profiles traffic after usability improvements and addition of finance and district comparison data	0%	0%	5%	10%	15%
Number of LEAs implementing Schools Interoperability Framework	40	122	146	258	258

2. Data systems and technology for Teaching and Learning System (T&L) and 3. Educator supports and training for data use

Strategy	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Invest in the data systems and technology necessary to support the statewide PreK-12 teaching and learning system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document functional, access, and performance requirements including analysis of current LEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize architecture Create detailed system designs Begin developing the system Begin adding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and validate the system and integrate into the EDW; design data reporting Complete and evaluate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate impact of state-built instructional system Plan test builder rollout to all LEAs

	<p>implementations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluate options, begin defining architecture, purchase licenses ▪ Engage contractor(s) ▪ Begin preparing resources to the Digital Library (see B3) 	resources to the Digital Library	<p>the pilot, modify as needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Connect Digital Library resources to other elements of the teaching & learning system ▪ Launch test builder 	
Strengthen and expand educator training and supports for data use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop a data training implementation plan ▪ Hire data specialists in DSACs ▪ Review districts on effective data use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhance online course delivery infrastructure ▪ Revise courses as indicated and make available face-to-face and online ▪ Review districts on data use ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue course delivery ▪ Determine which trainings developed under section B, D and E initiatives are priorities for adaptation to online delivery ▪ Develop curricula for courses on the PreK–12 teaching and learning system; pilot the courses and train trainers ▪ Review districts on effective data use ▪ Data team leader endorsement to licensure available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue course delivery ▪ Adapt and implement additional courses for online delivery ▪ Review districts on effective data use
Make state longitudinal data available to researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue existing processes of providing confidential data to researchers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue existing processes of providing confidential data to researchers ▪ Discuss req'ts with researchers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop processes and protocols for sharing more detailed aggregate data with researchers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build detailed data files and begin providing data sets to researchers

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
% of LEAs using EDW to inform instructional decisions	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
# of educators trained on how to effectively use data and instructional tools to improve student achievement and growth	100	1,000	5,000	10,000	25,000
% of participating LEAs participating in the teaching and learning system project that are using one or more components of the system, other than the EDW (<i>also a performance measure for B3</i>)	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	90%
Percentage of user visits during which the teaching & learning system meets published service level agreements for:					
• Availability: continuously available other than at scheduled maintenance times	n/a	n/a	n/a	99%	99%
• Responsiveness: loads pages in less than 3 seconds	n/a	n/a	n/a	95%	99%
• Usability: easy to use and navigate	n/a	n/a	n/a	95%	100%

D. GREAT TEACHERS AND LEADERS

Massachusetts will only close its achievement gap when instruction in every classroom is uniformly strong. Too many students, typically those living in poverty, learning English as a second language, or struggling with disabilities, are still too often taught by teachers ill-prepared to teach them effectively, in schools led by principals unable to make their schools meet the needs of every student.

To change this over the next four years, Massachusetts will institute a series of intertwined statewide policy reforms to attract, develop, mentor, support, and retain an effective, academically capable, diverse, and culturally proficient educator workforce. To achieve these reforms, Massachusetts will:

- Develop a performance-based, comprehensive annual statewide evaluation process for teachers and principals, and provide training and support to ensure its effective implementation in every school.
- Review and enhance teacher induction policies and revise the licensure system for principals.
- Provide the most underserved students with access to the most effective teachers and principals.
- Strengthen and expand effective educator preparation programs and improve or close the one that are ineffective.
- Develop a comprehensive professional development system to support effective implementation of our objectives.

Our approach assumes that there is a range of effectiveness among teachers and principals, and that too few supervisors currently credibly identify where each individual falls within that range or provide actionable feedback. Four years from now, each district in the Commonwealth will evaluate teachers and principals annually, using student performance measures as a significant factor and at least three rating categories for each individual educator. Evaluations will be used to make key personnel decisions related to tenure, improvement planning, career ladder opportunities, compensation for new roles and responsibilities, and dismissal when adequate improvement does not occur. We will invest heavily in support for evaluators and provide training in evaluation protocols, including classroom observations, and offer coaching through a cadre of master evaluators employed by the state. Finally, we will link evaluation feedback to opportunities (e.g., coaching, professional development) and resources (e.g., data, curriculum materials) for improvement.

To ensure that all students receive high quality curriculum and instruction we need to get more highly effective teachers and leaders into all of our schools, with a particular focus on high poverty, high minority districts, and the fields in which we face critical shortages (ESL, special education and STEM). We will do so by pursuing three intertwined strategies: setting ambitious but achievable targets and holding districts accountable for meeting them; strategically employing incentives to recruit and retain great teachers and leaders in high poverty/high minority schools and shortage fields; and strengthening the ways in which new recruits are brought into the classroom and supported. Taken together, our focus on targets, incentives and

supports will help us close the achievement gap by ensuring that our most underserved students in our most underserved schools and districts will be taught and led by our most effective teachers and leaders.

In an effort to ensure that all students have access to well prepared and effective educators, we will expand effective educator preparation programs and improve or close ineffective programs. This will be done through expansion grants for new and existing programs and a new accountability system for educator preparation program approval. We will also devote resources for support of educators in the implementation of initiatives and a new comprehensive professional development system statewide.

In summary, there are four major projects for the state's work to build a workforce of effective educators:

1. Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance
 - a. Create a new evaluation framework, technical assistance, & implementation
 - b. Superintendent induction program
 - c. Create an improved performance-based licensure system
2. Ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals
 - a. Equitable distribution – general
 - b. Incentives for effective educators
 - c. National Board Certification grants
 - d. Online mentoring
 - e. SPED/ELL courses
 - f. U-Teach
 - g. Improved recruitment tools and resources
3. Improve the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs
4. Professional development for educators
 - a. Professional development for educators – operations
 - b. PLC expansion

Key Personnel:

Executive sponsor for improving teacher and principal effectiveness, ensuring equitable distribution, and improving preparation programs: Claudia Bach, Director of Educator Policy, Preparation, and Leadership

Executive sponsor for professional development: Julia Phelps, Associate Commissioner

Key activities and timelines:

Project	Start	End	Grant Year 2010-2011				Grant Year		
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Great teachers and leaders - building a workforce of effective educators	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1 Improve teacher and principal effectiveness	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1a <i>Create new evaluation framework, technical assistance, and implementation</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1b <i>Superintendent induction program</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1c <i>Create an improved performance-based licensure system</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2 Ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2a <i>Equitable distribution – general</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2b <i>Incentives for effective educators</i>	9/11	9/14					x	x	X
2c <i>National Board certification</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2d <i>Online mentoring</i>	9/11	9/14					x	x	x
2e <i>SPED/ELL courses</i>	4/11	9/14			x	x	x	x	x
2f <i>U-Teach</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2g <i>Improved recruitment tools and resources</i>	9/11	9/14					x	x	x
3 Preparation program effectiveness	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
4 Professional development for educators	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
4a <i>Professional development for educators – operations</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
4b <i>PLC expansion</i>	9/10	9/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

LEA Participation:

LEA participation in this area is linked to the district scopes of work through projects in assurance areas 1-Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance; 2-Ensure effective teachers in leaders in ever school and classroom; and 6-Turn around the lowest achieving schools. District participation is mandatory for Project 1A, 2A, and 2B and activity for LEAs will happen in all four years. Some projects are only available for Level 2 and 3 districts (Project 1B – Pilot a model, aligned human resource system) or Level 3 and 4 (Project 2J- Participate in a network for principals of high need schools), and many projects start in Year 2 after the state’s development of a program.

See the separately enclosed guidelines for responses to the Year 1 Request for Proposals, which outlines the projects and timelines for LEA participation in the Race to the Top program. LEA responses to this RFP were submitted under separate cover.

Budget:

D	Building a workforce of Effective Educators	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
1	Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance					
1a	Eval framework & impl – program	\$4,572,100	\$2,729,900	\$2,248,800	\$2,248,800	\$11,799,600
1a	Eval framework & impl – grants	\$0	\$700,000	\$550,000	\$450,000	\$1,700,000
1b	Superintendent induction program	\$0	\$116,100	\$226,100	\$226,100	\$568,300
1c	Performance-based licensure system	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$2,024,400
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$5,078,200</i>	<i>\$4,052,100</i>	<i>\$3,531,000</i>	<i>\$3,431,000</i>	<i>\$16,092,300</i>
2	Ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals					
2a	Equitable distribution – state activities	\$620,434	\$210,235	\$370,191	\$218,062	\$1,418,921
2b	Incentives for effective educators – grants	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$2,050,000	\$2,550,000
2c	National Board Certification – grants	\$62,500	\$62,500	\$62,500	\$62,500	\$250,000
2d	Online mentoring	\$0	\$416,667	\$416,667	\$416,666	\$1,250,000
2e	SPED/ELL courses – program	\$406,100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$406,100
2e	SPED/ELL courses – grants	\$0	\$800,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,600,000	\$3,600,000
2f	U-Teach	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$506,100	\$2,024,400
2g	Improved recruitment tools and resources – State activities	\$406,340	\$410,960	\$423,040	\$435,483	\$1,675,823
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$2,001,474</i>	<i>\$2,406,462</i>	<i>\$3,478,498</i>	<i>\$5,288,811</i>	<i>\$13,175,244</i>
3	Improve the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs					
3a	Prep program effectiveness – program	\$337,756	\$495,403	\$324,445	\$274,545	\$1,432,149
3a	Prep program effectiveness – grants	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000	\$5,000,000
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$1,587,756</i>	<i>\$1,745,403</i>	<i>\$1,574,445</i>	<i>\$1,524,545</i>	<i>\$6,432,149</i>
4	Professional development for educators					
4a	Professional development – state activities	\$1,826,644	\$1,825,039	\$1,832,261	\$1,833,387	\$7,317,331
4b	PLC expansion	\$406,100	\$206,100	\$206,100	\$0	\$818,300
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$2,232,744</i>	<i>\$2,031,139</i>	<i>\$2,038,361</i>	<i>\$1,833,387</i>	<i>\$8,135,631</i>
	Project total	\$10,900,174	\$10,235,104	\$10,622,304	\$12,077,743	\$43,835,325

Annual targets for key performance measures and/or major milestones:

1. Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extend growth model to all LEAs statewide ▪ Track student results by individual teachers and principals by linking student and educator data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish district exemplars for measuring growth in non-tested subjects ▪ Implement student performance measures for non-MCAS subjects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue support for measuring student growth in all subject areas ▪ Deploy test builder engine and item banks statewide ▪ Issue guidance in how to use test builder engine and item banks for measuring student growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to gather and disseminate non-tested subject best practices
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish Task Force to advise/develop new statewide Evaluation Framework (regulations and guidelines) ▪ Develop measures of effectiveness for both principals and teachers ▪ Adopt new educator evaluation regulations ▪ Develop new educator evaluation framework/guidelines with rubrics ▪ Develop default model of evaluation available for district implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Begin tiered implementation of new evaluation framework/guidelines ▪ Provide technical assistance and training for new evaluation guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to provide technical assistance and training for ongoing implementation of new evaluation guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to provide technical assistance and training for statewide implementation of new evaluation guidelines

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Begin developing training modules for principals and teachers on implementing effective evaluation plans ▪ Train cadre of evaluation coaches ▪ LEAs form Evaluation Working groups ▪ Launch 3-year induction program for superintendents (no cost for Level 3 & 4 districts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create training modules for principals and teachers on implementing effective evaluation plans ▪ Adopt the educator evaluation framework in all participating LEAs ▪ Implement the new evaluation system in Level 4 schools ▪ Conduct hands on training through DSACS on new evaluation framework ▪ Collect and analyze LEA evaluation plans ▪ Provide professional development opportunities for school leaders on becoming effective evaluators ▪ Collect LEA evaluation results noting equitable distribution of educators ▪ Provide searchable educator contract database and evaluation protocols ▪ Deploy evaluation coaches to work with LEA evaluation teams through the DSACs ▪ Extend superintendent induction program to Level 1 and Level 2 districts on a fee basis ▪ LEAs use evaluation to target professional development to educators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refine training modules for principals and teachers on implementing effective evaluation plans ▪ All participating LEAs implement evaluation systems statewide ▪ Provide online LEAs best practices of new evaluation framework ▪ Conduct hands on training through DSACS on new evaluation framework ▪ Continue to provide evaluation coaches through the DSACs ▪ LEAs use evaluation to target professional development to educators ▪ Superintendent Induction Program continues for all districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refine training modules for principals and teachers on implementing effective evaluation plans ▪ Refine measures of student performance in LEA evaluation systems ▪ Conduct hands on training through DSACS on new evaluation framework ▪ Continue to provide evaluation coaches through the DSACs ▪ LEAs use evaluation to target professional development to educators ▪ Superintendent Induction Program continues for all districts

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adopt regulations for principal standards and performance indicators ▪ Begin developing principal performance assessments and portfolio for licensure ▪ Begin creating HR systems models/pilots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adopt regulations for tiered principal licensure system and career ladder ▪ Begin developing framework for teacher leader endorsements & career ladder, including any necessary regulatory change ▪ Develop teacher leader performance assessments and portfolio systems, ▪ Continue to create HR systems models/pilots ▪ Provide additional supports to districts for improving their HR systems, such as coaching and an HR toolkit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Begin field-testing teacher leader performance assessment and portfolio systems ▪ Review induction policies ▪ Adopt regulations for teacher leader endorsements ▪ Begin field-testing principal performance assessment and portfolio systems ▪ Continue to create HR systems models/pilots ▪ Continue to provide additional supports to districts for improving their HR systems, such as coaching and an HR toolkit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implement teacher leader endorsement and performance assessment system ▪ Implement principal performance assessment and portfolio systems ▪ Continue to create HR systems models/pilots; disseminate exemplars of usage of HR models ▪ Continue to provide additional supports to districts for improving their HR systems, such as coaching and an HR toolkit

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
	Baseline data and annual targets				
Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	0%	0%	4.4%	100%	100%
Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	0%	0%	4.4%	100%	100%
Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:	--	--	--	--	--
• Developing teachers and principals.	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	100%
• Compensating teachers and principals.	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	100%
• Promoting teachers and principals.	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	100%
• Retaining effective teachers and principals.	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	100%
• Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	100%
• Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	100%

2. Ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adopt exchange policies for enabling effective educators to move to high poverty districts ▪ Expand instructional leadership training (NISL) ▪ Collect EPIMS and TEQIP data to monitor equitable distribution ▪ Publish <i>Status</i> report ▪ Expand National Board certified and other master educators ▪ Plan for implementation of the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) in Boston and Springfield turnaround schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct Mass TeLLS survey results and publish results ▪ Convene statewide diversity summit and formulate action agenda and indicators with Readiness Centers ▪ Expand aMAzing teachers recruitment website and revise Massachusetts Educators Career Center Develop and implement recruitment and retention incentives for educators in high poverty and high minority schools ▪ Implement exchange policies for effective educators ▪ Launch support network for principals in high need schools ▪ Continue NISL training ▪ In TIF schools, begin piloting group and individual rewards systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue support network for principals ▪ Continue implementing exchange policies for effective educators ▪ Disseminate exemplars of school conditions and culture initiatives ▪ LEAs develop action plans for improving school culture based on results from Mass TeLLS survey ▪ Publish <i>Status</i> report ▪ Continue NISL training ▪ In TIF schools, agree on details of individual performance awards and use educator evaluation data to prioritize the assignment of effective teachers to TIF schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue support network for principals ▪ Continue implementing exchange policies for effective educators ▪ Conduct Mass TeLLS survey results and publish results ▪ LEAs develop action plans for improving school culture based on results from Mass TeLLS survey ▪ Continue NISL training ▪ Develop and implement online network for Level 4 educators to share best practices for school turnaround efforts ▪ In TIF schools, continue implementing performance awards and new assignment practices
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create STEM-focused educator preparation site (UTeach) ▪ Begin developing online competency-based special education and ESL courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implement competitive grant fund for expanding proven models of educator preparation programs ▪ Complete development of online competency-based special education and ESL courses ▪ Continue UTeach Develop online courses for mentors of ESL, special education, and STEM field teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ License 234 new ESL and special education teachers ▪ Continue UTeach ▪ Train cadre of ESL and special education field coaches ▪ Implement online competency-based special education and ESL courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support 10–15 working conditions/school climate teams ▪ License 234 new ESL and special education teachers through new online courses (total of 468 over the four years) ▪ Produce 250 new STEM teachers through UTeach

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
	Baseline data and annual targets				
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	10%	n/a	15%	17%	20%
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	15%	n/a	18%	20%	23%
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	35%	n/a	27%	22%	10%
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	20%	n/a	18%	15%	10%
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	7%	n/a	11%	15%	25%
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	12%	n/a	15%	18%	25%
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	35%	n/a	25%	19%	12%
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	15%	n/a	14%	12%	10%
Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	75%	n/a	79%	83%	88%
Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	75%	n/a	79%	83%	88%
Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	65%	n/a	70%	75%	85%
Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	65%	n/a	70%	75%	85%

3. Improve the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refine effectiveness indicators and measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide competitive expansion grants to scale effective teacher and principal preparation programs ▪ Provide competitive grants for residency models of principal preparation ▪ Adopt regulations for educator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide technical assistance to preparation programs on new approval and reporting requirements ▪ Establish platform, using ELAR, for capturing new approval evidence and reporting requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and approve at least 25 preparation programs based on new regulations of program approval ▪ Continue annual publishing of educator preparation program report cards with effectiveness measures on state website

	<p>preparation program approval and reporting, including new effectiveness indicators and measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Align accountability systems with new program approval regulations ▪ Develop educator preparation program report cards via Title II data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide competitive expansion grants to scale effective teacher and principal preparation programs ▪ Provide competitive grants for residency models of principal preparation ▪ Refine publicly available educator preparation program report cards with effectiveness measures and publish on state website 	
--	--	--	--

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most	2010-2011 End of SY	2011-2012 End of SY	2012-2013 End of SY	2013-2014 End of SY
	Baseline data and annual targets				
Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the state for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0%	0%	0%	60%	100%
Percentage of principal preparation programs in the state for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0%	0%	0%	20%	100%

4. Professional development for educators

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analyze 2010 statewide student achievement and teacher shortage data to identify high need areas; survey districts statewide on PD needs ▪ Develop and make available PD aligned with RTTT objectives, high need areas, and LEA priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to identify high-need areas for PD ▪ Develop and make available PD aligned with RTTT objectives, high need areas, and LEA priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to identify high need areas for PD ▪ Develop and make available PD aligned with RTTT objectives, high need areas, and LEA priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to identify high need areas for PD ▪ Develop and make available PD aligned with RTTT objectives, high need areas, and LEA priorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop formal agreements of the scope of work for Readiness Centers and DSACs on professional development for 2010-2012 ▪ Review process of approval for pre-approving PD providers for online and in-person courses ▪ Hold statewide summits and regional forums ▪ Create professional development calendar for the following year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop specific PD offerings for Readiness Centers and DSACs for next year with an emphasis on RTTT priorities, ▪ Enhance infrastructure for online course delivery (see C3) ▪ Hold statewide summits and regional forums ▪ Create professional development calendar for the following year ▪ Revise process for pre-approving PD providers for online and in person courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue previous year's activities ▪ Hold statewide summits and regional forums ▪ Implement new process for pre-approving PD providers; select providers; recruit additional providers as needed to expand course availability or offer them online 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue previous year's activities ▪ Hold statewide summits and regional forums
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ With LEAs and providers, begin to revise standards for professional development to include performance and quality measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise draft PD standards based on Year 1 experiences ▪ Develop and pilot-test professional development assessment tools for districts ▪ Apply standards in evaluations of Year 2 PD ▪ Publish performance criteria for providers to be on the preferred provider list ▪ Conduct NSDC survey in a representative sample of schools and LEAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publish final version of standards for professional development providers ▪ Disseminate PD assessment tools statewide ▪ Apply standards in evaluations of Year 3 PD ▪ Publish preliminary preferred provider list and share findings on effective PD through Readiness Centers, DSACs, and other venues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to deploy assessment tools statewide ▪ Apply standards in evaluations of Year 4 PD ▪ Update preferred provider list and share findings on effective PD through Readiness Centers, DSACs, and other venues

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline	End of SY 2010- 2011	End of SY 2011- 2012	End of SY 2012- 2013	End of SY 2013- 2014
Revised standards for professional development are complete	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	✓
% of PD offered through DSACs, Readiness Centers, Professional Development Institutes, and ESE grant-funded PD programs that is aligned to new standards	n/a	n/a	50%	75%	100%
Preferred provider list based on new professional development standards is available	n/a	n/a	n/a	✓	✓
% of LEAs using ESE-developed tool and processes to evaluate the impact of professional supports	0%	0%	0%	35%	80%

E. TURN AROUND THE LOWEST ACHIEVING SCHOOLS

Perhaps the most visible representation of the variation in student outcomes is the contrast in results between the highest and lowest performing schools in the Commonwealth. Legislation enacted in January 2010 and final regulations adopted by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education in April 2010 provide extraordinary authority to intervene in the lowest performing schools and districts. This authority includes significant autonomy and flexibility in school staffing decisions and the ability to enlist health and human services support for students and their families.

Turning around low-achieving schools requires changes that will enhance students' readiness to learn, teachers' readiness to teach, and leaders' readiness to act (Calkins et al. 2007). There is no silver bullet for achieving these changes or guarantees they will be used effectively to dramatically improve student achievement. To that end, our strategy calls for building expertise and capacity at the state level, within our districts, and among proven and promising partners. This approach will allow us to transform today's struggling schools and help us prevent other schools from falling into that category in the future.

Massachusetts will use RTTT funds to pursue four interconnected strategies to build state and district capacity to turn around the persistently lowest achieving schools, and to prevent others from falling into that category in the future:

1. Develop a specialized corps of turnaround teacher and leader teams
2. Build district capacity to intervene in struggling schools
3. Identify and scale up effective partners to address priority conditions for school effectiveness
4. Develop, attract, and manage lead partners and turnaround operators

Additional investments to scale up the regional DSACs will provide targeted professional development to help teachers and leaders in smaller districts prevent more schools from entering Level 4.

This initiative will include six major projects:

1. Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the state
2. Develop a specialized corps of turnaround teacher and leader teams
3. Build district capacity to intervene in struggling schools
4. Create wraparound zones to support struggling schools
5. Build the capacity of proven partners to support struggling schools
6. Develop, attract, and manage lead partners and turnaround operators to execute the restart model at Level 4 and 5 schools

Key Personnel:

Executive Sponsor: Lynda Foisy, Senior Associate Commissioner

Key activities and timelines:

Project	Start	End	Grant Year 2010-2011				Grant Year		
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Turn around the lowest achieving schools	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1 Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the state	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2 Develop specialized corps of turnaround teacher and leader teams	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Program design and assessment</i>	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3 Build district capacity to intervene in struggling schools-operations	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Effective governance and leadership</i>	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
4 Create wraparound zones to support struggling schools	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
5 Build capacity of proven partners to support struggling schools	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
6 Develop, attract, and manage lead partners and turnaround operators to execute the restart model at Level 4 and 5 schools	9/10	8/14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

LEA Participation:

LEA participation in this area is linked to the district scopes of work through projects in assurance area 6-Turn around the lowest achieving schools. Districts with Level 4 schools must participate in at least one project in this area; for other districts, participation is not mandatory. Some of the initiatives are only available for level 3 and level 4 schools (district project 6A) or Commissioner’s Districts (district projects 6C and 6D), while other projects are open to all RTTT LEAs. In addition, there will be overlap with project 1-Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance and 2-Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every school and classroom. LEA participation will begin in year 2 of the RTTT program.

See the separately enclosed guidelines for responses to the Year 1 Request for Proposals, which outlines the projects and timelines for LEA participation in the Race to the Top program. LEA responses to this RFP were submitted under separate cover.

Budget:

E	Turn around the lowest performing schools	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total
1	Identify persistently lowest-achieving schools in the state					
2	Develop specialized corps of turnaround teacher and leader teams	\$200,000	\$1,776,470	\$1,699,081	\$1,313,707	\$4,989,258
3	Build District capacity to intervene in struggling schools-operations	\$391,214	\$931,832	\$1,024,451	\$1,309,257	\$3,656,754
4	Create Wraparound zones to support struggling schools					
4a	Create Wraparound zones - program	\$224,294	\$501,046	\$879,644	\$127,251	\$1,732,234
4a	Create Wraparound zones - grants	\$178,000	\$354,000	\$708,000	\$0	\$1,240,000
5	Build capacity of proven partners to support struggling schools	\$318,926	\$754,928	\$580,783	\$584,754	\$2,239,390
6	Develop, attract, and manage lead partners and turnaround operators to execute the restart model at Level 4 and 5 schools	\$156,100	\$662,200	\$918,300	\$2,006,100	\$3,742,700
Project total		\$1,468,534	\$4,980,476	\$5,810,258	\$5,341,069	\$17,600,336

Annual targets for key performance measures and/or major milestones:

1. Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in state.

Level 4 schools were identified in March 2010 and level 3 schools were formally announced in September 2010. These schools will be the focus of the initial turnaround efforts.

In 2012, ESE will designate Level 4 schools that fail to achieve ambitious annual benchmarks after two or more years as Level 5 schools. Level 5 schools will be managed under ESE authority or its designated turnaround partner.

2. Develop a specialized corps of turnaround teacher and leader teams

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convene experts to begin the design of program models with an emphasis on recruitment, training, support, and retention of experienced educators (August 2011) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to build program models with expert input, focusing on placement and Year 1 supports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update recruitment, training, and retention models 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess early results and modify model as needed Link learning and results to broader MA human capital initiatives
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the first class of 10 proven principals, engaging executive search experts Work with higher education and residency programs to launch training and induction in western MA (Springfield) and greater Boston 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place first leaders in schools Select second class for original regions and first class for two more regions (11 additional principals) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select and place cohorts of 12 leaders each year (45 total by Year 4) Continue induction and support Districts will have sufficient numbers of principals to fill most of the leadership positions in the Level 4/5 schools.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work with higher education and residency programs to launch training and induction in western MA (Springfield) and greater Boston ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Place first class in schools ▪ Select the first class of 50 proven teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Select the second class of 150 proven teachers (200 total by Year 4) ▪ Continue induction and support ▪ Districts will have sufficient numbers of teachers to fill most of the leadership positions in the Level 4/5 schools.
--	--	--	---

3. Build district capacity to intervene in struggling schools

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify partners and engage four level 3 and/or level 4 districts in one or more of the governance, HR, or community-engagement systems of support (August 2011) ▪ Provide grants to state associations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engage a total of eight more districts in one or more of the systems of support ▪ Expand four original district participation to include one additional system of support ▪ Provide grants to state associations ▪ Evaluate progress to date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to support district engagement with key partners ▪ Engage a total of eight more districts in one or more of the systems of support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to support district engagement with key partners

4. Create wraparound zones to support struggling schools

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initiate one wraparound zone (August 2011) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initiate two wraparound zones ▪ Evaluate progress to date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initiate 4 wraparound zones ▪ Continue to support district engagement with wraparound zones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to support district engagement with wraparound zones

5. Build the capacity of proven partners to support struggling schools

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hire one FTE/consultant at ESE to develop Priority Partners process (February 2011) ▪ Identify Priority Partners in three priority conditions for school effectiveness (August 2011) ▪ Make grants to three Priority Partners to allow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluate and refine Priority Partners process and identify the next three critical conditions based on school/district conditions that are limiting success ▪ Make grants to three Priority Partners to seed the capacity to expand to 50% of all Level 4 schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluate and refine the Priority Partner process and identify the next conditions to address ▪ Make grants to three Priority Partners to seed the capacity to expand to 75% of all Level 4 schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finalize list of Priority Partners ▪ Execute three-year impact evaluation of Priority Providers ▪ Transition fully to district and Title I STG funding for school-partner collaboration

them to fully respond to requests from two new districts with Level 4 schools (August 2011)			
---	--	--	--

6. Develop, attract, and manage lead partners and turnaround operators to execute the restart model at Level 4 and 5 schools

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conduct competitive process to identify school turnaround operators ▪ Identify lead partners and turnaround operators, who will have one year for planning, development, and incubation ▪ Work with state experts and other experts in incubation and intermediary design, and with philanthropic funders to design and create the full scope of the nonprofit intermediary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engage operators at five Level 5 Restart schools, then employ Title I School Improvement Grants, district, and philanthropic funding to provide ongoing support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue support for lead partners and turnaround operators at five Level 5 Restart schools

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010–2011	End of SY 2011–2012	End of SY 2012–2013	End of SY 2013–2014
The number of schools for which one of the four-school intervention models will be initiated each year.	0	35	10	0	20

In the table of performance measures, we have identified the total number of schools where one of the four intervention models will be in process in each year. These schools will be supported by the strategies defined above.

The state is requiring that districts initiate one of the four intervention models in all 35 schools declared Level 4 within the next year, both to receive supports and to be eligible for Title I STG funding. We do not expect that every element of the Transformation model will be in place in each school using that intervention by the end of Year 1; however, districts must have begun to implement key elements of transformation within the first year. In Years 2 and 3, full intervention models will be up and running in all 35 Level 4 and 5 schools in the state as well as an additional 10 schools in Level 3 status, including some schools implementing Turnaround and Restart. In Year 4, with an additional round of Title I STG funding available, we plan to increase

the number of interventions by identifying 20 additional Level 3, 4, and 5 schools and requiring them to initiate one of the intervention models. This will result in a total of 65 Level 3, 4, and 5 schools by Year 4 implementing one of the intervention models.

Creating an incentive for dramatic intervention in the lowest performing Level 3 schools will be a powerful strategy to spur innovative practices, build knowledge on effective transformation strategies, and prevent additional schools from declining to Levels 4 and 5. ESE is already using Title IID ARRA funds to establish a network for alternative secondary schools to develop and disseminate hybrid face-to-face and online competency-based courses in MassCore subjects (see section B3 for a description of MassCore). Alternative schools and programs serve 6,000 of our students most likely to drop out of school. A number of them are eligible to compete for STG funds as Tier 2 schools. ESE will work with a partner to convene and provide ongoing technical assistance to the alternative schools receiving STG funds in order to build knowledge around dropout prevention, recovery, and effective instructional and outreach practices. Using regional DSACs we will disseminate best practices to support innovation in other alternative programs and traditional high schools across Massachusetts.