

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

RACE TO THE TOP

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLANNING WORKSHOP  
FOR THE STATES

9:00 a.m.

Thursday,  
December 3, 2009

Silverton/Breckenridge Ballroom  
Crowne Plaza Denver International Airport  
15500 East 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Denver, Colorado

FACILITATOR: JOANNE WEISS

PANEL MEMBERS:

JOANNE WEISS  
MEREDITH FARACE  
JOSHUA BENDOR  
JANE HESS  
RACHEL PETERNITH

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

A G E N D A

<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Welcome and Introduction	
Joanne Weiss .....	5
Overview of the Notice	
Joanne Weiss .....	14
 <u>Expert Presenters</u>	
Understanding the Application	
Meredith Farace .....	27
State Success Factors	
Joanne Weiss .....	47
MOUs	
Joanne Weiss .....	88
Criterion (A) (1)	
Putting It All Together .....	102
Joanne Weiss	
Budget	
Joanne Weiss .....	124
Criterion (A) (3)	
Joanne Weiss .....	154
B. Standards and Assessments	
Joshua Bendor .....	187
Criterion (B) (3)	
Joshua Bendor .....	210
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	
Joshua Bendor .....	218
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	
Joshua Bendor .....	284

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

A G E N D A

SPEAKER

PAGE

Expert Presenters

Definitions and Performance Measures

Joshua Bendor..... 290

E. Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools

Joanne Weiss..... 295

F. State Reform Conditions Criteria..... 297

Adjourn

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (8:30 a.m.)

3 MS. WEISS: Good morning,  
4 everybody. We're about ready to get started.5 Come grab seats and we'll get going. So I  
6 want to start by thanking you on this lovely,  
7 crisp Colorado morning. Luckily, we're  
8 totally shielded from all the elements in this  
9 room, so no one has to know that it's only two  
10 degrees outside.

11 So thanks so much for being here.

12 My name's Joanne Weiss. I'm the Director of  
13 the Race to the Top program at the Department  
14 of Ed. In a minute I will introduce the other  
15 folks up here who are going to be helping  
16 today.17 But first, what I want to do is  
18 give you a little bit of guided tour of what  
19 we're trying to accomplish today. I think  
20 that most of you know a lot about the  
21 background of the program. So we are going to  
22 spend about a minute on that and then really**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dive into providing you with what we hope will  
2 be useful information for all of you as you're  
3 trying to put your applications together.

4 We're going to go over all of the  
5 information that we've released that we think  
6 is most relevant to you in putting together  
7 applications, tell you what it is and where to  
8 find it. We're going to walk you through how  
9 the application works and how all the  
10 different parts fit together. And then we're  
11 going to spend the bulk of the time walking  
12 through all the selection criteria so that you  
13 understand how all of them work.

14 And as we go through the selection  
15 criteria we'll be talking about the relevant  
16 definitions, evidence, Performance Measures.  
17 We know there's a lot of different moving  
18 parts here and we want to make sure that we do  
19 the best job we can today of connecting the  
20 dots for all of you.

21 We're going to also be taking your  
22 questions as you have them throughout the day.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       So ask away. I just want to give you a  
2 little bit of sort of disclaimer at the front  
3 end. We are -- we're not allowed to answer  
4 any questions about whether the ideas you have  
5 are good ideas and competitive ideas and how  
6 to get an edge on your application. You can  
7 have all those conversations that you'd like  
8 during the breaks and lunch with one another.

9               What we're going to be able to  
10 answer for you are technical questions,  
11 clarifying questions, logistical questions.  
12 That doesn't mean that you shouldn't ask. But  
13 if we occasionally say, You know what, I can't  
14 answer that one, you'll understand why.

15               There may also be questions you  
16 ask us that stump us. And not that we want  
17 you to play stump the chump here. But if you  
18 ask questions that stump us we are probably  
19 going to ask you to mail them into our web  
20 site so that we can get a real correct answer  
21 back to you, which we will do as quickly as we  
22 can. And we'll talk a little bit more about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 how to do that.

2 So here's the agenda that we've  
3 planned for you today. It is packed. I  
4 believe that all of you have copies. Does  
5 someone have copies of the giant deck? Okay.

6 No reading ahead. No. So we want to make  
7 sure you have copies of everything that was  
8 here so that you could take notes as we went  
9 on this. And so you can see from the  
10 thickness of the packet we put in front of you  
11 we have a lot of material that we're trying to  
12 cover with you today.

13 We're going to -- right after this  
14 I'm going to talk for a few minutes about just  
15 the big picture parts of the notice which I  
16 think most of you know. So I'm going to zoom  
17 through that pretty quickly. And then we're  
18 going to talk about the application itself and  
19 how all the parts fit together. And then the  
20 rest of the day is going to be talking about  
21 each of the criteria.

22 We're going to start with Section

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 A, the State Success Factors. And that's  
2 going to take us the whole rest of the morning  
3 because there's just a lot of complexity in  
4 that section. The nice thing we hope is that  
5 it will set up your whole application in a way  
6 that the peer reviewers will understand what  
7 you're trying to accomplish and how the parts  
8 fit together. The downside for you guys is I  
9 get to start today with the most complicated  
10 part of the application as the guinea pig part  
11 to walk you through. So if everybody makes it  
12 through lunch it's smooth sailing after that.

13 So after lunch we're going to go  
14 through Sections B, C, D and then E, F and the  
15 priorities. And then we'll end with a whole  
16 bunch of important but miscellaneous things  
17 around the program requirements, how to submit  
18 applications, how the competition itself will  
19 work.

20 And then we wanted to point your  
21 attention to a few things about, as you're  
22 putting your work plans together for the next

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 couple of months in figuring out what your  
2 teams are going to be doing as you're putting  
3 together the applications, there's just a  
4 couple of things that we wanted to point your  
5 attention to, inter-dependencies in the  
6 application that we want to make sure you're  
7 aware of so that you plan accordingly and  
8 don't get stuck at the last minute without all  
9 the pieces in place that you need to.

10 So that's the plan. We do have  
11 Q&A at the end for all the sort of  
12 miscellaneous questions that you might have  
13 forgotten about. The reason it's short though  
14 is because we really have built Q&A time into  
15 all of these sections. It's going to be much  
16 easier, I think, to ask your questions as you  
17 see the slides up here.

18 Okay. Which takes us to the first  
19 thing, Ask your questions as we go. We do  
20 have mikes up here. Our folks from the  
21 Department are actually going to be manning  
22 the mikes. You're not -- you don't need to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 walk up to the front of the room. They'll  
2 have the mikes in their hands and they'll be  
3 wandering around. So if you have a question  
4 just raise your hand and one of the folks will  
5 have a mike there for you and when we get to a  
6 good break point up here we'll acknowledge you  
7 and you can ask your question.

8 We do ask that you start every  
9 question by telling us your name and what  
10 state you're from. Everything we're doing  
11 today is being transcribed and our transcriber  
12 needs to know who's saying what. So please do  
13 start by telling us who you are and what state  
14 you're from, even if you've asked a question  
15 before.

16 If you have other questions that  
17 we either don't get to today or that we tell  
18 you we need you to submit in writing because  
19 we don't know the answer, that's the address  
20 to send it to. It's very hard,  
21 [racetothetop@ed.gov](mailto:racetothetop@ed.gov).

22 I have a handy timer up here that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 all of us are going to be using to try to keep  
2 time. So there may be cases where we just run  
3 out of time for questions. So I do urge you  
4 to prioritize your questions a little bit. If  
5 we have time we'll do them all. But if we  
6 don't, make sure you get your highest priority  
7 questions asked first and then send the others  
8 into the web site. Please just make sure your  
9 cell phones are on vibrate.

10 And the last thing that I wanted  
11 to say is you may notice that there's a camera  
12 crew here today. It is not a Department of Ed  
13 camera crew. Because this is a public meeting  
14 we do have members of the media here. PBS is  
15 actually thinking of doing a documentary on  
16 Race to the Top. And it is the PBS crew  
17 that's in the room today. So I'm going to  
18 take a minute for the producer to come give  
19 you a two-second overview of what he's trying  
20 to accomplish and how it's going to work.

21 But I want to tell you from the  
22 Department's point of view, this meeting is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for you. And so we have set up ground rules  
2 with PBS that say that it's most important for  
3 us to make sure that you get your questions  
4 answered in whatever way makes you  
5 comfortable. So if you've got a question you  
6 can start your question or any time during  
7 your question you can say, I want to do this  
8 without the camera. And that is the cue that  
9 you are not allowed to be filmed on camera and  
10 everything you say is off the record. So  
11 anytime you can say that word and the camera  
12 will go off and the information that you ask  
13 us won't be able to be on film.

14 So with that, let me ask David to  
15 just come up for a second and tell you how  
16 this will work.

17 MR. WALD: Hi. I -- my name's  
18 David Wald. I'm from a company called  
19 Learning Matters. And we produce for PBS.  
20 And what we're doing is for the Lehrer News  
21 Hour. We're regular contributors, education  
22 stories for the Lehrer News Hours. Our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 correspondent is John Marrow. I'm sure some  
2 of you have seen him.

3 Basically, what we're doing is  
4 just trying to get a set -- our overall idea  
5 is to follow the Race to the Top, you know, as  
6 a new, unprecedented kind of event. And so  
7 what we're trying to do here is just kind of  
8 get a sense of this part of the process as  
9 honestly and accurately as we can. So if  
10 there's something that for whatever reason you  
11 don't want us to shoot again, just say  
12 something and we won't shoot it. But for the  
13 most part we're just going to try to be flies  
14 on the wall. And ignore us as much as you  
15 can. Thank you.

16 MS. WEISS: Great. Thanks.

17 One other thing I should say is  
18 that because this is news you don't need to  
19 sign consent forms. So if you don't want to  
20 be on you know the magic words.

21 Okay. Introductions. Let me  
22 start by letting the folks who are going to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 answering questions and doing presentations  
2 today introduce themselves to you.

3 And, Rachel, why don't you --

4 MS. PETERNITH: Sure. Is this on?

5 MS. WEISS: Yes.

6 MS. PETERNITH: Okay.

7 Hi. I'm Rachel Peternith. I'm  
8 from the Department's Office of General  
9 Counsel. And I will be answering questions  
10 where I can help.

11 MS. HESS: Hi. I'm Jane Hess.  
12 I'm also from the Office of the General  
13 Counsel.

14 MR. BENDOR: Josh Bendor with the  
15 Race to the Top team at the Department.

16 MS. FARACE: Hi. I'm Meredith  
17 Farace. I'm in the Office of Elementary and  
18 Secondary Education.

19 MS. WEISS: And over here --  
20 without mike so I'll introduce them -- we have  
21 Beth Caron, Kevin Liao and Jessica Clark. And  
22 they're going to be manning mikes as soon as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we get to the part where you might actually  
2 have a question, which is now.

3           Okay. So let me start by just  
4 giving you -- I know that you all know this.  
5 But it is going to be so easy today to get  
6 lost in the minutia and the details. So I  
7 thought it was important, even though I'm  
8 telling you things you already know, to start  
9 with a big picture reminder of why this  
10 competition exists and why we're here and just  
11 to remind everybody that this is a \$4 billion  
12 opportunity and a \$4 billion challenge to the  
13 states to take all of the individual point  
14 reforms that we know have made a huge  
15 difference in the lives of kids and figure out  
16 what it would take to take those to scale  
17 across your states.

18           We know a lot about what works out  
19 there for different kinds of kids and we do it  
20 very well at the classroom level, we do it  
21 well at the school level, we even have  
22 districts that are doing it well at the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 district level. We need to figure out as a  
2 society how to take those reforms to scale.

3 And so the competition has been  
4 designed to do that. It operates in a  
5 comprehensive fashion across the four areas  
6 that are defined in the Recovery Act, adopting  
7 standards and assessments that prepare  
8 students for success in college and in  
9 careers; recruiting, rewarding, retaining  
10 effective teachers and principals and making  
11 sure that they're deployed to the students and  
12 in the schools that need them the most;  
13 building data systems that really measure  
14 students' success and can be used by teachers  
15 and principals to inform their practices and  
16 improve their practices; and taking on that  
17 very troubling situation of those schools that  
18 have just persistently been underachieving in  
19 some cases for decades and stepping up to the  
20 plate to actually do something radically  
21 different in those places.

22 And all, of course, with the over-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 arching goal of taking the successes that we  
2 have seen in so many of our individual schools  
3 and classrooms, around deriving substantial  
4 gains in student achievement, increases in  
5 high school graduation rates, college  
6 enrollment rates, narrowing of the achievement  
7 gaps and making those happen at a much greater  
8 level statewide.

9 So I think that you all know we  
10 went through a public comment period in  
11 August. We got an overwhelming number of  
12 comments from the public. We got about 1,200  
13 comments, I think our typical really large-  
14 scale program gets maybe a couple hundred  
15 comments. These comments were not trivial.  
16 They ranged from a paragraph to over 67 pages.

17 So some of these were more like books than  
18 they were like comments, although none of them  
19 was as long as the document itself. So that's  
20 a good thing.

21 We heard from people in every  
22 single one of the 50 states. Also, unusual, I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think, commenting on these things tends to be  
2 an inside-the-beltway kind of activity,  
3 typically. This one most decidedly was not.  
4 It was all over the country. Individuals as  
5 well as organizations and associations read  
6 the notice, which is also quite unusual for  
7 us. And I think in the end we stayed firm to  
8 the four core reforms that we had put out  
9 there. But we did hear a lot of terrific  
10 input from people that helped us both clarify  
11 things that were misunderstandings, use much  
12 better words than we had used to express  
13 ourselves thanks to the comments that we got  
14 from people and in some cases made some  
15 significant changes to the document.

16 We're not going to talk today  
17 about the differences. I think that's just  
18 confusing at this point. We're just going to  
19 talk about what is. But if you've got  
20 questions certainly ask them.

21 Okay. A quick overview of the  
22 time line. The notice was published in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Federal Register on November 18. The  
2 application deadline is January 19. There was  
3 a request that many of you might know about to  
4 move this deadline back a little bit. After  
5 consulting within the Department and with the  
6 Secretary himself we decided that we're  
7 leaving the deadline January 19 for Phase I  
8 and want to remind everybody that the bar for  
9 Phase I is going to be really high.

10 There will be plenty of money left  
11 for Phase II. So if you get to the point  
12 where you feel like, you know what, you just  
13 can't get this done in time for Phase I we  
14 really seriously want to communicate to  
15 everybody that Phase II will be there, there  
16 will be tons of money left for Phase II. It's  
17 an absolutely viable place to compete. So  
18 don't feel like you have to do Phase I or  
19 you'll be shut out. That is not what's going  
20 to happen.

21 Winners for Phase I will be  
22 announced in early April and feedback will be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 provided to everybody who doesn't win. And  
2 then the Phase II deadline is June 1 with  
3 winners decided by September. So -- and if  
4 you have questions --

5 And so just raise your hand if  
6 you've got a question and we'll come -- we'll  
7 head your way.

8 Okay. So I want to just spend the  
9 next couple of minutes giving you a quick  
10 overview of the parts of these notices so you  
11 know what each section is and is about. You  
12 -- many of you probably have a lot more  
13 experience than I do in reading these  
14 regulations. But when I came to the  
15 Department I sort of wished somebody had sort  
16 of given me a primer in what these pieces  
17 were. So now I'll tell you what I hope I  
18 learned and I'm sure I will get corrected if  
19 it's not correct.

20 So the first thing is application  
21 requirements are the part of the documents  
22 that give the basic information about what has

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to be in the application. What you see here  
2 is not the full list of application  
3 requirements. Those are in your documents.  
4 But there's some key things there that we  
5 wanted to just call your attention to.

6 One thing that you do have to  
7 remember is that you've got to get special  
8 signatures in your applications that you might  
9 not always get. So there's some planning that  
10 you'll have to do to make sure that you find  
11 some people who you might not normally do  
12 business with like the State's Attorney  
13 General to review pieces of the application.  
14 We're going to talk a little bit more. We've  
15 got some guidance for you about which sections  
16 of your application you probably want to get  
17 done quickly and get on that person's desk  
18 sooner rather than later.

19 The program requirements are the  
20 requirements that if you win a grant here's  
21 the things that you will be asked to do.  
22 Eligibility requirements are the things that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you have to do in order to be eligible to win  
2 a grant. There are two of these. I think we  
3 have discussed them as a nation ad nauseam.

4 I'm actually therefore, only going  
5 to talk about the first one, which is in order  
6 to get a grant you have to have been approved  
7 for both phases of State Fiscal Stabilization  
8 Fund. This is one change I'm going to  
9 highlight from the proposed notice where you  
10 had to have approval before you submitted.  
11 Now you just have to have approval before you  
12 win an award.

13 Was that a question? No. Yes?  
14 Did you have a question? No, I guess not.  
15 Okay.

16 Okay. Then there are the sections  
17 of the application that you're going to be  
18 writing to. And these are the things that in  
19 general earn points or peer reviewers are  
20 considering as they're scoring.

21 So first, there are the absolute  
22 priorities. The absolute priority in this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 competition is that you have to  
2 comprehensively address all four areas. That  
3 does not mean you have to answer every single  
4 individual criterion or sub-criterion. That's  
5 up to you. But each of the four major areas  
6 you have to have a coherent, comprehensive  
7 plan in that area in order to win. So in  
8 other words, if you did a great application  
9 that ignored one section your application  
10 could not win.

11 There's a competitive priority on  
12 STEM. We will be talking a little bit more  
13 about this. But a competitive priority is one  
14 that earns points in a special way. In this  
15 case STEM is something that you'll be  
16 addressing throughout the entire application.

17 If you choose to write to it you would  
18 address STEM wherever it is applicable  
19 throughout your application. And the  
20 reviewers will go back and holistically look  
21 across your application and see whether you've  
22 addressed the priority. And if you have, you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will get full points and if you have not done  
2 so in a high quality way you'll get zero. So  
3 it's an all or nothing point that's awarded  
4 sort of at the end by the peer reviewers.

5 Then there are a number of  
6 invitational priorities. These are things  
7 that the Secretary is interested in. In  
8 general they tend to be extensions to the core  
9 K-12 work we're doing and they don't earn  
10 points, but they are good things to do and  
11 they are things that are certainly allowable  
12 uses of funds. And finally, the selection  
13 criteria themselves. And that's where we're  
14 going to spend the bulk of our time today. So  
15 I'm not going to go into them now.

16 A couple other things that you'll  
17 find in the notices -- and we are going to  
18 review all of these today, but I wanted to  
19 just point you to where they are because these  
20 are some other important sections. We have  
21 published the scoring rubric and points for  
22 the competition. So what you see in your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 documents -- it's in Appendix B in every  
2 notice -- is the guidance we are giving to the  
3 reviewers who are going to be scoring your  
4 applications. There is nothing else they'll  
5 get. They'll get training from us just like  
6 you are. But this is the document they're  
7 going to get plus the criteria as they do  
8 their scoring. So you can see everything that  
9 they've got.

10 We've got budget guidance that  
11 we've provided in the notice inviting  
12 applications. And we will be talking more  
13 about that. We're going to also explain to  
14 you how the competition itself is going to be  
15 run and managed. There is guidance. And  
16 we're going to be spending a lot of time today  
17 talking about this issue of signing up LEAs.

18 It was really clear from our  
19 initial notice that we had lots of questions  
20 about that and had not done a good job in our  
21 preliminary notice of putting a structure  
22 together that you guys understood and could

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 implement. Hopefully, we've corrected that in  
2 the final notice. I'm sure you'll let us  
3 know. But we'll talk through that extensively  
4 today. And then we'll talk a little bit about  
5 how the program's going to be evaluated.

6 So with that, I'm going to turn it  
7 over to my colleague Meredith and she's going  
8 to take you through the application.

9 MS. FARACE: Good morning,  
10 everybody. This part of the presentation  
11 might look familiar to some of you. We did a  
12 webinar on November 24. I see some nodding  
13 heads. And this is exactly the same, this  
14 part, as that webinar. We didn't want to  
15 assume that you all participated in that. And  
16 we felt like it was a good way to overview how  
17 the application works. So for some of you  
18 this is going to be review. But maybe you've  
19 gotten some more questions since the 24th and  
20 you can always try to stump us because you're  
21 ahead of the game.

22 So we're going to go forward and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 go to the next slide here. Okay. How the  
2 pieces fit together. So you probably noticed  
3 -- but I'll go over them -- there are two  
4 types of selection criteria. There is State  
5 reform conditions criteria. And that is used  
6 to assess the state's progress and success in  
7 creating the conditions related to the four  
8 education reform areas. So that's what you've  
9 done. And then looking forward, the Reform  
10 Plan Criteria. And that's used to assess the  
11 state's plan for future efforts in the reform  
12 areas. Those are going to be treated a little  
13 bit differently on what you need to write. So  
14 we'll go through that.

15 Okay. For each of the condition  
16 there are up to three parts. There's a  
17 narrative. And so in every case you're going  
18 to be writing a narrative on the criterion and  
19 addressing what the state -- in the space  
20 provided describe how the state has addressed  
21 all the criterion.

22 The Performance Measures -- some

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 criteria have Performance Measures and some  
2 don't. Several selection criteria ask the  
3 state to provide goals and annual targets,  
4 baseline data and other information. And  
5 we'll go through later why you have some with  
6 Performance Measures and why some don't. And  
7 then with evidence some of the selection  
8 criteria requires specific information  
9 requested as supporting evidence.

10 We'd like to go through an  
11 example. You may have particular questions  
12 about (C)(1), which is the example here -  
13 Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal  
14 data system. We'll go through the content of  
15 (C)(1) later on, but we're just using this as  
16 an example for you to see how the application  
17 works and how it's set up for you.

18 This is on page 29 of the  
19 application. I know we said to bring your  
20 application with you. If some of you want to  
21 follow along you can. I'm going to try to  
22 tell you what page things are on. So this is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 29.

2 Okay. So the first part is the  
3 criterion. So we always put that out for you.

4 This is the extent to which the state has a  
5 statewide longitudinal data system that  
6 includes all the America COMPETES elements.  
7 So that's the top box. And this -- like I  
8 said, it's just an example. We'll talk about  
9 this particular criterion later.

10 Want to make a note here. This is  
11 important. In quite a few places in the  
12 notice you'll see where it says, "As defined  
13 in this notice." It's important that you  
14 really pay attention to that and go to the  
15 definition sections that are in each of the  
16 notices and look those definitions up because  
17 those are going to be important. We're  
18 probably not going to go through every  
19 definition today. I know we're not going to  
20 because there are quite a few. But some of  
21 them we will highlight later on.

22 Okay. The next part is the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 directions. So this tells you exactly what to  
2 write. And then the next part is the  
3 evidence. So this is what's listed here. You  
4 have to have documentation for each of the  
5 America COMPETES elements that's included in  
6 the state's statewide longitudinal data  
7 system. And this will make it easy for the  
8 reviewers to follow. We're trying to make  
9 this easy for you but also, easy for the peer  
10 reviewers so that they can kind of track  
11 what's going on in your application.

12 If you need to provide supporting  
13 documentation -- so something beyond what you  
14 can write in these boxes -- you can feel free  
15 to add appendixes. Just let the reviewers  
16 know where to find that.

17 And then finally, this is a  
18 recommended page length. This is just a best  
19 guess on our part. This is what we encourage.

20 We don't say this is what you have to do.  
21 But remember that even though these aren't  
22 binding and you're welcome to go over them

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that from a reviewer's point of view, clarity  
2 matters and brevity will be appreciated.  
3 They'll have a lot to read.

4 Pay attention to application  
5 requirement d. This is where you start typing  
6 and you want to watch application requirement  
7 d because it provides guidance on how to write  
8 your responses to state reform conditions  
9 criteria.

10 Finally, it's a good idea before  
11 you start writing to look at the guidance  
12 that's provided to the peer reviewers on how  
13 to score the applications. And there's a  
14 scoring rubric. This is in Section 11  
15 beginning on 75 of your application. And this  
16 shows you part of the rubric that deals with  
17 (C) (1). And that's on page 82. So this is  
18 what the peer reviewers will be looking for as  
19 they're reviewing your application.

20 First, you'll see guidance to the  
21 reviewers. This is general guidance on the  
22 top and then more specific guidance for this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 particular criterion. It gives the reviewers  
2 more information on how to allocate the  
3 points. And then after the reviewer guidance  
4 the criterion text is included for you. And  
5 then the total points are shown here. There  
6 is a part in the scoring rubric that you'll  
7 find in the application that gives a list of  
8 every single point value.

9 Okay. Let's go next to the Reform  
10 Plan Criterion example. We'll start with the  
11 criterion to be addressed. So this is (D) (4),  
12 Improving the effectiveness of teacher and  
13 principal preparations programs. Again, if  
14 you have questions about the content of (D) (4)  
15 we'll cover that in depth later on.

16 Next, this is the directions.  
17 There's no specific evidence required for this  
18 particular criterion. But you're welcome to  
19 include any evidence that you want if you  
20 think that will help the reviewers. And  
21 again, suggested page length. To be honest,  
22 we included this to show that you should, you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know, take this as loose guidance because one  
2 page seems a little bit short, even to us.  
3 But at the time this is what we thought we  
4 should write.

5           And then on the Reform Plan  
6 Criterion take a look at application  
7 requirement e. So you type your response and  
8 pay attention to these application  
9 requirements. They describe the components of  
10 high quality plans. So such a plan includes  
11 goals, activities, timelines and responsible  
12 individuals and might include evidence if you  
13 have any that would support the credibility of  
14 your plan. Finally, it also might include  
15 Performance Measures which we're going to turn  
16 to next.

17           MS. WEISS: Hey, Meredith?

18           MS. FARACE: Yes.

19           MS. WEISS: Can I jump in there  
20 for a second.

21           MS. FARACE: Yes. Sure.

22           MS. WEISS: We got a question from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 somebody. Can you --

2 MS. FARACE: Let me go back. Yes.

3 MS. WEISS: Yes. We got a  
4 question from somebody saying, Are we supposed  
5 to do this for every one of the sub-criteria.

6 MS. FARACE: Oh, right.

7 MS. WEISS: The reason that we're  
8 asking you to answer these things at the  
9 criterion level instead of put a little box in  
10 for each sub-criterion is because a lot of  
11 these are coherent, sort of big-picture ideas.

12 And we want you to be able to address them in  
13 a comprehensive way.

14 The reviewers will be looking for  
15 each sub-part in your plan. But you don't  
16 need to write a plan for each little piece.  
17 It's a plan for the big picture, whichever  
18 parts you're addressing. And then -- so  
19 whatever way you want to do it and whatever  
20 you think makes the most sense for how you're  
21 implementing this in your state is the way you  
22 should write it. And the reviewers will be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 told that they -- that it's their job to --  
2 you know, to look for it and make sure they  
3 can find the parts. So make it easy for them  
4 to do that. But you don't need to write it in  
5 a little sort of micro-disaggregated way if  
6 that's not the way you're thinking of the plan  
7 for your state.

8 MS. FARACE: Thanks.

9 Okay. Performance Measures. So  
10 criterion (D)(4) -- that's the example we're  
11 going over -- has a number of Performance  
12 Measures associated with it. And Performance  
13 Measures include goals and annual targets,  
14 baseline data and other information. Again,  
15 when we get to (D)(4) later on we'll go  
16 through those specific things. Where a  
17 performance measure is required we've put  
18 tables right into the application for you.  
19 And they come just after the narrative.

20 So reviewers consider as part of  
21 their evaluations the extent to which the  
22 state has set ambitious, yet achievable

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 targets for the Performance Measures. And so  
2 you probably want to know, 'Well, what does  
3 that mean, what are they going to be looking  
4 for?'

5 So what we're going to ask the  
6 peer reviewers to look for are how ambitious  
7 you are in what you're attempting to do, are  
8 you being realistic in proposing a plan that  
9 you can achieve, have you balanced ambition  
10 and achievement thoughtfully and well. So  
11 these are questions that peer reviewers will  
12 be asking themselves as they review.

13 To help reinforce the seriousness  
14 of these questions we want to remind you that  
15 funding could be affected, delayed or even  
16 withheld based on the state's actual  
17 Performance Measures against the annual  
18 targets you set in your applications. So  
19 consider them carefully because we'll be  
20 monitoring that as the grant goes on.

21 Okay. So now let's look at the  
22 mechanics of completing the application.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There are three types of data requests.  
2 Criterion (D)(4) has all three, which is why  
3 we chose this example. First, there are  
4 general goals. That includes current baseline  
5 data and annual targets for the four years of  
6 the grant. And on all the Performance Measure  
7 tables you'll fill in cells that are blank and  
8 you'll fill in the actual baseline data in the  
9 first column and the targets in the next four  
10 columns.

11 So next you type in general data  
12 that's used to support other calculations.  
13 Again, only fill the blank cells. That's why  
14 the rest is blacked out. In this case you  
15 fill in the first column that asks for the  
16 actual baseline data for the current school  
17 year across the four years.

18 On this third table you may wonder  
19 why it's all blacked out. This is data to be  
20 requested of grantees in the future. It's  
21 really just a heads up that this data will be  
22 collected in the future as part of annual

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reporting requirements. And we're giving it  
2 to you now so you can think through this as  
3 you develop your plans and take this into  
4 account. But you don't have to fill this out.

5 It would be hard to since it's blacked out.

6 A couple other notes. Performance  
7 Measures have been requested only where the  
8 Department intends to report nationally on  
9 them and for measures that lend themselves to  
10 objective and comparable data gathering. So  
11 we didn't ask for Performance Measures on  
12 every single one. Feel free to supplement  
13 them as you feel -- see fit. And in the  
14 future we might require grantees to submit  
15 additional performance data as part of  
16 reporting, evaluations or other studies.

17 Finally, remember to look at the  
18 scoring rubric for (D)(4) before you start  
19 writing. I want to make one little note in  
20 this particular area. If you'll look at  
21 General Requirement for (D)(4) it talks about  
22 the elements of the high quality plan as set

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       forth in application requirement e. Well, it  
2       actually says "d" in the scoring rubric but it  
3       should have said "e". So we caught a typo.  
4       So we apologize for that. But it's correct in  
5       the slide. If you find in the scoring rubric  
6       it says "d", it's not correct. It is correct  
7       in the application.

8                   MS. WEISS: This is only in the  
9       reviewers -- this is only true in the  
10      reviewers rubric. It's wrong in the rubric  
11      that we're giving reviewers. It should be "e"  
12      and we said "d" by mistake there.

13                   MS. FARACE: We're not perfect.  
14      We're trying. Okay. So in this case the  
15      general guidance points were for reviewers,  
16      look back to the application requirement and  
17      the specific guidance just reminds reviewers  
18      to watch for both teachers and principals in  
19      the response.

20                   Oh, we have a question. Sorry.  
21      Hi.

22                   MR. NELLHAUS: Hi. This is Jeff

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nellhaus from Massachusetts.

2 MS. FARACE: Hi. How are you?

3 MR. NELLHAUS: Hi. Two quick  
4 questions. One on -- just in terms of  
5 reporting certain measures.

6 MS. FARACE: Uh-huh.

7 MR. NELLHAUS: You asked for  
8 reporting on sub-groups in a few different  
9 areas. But you don't define which sub-groups  
10 you're looking for. So we'd like some  
11 guidance on that. And the second question is  
12 where you ask for data and there's no existing  
13 data in the state at the time. How do we  
14 report that?

15 MS. WEISS: Okay. So the sub-  
16 group thing we actually are going to talk  
17 about. It's in application requirement g.  
18 And we have a slide coming up later where  
19 we're going to go over that with you. So  
20 we'll show you where to find that.

21 MS. FARACE: And then the second  
22 part --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: And the second one is  
2 what if they don't have data.

3 MS. FARACE: So make a note?

4 MS. WEISS: No. So we do -- I  
5 think we have an FAQ on this one. But yes, if  
6 you don't have the data don't put in the data  
7 but do explain to the reviewers --

8 MS. FARACE: Right.

9 MS. WEISS: -- why the data's not  
10 there. We give you in most cases a little  
11 place underneath each chart to put anything  
12 that you want to tell us about it. And you  
13 can just describe there whatever is  
14 appropriate to say. Okay?

15 MS. FARACE: Thanks. First  
16 question. That was exciting.

17 MS. WEISS: Okay. I know.  
18 Hopefully that opens the floodgates.

19 MS. FARACE: Okay. So next is  
20 points. And obviously, this is worth 14  
21 points. One thing that's not obvious is what  
22 about Romanette one and Romanette two. Oh, I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was the first to say "Romanette", that's the  
2 legal term for the little i and the little ii.

3 The Department's general administrative  
4 regulation is called EDGAR. Unless otherwise  
5 stated, points are evenly divided across the  
6 criterion section. So in -- they have to be  
7 divisible across the sections equally. So in  
8 this case each part would be worth seven  
9 points. Just to let you know.

10 Oh, other questions. Flood gates  
11 are open.

12 MS. BOWEN: Janene Bowen from  
13 Utah. This is a technical question on just  
14 the mechanics of the application. I read that  
15 it's a technical Word document but that the  
16 idea was to type right on it. Question about  
17 can you cut and paste and when you cut and  
18 paste do things happen to the formatting. For  
19 example, is everything carried over like bold  
20 face, bullets, spacing? Because sometimes  
21 those change if you cut and paste. And it's  
22 going to be a lot easier if we can do those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 bolding and those kinds of things for clarity  
2 for the reader.

3 MS. FARACE: So later on in the --  
4 towards the very end when we talk about format  
5 we'll get to that a little bit more. But it's  
6 -- it is really important that when it comes  
7 to us and to the reviewers however we print it  
8 is what we're going to be able to see. So we  
9 very much encourage people to save this as a  
10 PDF so that when you print it it looks exactly  
11 like it is when we see it.

12 Sometimes if something comes in as  
13 a Word document and then you print it the  
14 tables get all messed up and the formatting  
15 gets all messed up and it's going to be really  
16 difficult for reviewers to figure out what  
17 you're talking about. So do what you need to  
18 do on your end as far as making it however you  
19 want to format. And then my recommendation is  
20 if you have the capability of doing it, saving  
21 it as a PDF version. Does that help or make  
22 sense? I mean, I think you can cut and paste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 into it. Just --

2 MS. BOWEN: Yes.

3 MS. FARACE: -- make sure that  
4 when we get it -- you're right. It can  
5 sometimes get lost.

6 MS. WEISS: But you can use bold  
7 and italics and --

8 MS. FARACE: Whatever you want.

9 MS. WEISS: -- underlines and  
10 anything that you want to use.

11 MS. BOWNE: It does carry over.  
12 Okay. Thank you.

13 MS. FARACE: Again, we'll get into  
14 more about formats and all that kind of stuff  
15 later on. That's going to be my exciting task  
16 at the end of the day.

17 Okay. My final slide here is  
18 Selection Criteria and Points. This is just  
19 to give you an overview of the major sections  
20 coming up. So first, we have State Selection  
21 Factors. And that's 125 points. That's  
22 Section A. And we're going to spend the rest

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the morning on A. Then we've got Standards  
2 and Assessments, 70 points; Data Systems that  
3 Support Instruction, 47 points; Great Teachers  
4 and Leaders, 138 points; Turning around Lowest  
5 Achieving Schools, 50 points. And as you'll  
6 notice, B through E are the four reform areas.

7 And then we have a General Selection Criteria  
8 of 55 points.

9 So all that makes up selection  
10 criterion points. Then we'll talk about  
11 priorities and then other miscellaneous  
12 things. Okay?

13 MS. WEISS: Yes.

14 MS. FARACE: Are there questions  
15 on this section? Because we're going to move  
16 to the next section. And I have 23 minutes to  
17 go. So we might be ahead of schedule. But  
18 don't worry because we'll use it later.  
19 Anything else?

20 (No response.)

21 MS. FARACE: Okay.

22 MS. WEISS: Give us a minute to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 get readjusted. Okay. We good? All right.  
2 Thank you. Okay. So now it's my job to take  
3 you through State Success Factors. This is a  
4 brand new section that we added to the  
5 application when we -- or to the notice when  
6 we published the final notice.

7 It's also the most complex one to  
8 explain because it deals with Participating  
9 LEAs, and it deals with the budget. So we've  
10 got -- it deals with a Memorandum of  
11 Understanding between states and LEAs. So we  
12 have a lot of sub-pieces that we're going to  
13 go off into deep dives on as we go through  
14 this section together.

15 And our hope is that by the end of  
16 the morning all of these questions about how  
17 to work with your LEAs, what's allowable,  
18 what's not, how do you do sub-grants to them,  
19 as well as the criteria themselves and what  
20 they're looking for will all be understood.  
21 So truly, truly raise those hands. And we're  
22 standing by with mikes because I do know that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this is -- I mean, we know from having to  
2 write this power point that this is a  
3 complicated section of the application to work  
4 through.

5 So first let's start with the big  
6 picture. The goal behind the State Success  
7 Factor section is that it was obvious to us as  
8 we were reading through comments that the  
9 original 19 criteria that we had put out in  
10 our proposed notice were being treated as sort  
11 of discreet things on a checklist that people  
12 needed to do. And that is partly thanks to  
13 the great training we've given everybody at  
14 the Department that we put out lists and you  
15 sort of check the boxes.

16 And we wanted to make sure that in  
17 this case we were all sort of coming up a  
18 level. And before we got into each of the  
19 pieces we give you guys an opportunity to say,  
20 Here's the big picture of what we're trying to  
21 accomplish, so that the peer reviewers could  
22 see the big picture of what you're trying to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 do in the state and then hopefully, all of the  
2 sections that followed would be able to click  
3 into that big picture for them.

4 So this is sort of a front end  
5 organizer for your application that lets you  
6 put forth your statewide reform agenda, that  
7 lets you talk about how the LEAs in your state  
8 have committed to implementing this agenda,  
9 because we all know that the work that happens  
10 at the state is critical but what really  
11 happens on the ground in the LEAs is what's  
12 going to make all the difference. And then  
13 talk about the state's capacity to deliver on  
14 this proposal and your track record for having  
15 success in the past that should lead reviewers  
16 to understand your capability to do so in the  
17 future.

18 So that's sort of the big picture  
19 of what Section A asks you about. So with  
20 that, what I'm going to do is just sort of  
21 quickly show you the different parts of  
22 (A) (1). So we'll go into (A) (1) first. I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to show you the different parts of  
2 (A) (1) quickly. And then we're going to come  
3 back and talk about each of them in more  
4 detail.

5 So (A) (1) has three parts to it.  
6 The first part is about your statewide reform  
7 agenda and just sort of is going to give you  
8 open reign to explain to the reviewers what  
9 your agenda looks like for the state. The  
10 second part is asking you to show that your  
11 LEAs are strongly committed to implementing  
12 this agenda. And we're going to talk in a  
13 minute about what strongly committed means and  
14 how you show it. And the third part is that  
15 the LEAs that are participating are going to  
16 translate into moving the needle statewide.  
17 So having broad statewide impact on increasing  
18 student achievement, decreasing gaps,  
19 increasing high school graduation rates,  
20 increasing college enrollment rates.

21 So that's sort of the big picture  
22 for A. And now let's take it apart and start

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with participating LEAs. Okay. So the first  
2 question is what is a participating LEA. So  
3 participating LEAs are the LEAs that choose to  
4 work with the state to implement all or  
5 significant portions of the state's Race to  
6 the Top plan. Talk about each of these pieces  
7 more.

8           Participating LEAs have to enter  
9 into a Memorandum of Understanding or some  
10 binding agreement that you design with the  
11 state. So it's an agreement between the state  
12 and the LEA. Again, we're going to talk a lot  
13 more about this in a minute. And the state  
14 has to sub-grant at least 50 percent of its  
15 award to participating LEAs.

16           And you'll hear us talk about this  
17 in a few minutes as a section 14006(c) sub-  
18 grant, because that's the section of the ARRA  
19 code that pertains. And you will see this  
20 throughout your documents. And we'll talk  
21 about how you calculate that in a minute, as  
22 well.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Is there a question?

2 MS. LOPEZ: Hi. Excuse me. My  
3 question actually is like, there isn't a  
4 definition --

5 MS. WEISS: Can you start with  
6 your name and --

7 MS. LOPEZ: Oh, I'm sorry.

8 MS. WEISS: That's okay.

9 MS. LOPEZ: Nina Lopez from  
10 Colorado.

11 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh?

12 MS. LOPEZ: The question is around  
13 the definition of LEA. So in Colorado we have  
14 for certain purposes LEA is a district and in  
15 some cases it's a board of cooperative  
16 educational services. And my question is  
17 whether participating LEA could for this  
18 purpose be the BOCES, the Board of Cooperative  
19 Educational Services, or whether it's expected  
20 to always be a school district.

21 MS. WEISS: I will turn that one  
22 over to our legal team. Now you see why we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 brought them.

2 Pull up the mike closer to you,  
3 Jane.

4 MS. HESS: The LEA definition --  
5 it's at the end of our statute. And it's the  
6 same definition that's used for other ESEA  
7 purposes. So --

8 MS. LOPEZ: As long as they're an  
9 LEA for any ESEA purpose -- I'm sorry. So as  
10 long as they are defined as an LEA under any  
11 one of the ESEA programs then they could be an  
12 LEA here. So we -- in some cases, for  
13 example, a school district is an LEA. In  
14 other cases, for Title One it might be they're  
15 BOCES. So if a BOCES is an LEA under one of  
16 the federal programs then they would be an LEA  
17 for this purpose?

18 MS. HESS: Yes.

19 MS. LOPEZ: Thank you.

20 MS. WEISS: Okay. So the big  
21 question then if I'm you is, Well, what are  
22 the criteria I can establish, what does "all

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or a significant portion" mean, how do I  
2 really operationalize this and what are the  
3 degrees of freedom that states have to define  
4 this. So at the highest level here are the  
5 things that states can do to set up the  
6 conditions within which LEAs in their state  
7 can decide whether or not they're interested  
8 in participating.

9 So first thing you get to do is  
10 define the reform plans. Now, obviously that  
11 could well be done in collaboration with your  
12 LEAs or however you're going to do it in your  
13 state. But it's your prerogative to define  
14 the reform plans that you think are important  
15 to implement in your state. And that's the  
16 first thing that LEAs are signing up to. Yes,  
17 I'm going to implement your plans.

18 The second thing LEAs are signing  
19 up to is that they're going to implement all  
20 or a significant portion of your plans. You  
21 also get to define what that means. Generally  
22 speaking, we would expect LEAs to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 implementing the state's entire plan. There's  
2 a bunch of cases where that might not be true.

3 A particular LEA might not have a turnaround.

4 So they might not be implementing anything in  
5 Section E on turning around low-performing  
6 schools.

7 There might be a bunch of reasons  
8 that are good reasons why LEAs don't have to  
9 sign up to everything in order to be  
10 participating LEAs. You guys get to set those  
11 parameters and you can explain them to the  
12 peer reviewers when you answer question  
13 (A) (1).

14 The next thing is you get to  
15 design -- oh, is there a question?

16 (No response.)

17 MS. WEISS: I'm just going to keep  
18 going so that we're not -- oh, no. We're  
19 there.

20 Go ahead.

21 MS. STEELE: Okay. I'm Christine  
22 Steele from Wyoming. My question is on Slide

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 58 that we're talking about with the  
2 allocation of the funds under Section 14.

3 MS. WEISS: Now, we're not on  
4 Slide 58 yet. Oh, I'm ahead. I'm -- see.  
5 Reading ahead. And we should be handing these  
6 out one page at a time to all of you. No.  
7 Hang on to your questions. I just want to  
8 finish this big picture thought. And then we  
9 will come back to the calculation question,  
10 because I know the calculation is -- has been  
11 confusing to people. But hang on to that  
12 thought for just a minute more.

13 So the next thing you get to  
14 define is what's the Memorandum of  
15 Understanding that the LEAs sign. Now, we're  
16 going to go through this in detail because in  
17 order to help make the task easier for you  
18 guys we put out a model Memorandum of  
19 Understanding in these documents. You don't  
20 have to use it. But we wanted to put  
21 something out there to just give you a sense  
22 of, you know, we're talking about three pages,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not 300 pages. But if you wanted to make it  
2 300 pages that would be your prerogative.

3 But it -- so you get to write the  
4 agreement. And then the last thing you do is  
5 provide the option to all of your LEAs about  
6 whether they want to participate. So it is an  
7 opt in thing for LEAs. You don't get to pick  
8 who you give the option to. All your LEAs  
9 have the option. What you're picking are the  
10 criteria that LEAs have to meet in order to  
11 participate.

12 And the goal here is that LEAs  
13 actually know what they're signing up to do  
14 and they're signing up to high levels of  
15 participation. This is not meant to be free  
16 money, their fair share of the ARRA grant.  
17 This is meant to be money that is targeted at  
18 meeting your plans.

19 So hang on --

20 MS. HALL: I'm Tiffany -- oh,  
21 sorry.

22 MS. WEISS: Yes. I'm here.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HALL: Tiffany Hall, Utah. I  
2 just have a question about participation of  
3 LEAs. Is there a number or a percentage of  
4 either LEAs or students within your state that  
5 you are looking for to demonstrate commitment  
6 to the plan?

7 MS. WEISS: No. There's no magic  
8 number. And you'll see this when we show you  
9 the scoring rubric. And again, like, look at  
10 scoring rubrics because that's really what the  
11 reviewers will be looking for. And read those  
12 carefully. But the answer is no. What the  
13 reviewers are looking for per the criterion  
14 here is whether the LEAs you have signed up  
15 are going to translate into broad statewide  
16 impact on your outcomes. And your job will be  
17 to argue that this group of LEAs can do that.

18 Yes?

19 MS. LEVIN: Hi. Sue Levin from  
20 Oregon. Can the MOU be written to apply to  
21 Phase I only? Behind -- the reason -- and the  
22 question is if the state got feedback that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 required it to make substantive changes to the  
2 application the district might want the option  
3 to revisit.

4 MS. WEISS: Yes. Right? Sure.  
5 Absolutely. You'll see me do that often.  
6 Yes. Right? Okay.

7 MS. DeBACKER: Diane DeBacker from  
8 Kansas. With the MOU that we need to send out  
9 to our districts -- and -- am I understanding  
10 that that needs to be completed and those need  
11 to be back by the January 19 deadline?

12 MS. WEISS: Yes. And we are going  
13 to talk a lot more about different streamlined  
14 ways you might do that and how we tried to  
15 organize a process that allowed that to happen  
16 faster. Now, an LEA can sign up after the  
17 deadline. They just won't count as part of  
18 the peer review scoring. So we'll talk more  
19 about that. But in order to be counted by  
20 peer reviews the MOU has to be back.

21 VOICE: Do you want to mention  
22 Exhibit 1 versus 2 so --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: No, not now.

2 VOICE: Okay.

3 MS. WEISS: I have a place where  
4 I'm going to do that.

5 Yes?

6 MR. FANGMAN: Good morning,  
7 Joanne. Kevin Fangman from Iowa. I just want  
8 to clarify this point. You talked about it's  
9 an opt in for school districts. So if we  
10 wanted to, just for the sake, make six widget  
11 factories and have so many districts be  
12 involved with each one we really can't do that  
13 because all the districts have to have the  
14 opportunity to participate. So you just can't  
15 set up a slice of something.

16 MS. WEISS: That's correct. So we  
17 put down here things that we've heard like,  
18 that LEAs -- it's the note at the bottom of  
19 the slide -- states can't select the  
20 participating LEAs, you can't limit LEA  
21 participation on things like demography or  
22 geography, you can't hold a competition for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 who is going to be in the pot. Everyone has  
2 to be given the option to opt in. But they  
3 have -- in order to opt in they have to meet  
4 your criteria and sign a binding agreement  
5 that says they're doing that.

6 Oh, my God. That one sparked a  
7 million hands.

8 MR. LOCKWOOD: Morning. Tim  
9 Lockwood from Wyoming. You mentioned that  
10 this is a draft MOU, you can rewrite it as you  
11 like. But I'm curious. Is that true for the  
12 signature blocks, as well? You have a list of  
13 signature blocks down here. Does it have to  
14 be those to a minimum? Can we remove --

15 MS. WEISS: Yes. The -- we are  
16 going to cover the MOU in some detail in a  
17 minute. The answer is that those are the  
18 signatures at a minimum that we are requiring  
19 in the criterion itself. So the example that  
20 we've used is an example that matches the  
21 criterion. But anything that you put together  
22 should match the criterion, as well, which

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 means at a minimum those three signatures.

2 Yes?

3 MR. REICHARDT: Good morning.  
4 Robert Reichardt from Colorado. First of all,  
5 I'd like to welcome all of you to Denver and  
6 encourage you all to visit the high country  
7 this weekend. I would be remiss, given our  
8 economic times, if I didn't encourage you to  
9 spend a little money.

10 So one of these geographic  
11 characteristics is challenging for us. We  
12 were considering a differentiated strategy for  
13 data support. So if you have small rurals  
14 that need a lot of support that's different  
15 from your urban sophisticated. So if you  
16 created a package for your rurals and a  
17 package for your urbans that they could opt  
18 in. But there was differentiation on how you  
19 support them.

20 MS. WEISS: So that's just saying  
21 that you've got a plan and the plan has two  
22 parts. Part one is applicable to these guys,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 part two is applicable to those guys, but  
2 everybody can opt in. So that's fine. So you  
3 can have plans that are differentiated in any  
4 ways that you want to. It's just that you  
5 can't have a plan that's only for one sector  
6 so nobody else but that sector could qualify.

7 MR. REICHARDT: So I interpret  
8 what you said by your plan has to have  
9 openings for everyone to play but you can  
10 differentiate the -- what that means in some  
11 ways.

12 MS. WEISS: So let's let Jane jump  
13 in.

14 MR. REICHARDT: See, you need to  
15 go skiing afterwards to relax.

16 MS. WEISS: Jane? That was  
17 serious.

18 MS. HESS: Yes. The skiing part?

19 Yes. I'm not really sure. Let's  
20 let us talk at the break and we'll get back to  
21 you on that one.

22 MR. REICHARDT: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HESS: Thank you.

2 MR. REICHARDT: Thanks.

3 MS. GAITHER: Hi. Kathy Gaither  
4 from California. We have several questions  
5 about this whole section. But we'll try to  
6 divide them up between the different parts as  
7 you discuss them. I think this one does  
8 belong in this section.

9 When you talk about all or  
10 significant portions of the state plan our  
11 question is do LEAs need to participate in  
12 every aspect of an assurance or just as they  
13 can choose different pieces of the plan can  
14 they choose only parts of an assurance area?  
15 The best example of this is perhaps the  
16 teachers and leaders area where there's lots  
17 of different segments of that assurance area.

18 MS. WEISS: Yes. And I'm actually  
19 -- so I'm actually going to show you that in  
20 detail in a minute. So let's come back if I  
21 haven't answered your question. I've got a  
22 visual that will help answer that coming up.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Was there -- yes. Here.

2                   MS. VAUGHN:     Sally Vaughn from  
3 Michigan. Follow-up on the question about the  
4 MOU signatures. The three that are listed are  
5 at least at the minimum. Will there be any  
6 kind of weighting if it's signed by the  
7 superintendent but not the union president or  
8 not the board president?

9                   MS. WEISS:    Yes. And we will be  
10 talking about that, as well. One of the  
11 things that the peer reviewers are looking for  
12 is the level of leadership support. And  
13 that's judged by how many -- the breadth of  
14 signatures that you have. So an LEA isn't  
15 prohibited from participating if they don't  
16 have all the signatures but the state's  
17 application, on balance, as many of those  
18 signatures as you can get, you know, the level  
19 of signatures -- the extent to which you have  
20 all those signatures is one of the criteria  
21 that the reviewers are looking for.

22                   MS. MARTIN:    Hi. Rayne Martin

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from Louisiana. You mentioned that you can't  
2 do competitions with LEAs. However, if you  
3 have LEAs that are more -- that are signing up  
4 for more portions or more invested in the  
5 reform plan in general can you make  
6 delineations based on that when you decide  
7 which LEAs are going to be participating?

8 MS. WEISS: So what you would need  
9 to do is set the bar at the front end. You  
10 would say, In order to participate you need to  
11 participate in at least this, at least this  
12 many, everyone has to do at least this. But  
13 here's -- so you have to set the rules and  
14 then LEAs say, I'm willing to meet your rules  
15 or not. You don't get all of them in, review  
16 them and go, No to you, yes to you, because  
17 after the fact I'm looking at this and making  
18 decisions about where I want to draw the line.

19 MS. MARTIN: Perfect.

20 MS. WEISS: Does that make sense?

21 MS. MARTIN: Yes. Thank you.

22 MS. FARACE: I knew we'd get this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 group going.

2 MS. McGRATH: I'm Melissa McGrath  
3 from Idaho. And my question was about the --  
4 that the LEAs can sign up after the deadline.

5 Is that something the state can control? --  
6 because I'm not sure how we're supposed to  
7 create a budget based on the LEAs that sign up  
8 prior to that and then LEAs can -- you know,  
9 once they find out we get the award then maybe  
10 more would sign up.

11 MS. WEISS: So -- I'm trying to  
12 think of whether to answer that now or whether  
13 I have a better place. Hang on. Let me --

14 MS. McGRATH: If you just delay it  
15 --

16 MS. WEISS: Let me answer it when  
17 I came up to a slide. But remind me of that  
18 if I haven't covered it. Okay. I have a  
19 feeling we haven't exhausted this one. So  
20 when you think of a question later feel free  
21 to come backwards to it.

22 Okay. How you calculate the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 amount that an LEA is eligible for. So this  
2 is my favorite slide. I feel like doing a  
3 creative reading of it for you because it is  
4 so fraught with legalese and sections and  
5 parts and subsections. And so maybe rather  
6 than doing that I'm going to go to the next  
7 slide, which is an example that actually will  
8 say it much more clearly, I think, than the  
9 legalese did.

10 So here's the deal. If you have  
11 five LEAs and three of them are participating  
12 you ignore the two that aren't and you just  
13 list the three that are. So you take their  
14 2009 Title I allocation, which means it's  
15 going to be ESEA plus ARRA, because 2009 had  
16 both in it. So you're going to take the 2009  
17 Title I allocation and you're going to add  
18 them up.

19 In this example LEA 1 got \$20  
20 million, LEA 2 got \$10 million and LEA 3 got  
21 \$10 million. So the total that was given to  
22 all the participating LEAs was \$40 million.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Your whole state had five LEAs. So it's a  
2 small state. So the whole state had five  
3 LEAs. We've just ignored whatever amount of  
4 money those other two got. We've lined up the  
5 three that got \$40 million and we've said,  
6 Okay, of that \$40 million therefore, LEA 1 got  
7 50 percent and the other two each got 25  
8 percent. Just \$20 million divided by 40 gives  
9 you 50 percent. So --

10 And now we're saying, Now, how do  
11 I calculate the amount of your grant that that  
12 LEA is eligible for? Well, your grant is a  
13 \$200 million grant. Half of that has to flow  
14 through to the LEAs. So LEA 1 gets 50 percent  
15 of \$100 million or \$50 million. LEA 2 gets 25  
16 percent of \$100 million or \$25 million. So  
17 you just ignore everyone who's not  
18 participating and reallocate the money across  
19 those who are participating. So that either  
20 clarified everybody's questions or is so  
21 confusing that no one knows where to begin.

22 Yes?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. FANGMAN:    Kevin Fangman from  
2 Iowa.   So just for some clarification because  
3 this confuses me a little bit.   So this is  
4 done before our application goes in?

5                   MS. WEISS:     No.     You actually  
6 don't need to even send us this information at  
7 the beginning.   When you see the budget you'll  
8 see that the budget has one line item that  
9 says, My sub-grant to participating LEAs is 50  
10 percent.   This is how the money's calculated  
11 at the back end by you guys when you're ready  
12 to start distributing money if you win.

13                   But you can do it at the front end  
14 if you want to give -- I mean, you can be  
15 doing -- we want you to be able to do these  
16 calculations as you go so that the LEAs will  
17 have a sense of how much money they're signing  
18 up for.   So we wanted to give you the map.  
19 But you don't owe this number back to us right  
20 now.   It's just so that you can do the math  
21 and have the conversations in your states that  
22 you need to have.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. MILLER:     Rick Miller from  
2 California.     So really, if there's any  
3 flexibility in this -- and here's why I ask.  
4 As we've changed now so that the LEAs have  
5 more flexibility, they don't have to choose  
6 all assurance areas. It goes back to the  
7 questions asked before but this is about  
8 funding. So if you have one district that has  
9 one signature and only one thing you're doing  
10 versus a district that's doing everything with  
11 all three signatures, can we differentiate how  
12 much dollars they get in that 50 percent?

13                   MS. WEISS:    No. The choice you  
14 have is to say, Somebody who has one signature  
15 and one assurance area is not participating,  
16 that doesn't meet my state's definition of a  
17 participating LEA so if that's what you're  
18 signing up to I'm not interested in  
19 countersigning this, you're not -- you don't  
20 meet my criteria. So that's why I'm saying  
21 it's all about setting the criteria at the  
22 front end so that the people who cross the bar

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are worthy of getting their share.

2 MR. MILLER: Okay. And just to be  
3 clear, they're also -- but our 50 percent of  
4 the dollars we can spend anyway we want. So  
5 if we want to add incentives on that side we  
6 can do that?

7 MS. WEISS: Exactly. And you'll  
8 see -- when we go through the budget you'll  
9 see examples of how you can tell -- how you  
10 can define the budget to say, On top of that  
11 50 percent here's other money that we want to  
12 pass through to the LEAs for this purposes.

13 MR. MILLER: Got it.

14 MR. MUENKS: Good morning.  
15 Michael Muenks, Missouri. You may have just  
16 answered my question but I'm going to ask it  
17 anyway. In Missouri we have LEAs that do not  
18 receive Title I funds. So the answer is that  
19 we would be funding those districts, those  
20 LEAs through the 50 percent that the state has  
21 control on?

22 MS. WEISS: Correct.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MUENKS: Thank you.

2 MS. WEISS: Correct.

3 Other questions about this? Yes?

4 MR. FOLDESY: Jody Foldesy,  
5 Arizona. My question is about the level of  
6 prescriptiveness with the LEA half of the  
7 money or at least half of the money, in terms  
8 of specific initiatives. You know, clearly,  
9 on the state half we'll be very clear and  
10 specific about what the money's going to be  
11 used for. For the LEA half how much --  
12 somewhere between the discretion they're going  
13 to take half and figure it out later and we're  
14 going to be very specific about every single  
15 use of the dollar in there. Where are we  
16 allowed to play?

17 MS. WEISS: So that was like a  
18 ringer to take me to my next slide.

19 MR. MUENKS: Oh, great. I should  
20 have waited.

21 MS. WEISS: No. You did a good  
22 job. Thank you for setting me up properly.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           No. So can you limit how LEAs use  
2 their funds? The answer is absolutely yes.  
3 These funds are not used in a way that's Title  
4 I compliant. They're used in a way that is  
5 consistent with the plans that the LEA has  
6 said they're going to implement in the Race to  
7 the Top program. And you can be quite  
8 specific about how those funds should be --  
9 however much specificity you want.

10           You're not going to tell us -- and  
11 you'll see this when we do the budget section  
12 -- you're not going to tell us what the budget  
13 is for each LEA. That's going to be between  
14 you and the LEA. We are going to ask that  
15 before the grant is awarded, you and your LEA  
16 have that agreement in place. And you will  
17 definitely be able to have the conversations  
18 to make sure that the funds are being spent in  
19 a way that is consistent with the programs and  
20 plans that you've put forward in your grant.

21           So let me just see if there's  
22 anything else on here I want to say before I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 take questions. Yes. No. So was there a --

2 MS. MARTIN: Hi. This is Rayne  
3 Martin again with Louisiana. When you set  
4 your reform plan and you decide the portions  
5 that are going to be your reform plan can you  
6 also create some delineating factors within  
7 that that would allow you to rank LEA  
8 participation and make ultimate decisions on  
9 who is going to be a participating LEA versus  
10 not a participating LEA?

11 MS. WEISS: So say more. Like,  
12 give me an example. I'm going to try to  
13 understand your question.

14 MS. MARTIN: So let's say a  
15 portion of your plan is optional. And that  
16 optional portion of your plan is what you'd  
17 like to use to help decide who actually  
18 becomes a participating LEA.

19 MS. WEISS: I -- so I think the  
20 way you would do that is not that a portion's  
21 optional but that it's all required and  
22 somebody is willing to do that part -- and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that that's a required part for LEAs to  
2 participate in and that's how you get over the  
3 bar. You can't do it at the back -- you can't  
4 have like, discretion at the back end. You  
5 have to put the rules out at the front end so  
6 LEAs know what they're signing up to do. And  
7 if they sign up to do it the answer is yes.  
8 So you have to set the rules at the front end  
9 that are the rules you mean. So you have to  
10 sort of think through this at the front end.  
11 Am I answering your question?

12 MS. MARTIN: Sort of. I think  
13 maybe it would be helpful if I could ask it  
14 offline maybe at one of the breaks in a little  
15 bit more detail.

16 MS. WEISS: -- so our problem is  
17 that we're trying to make sure this is public.  
18 Everyone needs to hear everyone else's  
19 questions and answers. What you are asking me  
20 will be relevant to somebody else.

21 MS. MARTIN: Right.

22 MS. WEISS: So --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WOLFE: In setting the rules  
2 for LEAs determining whether they want to  
3 volunteer to participate if it's stated very  
4 clearly that selection priority will go to the  
5 LEA that's willing to do XYZ over LEAs that  
6 sign up that aren't willing to do XYZ then can  
7 you actually limit the total number of LEAs  
8 that participate?

9 MS. WEISS: No. So it really is  
10 that everyone in your state is eligible --  
11 every LEA in your state is eligible to  
12 participate if they agree to participate in  
13 your plan as you define it.

14 MS. MARTIN: Right.

15 MS. WOLFE: So if they sign the  
16 MOU or whatever means that we use, then they  
17 by the fact are part of that participating --

18 MS. WEISS: So they could sign --  
19 you could set rules, for example, that said,  
20 This part of my plan, 2.3, is required. And  
21 you could set requirements like that.  
22 Somebody could put an MOU together, send it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 back to you and they didn't say -- they didn't  
2 check 2.3. They're like, I'm not doing 2.3  
3 but here's my signed MOU. You do not have to  
4 countersign that MOU, because they did not  
5 meet the requirement you set.

6 So you'll see that we have on our  
7 draft a countersignature from the state.

8 MS. WOLFE: Yes.

9 MS. WEISS: Because you do have to  
10 accept that they actually met the requirement  
11 that you specified. So it's not just their  
12 signature, it's yours, too. But what you're  
13 signing is not, I like you, you meet my --  
14 you're signing something that says, Yes, you  
15 have met the standards that I put out. Does  
16 that -- am I answering your question? You  
17 might have a really specific thing in mind  
18 that we don't understand yet. So -- let's  
19 take another question and then see if you've  
20 got --

21 MS. AYBAR: Sorry. I'm about to  
22 trip. I'm Liz Aybar from Colorado. And my

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question is about the disbursement of funds to  
2 LEAs?

3 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh?

4 MS. AYBAR: How will that work?  
5 Will it be specifically on a reimbursement  
6 basis? And will states have all the money up  
7 front to reimburse? Or will they have only a  
8 portion at a time?

9 MS. HESS: Part of that will  
10 depend on your plan. And -- but the -- you  
11 know, we're anticipating that the grants are  
12 going to last four years. So you need to kind  
13 of plan the budgets over the course of the  
14 four years. The state will get its money  
15 obligated all up front. But we're certainly  
16 expecting that it's going to go for the whole  
17 four years, it's not -- you know, it will be  
18 based on what your budget is and your plan.

19 MS. WEISS: And you'll draw as you  
20 need it.

21 MS. AYBAR: Right.

22 MS. WEISS: But you can draw it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 down in advance of the reimbursement not at  
2 the back end -- I mean in advance of the  
3 disbursement, not at the back end. Right? Is  
4 that -- I think your question was --

5 MS. AYBAR: Right.

6 MS. WEISS: -- do they have to  
7 fund the money and then get it at the back  
8 end. No. We'll give you the money at the  
9 front. You disburse it but you're going to  
10 get the money as you're ready to disburse  
11 based on the budget that you're going to put  
12 out. And we're going to talk through the  
13 budget in a minute.

14 MS. AYBAR: Okay. And then will  
15 we -- will states reimburse LEAs?

16 MS. WEISS: Yes. So the money  
17 will come to states and states will disburse  
18 it.

19 MS. HESS: And you'd follow the  
20 regular federal grant rules that you'd follow  
21 for disbursement. We give them enough that  
22 they can spend in a reasonable time period.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 You know, some people say three days, all of  
2 that kind of thing. And you might have higher  
3 costs at the beginning to get some plans  
4 implemented. You know, you might spend more  
5 at the beginning. But still think about the  
6 whole four-year time period.

7 MS. AYBAR: Thank you.

8 MS. GAITHER: Kathy Gaither,  
9 California. Our question is whether an LEA  
10 that signs on initially, once a state is  
11 approved is there a time period when they can  
12 choose to withdraw? And if so, what would be  
13 the circumstances and how would they do that?  
14 And are there any consequences?

15 MS. WEISS: Okay. I'm sorry. Say  
16 that one more time?

17 MS. GAITHER: If an LEA signs an  
18 MOU and we submit an application and it's  
19 approved is there any time period after  
20 approval when an LEA, for whatever reason, may  
21 decide that they no longer want to  
22 participate, are they allowed to withdraw,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 under what circumstances are they allowed to  
2 and are there any consequences for the state  
3 or the LEA?

4 MS. WEISS: So your MOU needs to  
5 specify termination terms just like any  
6 agreement would. We've got some suggestions  
7 in the document we've put out. But if it's  
8 okay with you that they terminate. If you  
9 have not yet been awarded a grant and it  
10 happens -- I mean, there's some hard stuff if  
11 it happens in the middle of the judging  
12 process because the LEAs that have signed up  
13 are part of the sort of package that reviewers  
14 are judging. So let's assume it doesn't  
15 happen there, because that could be  
16 problematic.

17 But if it happens, you know, two  
18 years into the grant and the LEA -- there's a  
19 new superintendent, there's a new school  
20 board, they don't want to participate and  
21 you've allowed them to terminate their  
22 participation you would just use the formula

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and reallocate the money to the LEAs that are  
2 still in your pool.

3 MS. GAITHER: Okay. So if a state  
4 is awarded a grant and say, we had 40 LEAs  
5 participating and one of them after we're  
6 awarded the grant -- I'm thinking positive  
7 here --

8 MS. WEISS: Withdraws?

9 MS. GAITHER: -- decides for  
10 whatever reason -- if they have a budget  
11 crisis, a new superintendent, whatever, a  
12 whole board turnover -- maybe we don't get the  
13 level of funding that they thought we would  
14 get and so they say, No, we can't do this --

15 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh.

16 MS. GAITHER: -- as long as we're  
17 okay with them withdrawing, there's no rule  
18 against it in the Race to the Top?

19 MS. WEISS: Right. And --

20 MS. GAITHER: And we don't send  
21 the money back to you, we just give it to the  
22 other LEAs? Okay. Great. Thanks.--

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: -- reallocate that  
2 money to the --

3 MS. HESS: But the balance, I  
4 think, for whether -- how much that would  
5 happen -- I mean, your example is an easy one.

6 But if you came -- you know, if you came to  
7 the table competitively with we'll say 90  
8 percent of your LEAs and then you get a grant  
9 and then it's we'll say 50 percent of them  
10 decide not to do it, even though you received  
11 the grant then that's the other side of the  
12 example where it could have an effect on the  
13 state's grant because it would look that it  
14 was altering the scope of what the reviewers  
15 you know, found valuable.

16 MS. WEISS: Right. And we will --  
17 I mean, this is a grant where we will have a  
18 lot of oversight. And so the one or two small  
19 LEAs who drop out is one thing. But somebody  
20 who materially affects your ability to  
21 actually deliver on statewide impact -- you  
22 would probably be having a serious

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conversation with us at that point.

2 MS. STEELE: Christine Steele,  
3 Wyoming. My question goes back to the  
4 formula. When we do the allocation and let's  
5 say we had LEA 1, 2 and 3 on your side, is  
6 there any consideration that could be given  
7 because of the focus to the -- on the lowest  
8 performing schools, the lowest 5 percent of  
9 whether it's high schools, et cetera, and  
10 turnaround schools if the low -- if the LEA  
11 that gets the least amount of money in the  
12 formula for Race to the Top here has more of  
13 the persistent lowest--performing schools, is  
14 there a way that that could enter into how we  
15 set up the funding, you know, when you're  
16 first -- if you don't have all your LEAs and  
17 you have a few and neither one of them has a  
18 lot of the lowest-performing schools can you  
19 adjust the fund in that way?

20 MS. WEISS: So we'll show you when  
21 we go through the budget how you do that. But  
22 that comes out of the state's 50 percent then.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       So you can take your 50 percent and  
2 supplement in a whole variety of ways and that  
3 would be a good example of one that might make  
4 sense.

5                       Any other questions?

6                       (No response.)

7                       MS. WEISS: Okay. We don't have a  
8 break now. We decided last night to move the  
9 break. We thought this part would go a little  
10 faster. But don't worry. First of all, you  
11 know where the restrooms are. If you need  
12 them, don't hesitate. But we will give you a  
13 break right after this section. We thought  
14 that we should just keep going and power  
15 through the MOU part because it's sort of all  
16 one big whole.

17                      So the Memorandum of Understanding  
18 that you need to do is required to have at  
19 least these three parts. Our model MOU has  
20 them, obviously. But these are the three  
21 parts that the criterion language itself  
22 requires you to have in your Memorandum of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Understanding.

2           The first part is terms and  
3 conditions. And Appendix D, which is  
4 referenced within the criterion itself goes  
5 into quite a bit more detail about this in  
6 describing what terms and conditions have to  
7 be in your grant. These are all at a minimum  
8 so you can certainly supplement this in any  
9 way that you would like to. And we haven't  
10 said what the answers to these questions are.

11           We've just said, You have to at  
12 least address in your Memorandum of  
13 Understanding what the key roles and  
14 responsibilities of the state and of the LEA  
15 are, what the state recourse is for LEA non-  
16 performance. That's the how do you cure or  
17 terminate from your side. And then what's the  
18 LEA signing up to do.

19           So the LEA is signing up that: A,  
20 I understand the plan and I'm signing up to  
21 execute it; B, they're saying, We're going to  
22 implement all or significant portions of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plan and we're telling you -- and I'm going to  
2 show you the scope of work document in a  
3 minute -- and I'm going to tell you in my  
4 scope of work which pieces I am signing up to  
5 do; and if the state wins within 90 days of  
6 winning I am going to do a detailed scope of  
7 work that includes a whole lot of other  
8 information that the state probably needs in  
9 order to really manage the relationship with  
10 me around this. And that other information  
11 we'll talk about that in a second.

12 So in order to streamline this we  
13 basically said for the initial application you  
14 just need a pretty simple scope of work  
15 document. If you win within 90 days do a more  
16 detailed scope of work document with your LEA  
17 -- with each LEA in which they're going to  
18 tell you all the other stuff that you need to  
19 know in order to manage the plan. So that's  
20 the big picture idea. I'm going to take it  
21 apart and show you the pieces.

22 So in our model MOU -- you'll find

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it in Appendix D -- again, you can use it as  
2 is, you can modify it in any way that you'd  
3 like to, you can start from scratch. Just  
4 make sure that at least those pieces we just  
5 discussed are in it. And then here's how we  
6 helped -- we were talking -- we sort of  
7 thought through the scope of work question.

8           What we were trying to do is in  
9 acknowledgment of the fact that this is a lot  
10 of stuff to get from your LEAs in a very short  
11 period of time how can we have a streamlined  
12 process that ensures from your point of view  
13 that the LEA has had the hard conversations  
14 that they need to have about what the  
15 alignment is within the LEA around the plan  
16 itself and the commitment to implementing the  
17 plan. Those were the conversations we thought  
18 were the important ones from your point of  
19 view to have with the LEAs to make sure that  
20 they knew what they were signing up to and  
21 that they were on board.

22           There's a ton of other work they

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 need to do around the details of how they're  
2 going to do this. And we thought that could  
3 wait until such a time as you win an award and  
4 then they can get into the sort of hard work  
5 of doing their detailed plans.

6 So because of that we've broken it  
7 into these two parts. The preliminary scope  
8 of work which we've said is Exhibit 1 to the  
9 model MOU and a final scope of work which  
10 we've said would be Exhibit 2 to your MOU and  
11 wouldn't happen until after you win a grant.

12 So Exhibit 2 would come back and  
13 say, if we won a grant then the LEA is going  
14 to tell you what are their goals, what are  
15 their activities, what are their detailed time  
16 lines, budgets, personnel, performance  
17 measures, the kinds of things that you might  
18 want to have to make sure that they're really  
19 reporting to you and getting the data you need  
20 to roll up into all of your big picture plans.

21 They don't have to do that at the  
22 front end except, -- they don't have to, but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they can. So this is all up to you. Whatever  
2 you need them to do at the front end you're  
3 welcome to have them do. In fact, when we get  
4 to some of these sections on planning  
5 considerations, one of the things we're going  
6 to say is that you might want to think through  
7 an initial data collection tool from your LEAs  
8 that goes out with the MOU where you say, If  
9 you want to participate I also do need you to  
10 tell me this information because I need it in  
11 order to do my plan. So we're not saying  
12 don't get any of this. We're just saying you  
13 don't have to give it to us. But you might  
14 need it for yourself.

15 So with that, the preliminary  
16 scope of work is the only thing that we made  
17 an example of because we figured the final  
18 scope of work is for you guys to decide with  
19 your LEAs what you need that to look like.  
20 The preliminary scope of work --

21 And, Kathy, this is now going to  
22 go to your question so if I don't get there,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 holler.

2 But the preliminary scope of work  
3 that we've put together is really very simple,  
4 because again, the goal was that in order to  
5 put a little check mark in this box you had to  
6 have the hard conversations with your unions,  
7 with your teachers, with your school board.  
8 But all of that is sort of hidden. The one  
9 thing you need to do is put a check mark in  
10 the box that says, Yes, I'm signing up to  
11 this. So the list that's in our model MOU is  
12 the full list of the plan criteria.

13 And, Kathy, you'll see that on  
14 here -- or maybe you won't see -- yes. So you  
15 can see in (D)(2), which is the one that I  
16 think you were talking about that people might  
17 want to sign up to just pieces of it, rather  
18 than the whole thing.

19 We have literally, because of that  
20 made each piece a separate row so that people  
21 can say, You know what, I'm going to sign up  
22 to the measuring student growth, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evaluation system, I'll do annual evaluations  
2 but I'm not doing the rest of this stuff. So  
3 that you force those conversations to be  
4 happening at the LEA and they have to  
5 literally go through and say, Yes, here's what  
6 I am and am not doing. This is where we were  
7 saying you can set criteria.

8 So you could set criteria in your  
9 state that say, you know, whatever you want to  
10 say about what it means to participate in all  
11 or a significant portion. You could say you  
12 have to participate in everything -- you have  
13 to have a check mark across everything in D or  
14 you're not a participating LEA, if you wanted  
15 to.

16 So again, I'm suspicious that this  
17 silence is not clarity.

18 MR. MILLER: It's Rick Miller,  
19 California. It goes to the scope of work the  
20 90 days after?

21 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh.

22 MR. MILLER: And so this is a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 concern of our union. I just want to ask the  
2 question, which is there's language in it that  
3 the MOU is binding. And there's a concern  
4 that they sign a binding agreement not knowing  
5 what they're signing because the scope of work  
6 in detail hasn't been filled out yet. Is it  
7 your intention that when they sign that  
8 agreement on -- before they do the scope of  
9 work that that would have impact on their  
10 local collective bargaining conversations and  
11 that would affect their contracts?

12 MS. WEISS: It could. It depends  
13 on -- so what I think the LEA needs to know  
14 before they put a check mark here is what's  
15 your plan. They're signing up to your plan  
16 for (D) (2). They're not signing up to (D) (2),  
17 the criterion. They're signing up to what you  
18 said your plan is. So I would submit that  
19 they should know what they're signing up to.  
20 What they haven't done necessarily is put  
21 together their detailed work plan behind that.  
22 But they have said, Yes, we will do that. And

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 if collective bargaining is implicated in one  
2 of these rows by putting a check mark it  
3 presumably means, We have sat down and had  
4 this conversation and if we win this grant  
5 we're willing to come to the table and talk  
6 about this.

7 Any other questions? Yes?

8 MS. LOPEZ: Nina Lopez from  
9 Colorado. I think it's related to Rick's  
10 question in the back, as well. So some of the  
11 components of the plan, particularly around  
12 the teachers and leaders area, are subject to  
13 local bargaining agreements. And so the  
14 likelihood obviously of us not only getting  
15 MOUs signed up but bargaining agreements  
16 renegotiated between now and January is  
17 unlikely.

18 MS. WEISS: Right.

19 MS. LOPEZ: And so I guess my  
20 question is, how you sort of express the level  
21 of commitment that is just feasible at this  
22 stage. And how that gets weighted.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: So let me sort of  
2 connect the dots between this and something  
3 that's going to come up later this afternoon.

4 So when I said a check mark means, Yes, we're  
5 willing to come to the table and talk about  
6 this, we weren't thinking that it meant, Yes,  
7 we've renegotiated all the collective  
8 bargaining agreements before this. But yes,  
9 we've talked about this and we are willing to  
10 entertain looking at evaluations before we  
11 make tenure agreements, before we give  
12 somebody tenure. So it's -- if that's what  
13 your state plan said.

14 Having said that, when you have to  
15 do your performance measures -- and you'll see  
16 this when Josh talks about Section D later on,  
17 when he talks about (D)(2) -- one of the  
18 things that we're asking you is what's the  
19 percent of LEAs that you think are going to be  
20 participating in this part of your plan. And  
21 we're asking you to do that over time.

22 So what might happen, for example,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is that in that comments area a state comes  
2 back to you and says, We're going to talk  
3 about in this year but don't expect to see  
4 changes in our rules until school year '12,  
5 '13. So that would allow you as you're  
6 thinking about your goals over the course of  
7 the years to say more are going to come on  
8 over the course of time because some people  
9 need more time than others to get their ducks  
10 in a row and participate in this one.

11 So we're not expecting everybody  
12 to come out the gate with, Yes, we've changed  
13 everything and it's all done, it's a four-year  
14 plan. But we do expect people at the front  
15 end to say, Yes, I understand this and I'm  
16 participating in this part of the plan. Okay?

17 So now, the signatures. So the  
18 way it's worded is that the MOU with its  
19 participating LEAs includes as many as  
20 possible of these signatories. And the more  
21 signatures the stronger the leadership support  
22 that the reviewers will assess to that state

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 application. And the three signatures are the  
2 state superintendent or equivalent, the  
3 president of the local school board or the  
4 equivalent, if applicable. If you don't have  
5 a school board this signature doesn't need to  
6 be there. And the local teachers union  
7 leader, if applicable. If you don't have a  
8 union this signature doesn't need to be there.

9 Of course, at least one of the  
10 signatures better be from an authorized  
11 representative of the LEA so that it's  
12 actually a binding agreement. And then  
13 there's a countersignature from you, as we've  
14 talked about, from a state official that says,  
15 Yes, this contract meets the requirements that  
16 I set for a participating LEA, we accept you  
17 as a participating LEA in our plan.

18 And so this beautiful power point  
19 graphic that we put in here is an excerpt of  
20 the signature block that's from the model MOU  
21 that we gave you. You can certainly request  
22 more signatures than this if you'd like to.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Okay. Now, we really are going to  
2 give you a break. And after we come back from  
3 the break we're going to talk about what we're  
4 -- what is the work of states with their LEAs  
5 in getting them the sort of information they  
6 need to go off and have their hard  
7 conversations and decide if they are willing  
8 to participate in this plan.

9           When they send it all back to you  
10 what is it you are going to tell our reviewers  
11 so that they understand what this profile  
12 looks like without reading through every one  
13 of these MOUs and figuring out what it looks  
14 like?

15           So after the break we're going to  
16 come back and I'll show you how we've  
17 structured the evidence part of criterion  
18 (A) (1) in order to make it easy for our  
19 reviewers to see a big picture emerge out of  
20 all of this work that you've been doing.

21           So with that, let's take a break  
22 for maybe 20 minutes. So back here at ten

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 minutes to 11:00. And I think all of you know  
2 the restrooms are right outside. So 20  
3 minutes. Thank you.

4 (Whereupon, a short recess was  
5 taken.)

6 MS. WEISS: We're about ready to  
7 reconvene. Okay. We're glad to see that most  
8 of you came back from your break. That's a  
9 good sign.

10 Okay. So now we're going to go  
11 back to the criteria, having led you on this  
12 path around through LEAs and MOUs and other  
13 initials. We're going to come back to the  
14 criterion and see if we can put it back  
15 together again.

16 So you'll remember that then  
17 (A) (1) (i) or, as our lawyers like to say,  
18 (A) (1) Romanete one, the state has set forth a  
19 comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that  
20 clearly articulates goals and the path to  
21 achieving these goals. And this one is mostly  
22 about a narrative. There's no specific

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evidence that we require for this one though  
2 again, you're always welcome to put evidence  
3 in. But this is kind of the big picture  
4 front-end framing question for you.

5 (A) (1) (ii) then is where we start  
6 getting into the participating LEAs. So now  
7 on this one we're saying the participating  
8 LEAs are strongly committed to the state's  
9 plan and to effective implementation of reform  
10 in the four areas as evidenced by the  
11 Memorandum of Understanding or other binding  
12 agreements between the state and the LEAs.

13 And the way you're going to judge  
14 that evidence is that the terms and conditions  
15 reflect strong commitment, that the scope of  
16 work descriptions require LEAs to implement  
17 all or significant portions of the plan and  
18 that you've got signatures from as many as  
19 possible of these different groups  
20 demonstrating the extent of leadership  
21 support.

22 So as you rate your plan for this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one, I'm going to walk you through the  
2 evidence that we've requested, because this is  
3 how you translate all of this into a picture  
4 that a reviewer will be able to understand and  
5 evaluate.

6 So the evidence that we ask for is  
7 first of all, an example of your participating  
8 LEA MOU. So whatever your standard MOU is we  
9 ask you to just send us one copy of it. You  
10 don't need to give us every single agreement  
11 that you've got in your file but you certainly  
12 should have them handy in case you're asked  
13 for them. But -- so a standard MOU. And  
14 we're going to also say, If you've customized  
15 the MOU in any way for a particular LEA we're  
16 going to ask you to describe what those  
17 changes were that you made.

18 The next thing we're going to ask  
19 you for is a summary table that shows the  
20 specific portions of the state's plan that  
21 each LEA is committed to implementing. We're  
22 going to walk you through these in a minute.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The summary table indicating which LEA  
2 leadership signatures you've gotten. And then  
3 there's a detailed table.

4 So I'm going to start with the  
5 detailed table, because that's what provides  
6 the information that's going to feed into all  
7 the other tables. So starting with the  
8 detailed table -- you'll find this on page 22  
9 of your application -- this is the first thing  
10 I would fill out. And this is the document  
11 that I would keep current as you're getting  
12 MOUs back from your LEAs. Just -- our  
13 thinking is that you just sort of fill this  
14 out as you go and at the end you're going to  
15 be able to fill out all of the summary tables  
16 much more easily.

17 So the first thing, of course, is  
18 when in doubt read the directions at the top  
19 of the table, which we hope will be helpful  
20 reminders. You're going to fill out one row  
21 for every LEA and you're going to take  
22 information off the LEAs' MOUs and summarize

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it here. I also think that it could help --  
2 and you'll see why when you see the  
3 information you have to transfer -- it might  
4 help to add two more rows to the bottom of  
5 your table. One that is a total, total number  
6 of -- just total up the columns. And the  
7 other that is the percentage of the total  
8 participating LEAs who are doing each of these  
9 things.

10 So if you've got 50 LEAs and --  
11 I'm going to make the math easy for myself --  
12 40 of them are doing something, one row would  
13 say 40 and the next row would say 80 percent,  
14 because you'll see in a minute that those two  
15 numbers are going to transfer into your  
16 summary tables.

17 Okay. So the first thing in the  
18 detailed table is in this spot we're asking  
19 you to describe the MOU terms and conditions.

20 And what we're asking you here is a yes/no  
21 question, -- Did this LEA sign the standard  
22 terms and conditions or did you do some custom

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 version for them, because if you did a custom  
2 version we want you someplace to summarize  
3 what the variations were. So if this just  
4 says, Yes, yes, yes you don't have to do  
5 anything. If you say, No, we did a non-  
6 standard version for this LEA we're going to  
7 ask that you tell us what it was that you  
8 changed.

9 So that's the part that I just  
10 said. So then you're going to take the scope  
11 of work information and you're going to tally  
12 that up here, which MOUs are participating in  
13 which parts of your plan. And you're going to  
14 transfer the total participation numbers in  
15 percentages from those rows that I think you  
16 should add at the bottom to the scope of work  
17 summary table.

18 So that's the summary table.  
19 That's also in your evidence. This is in your  
20 application. All these tables are in your  
21 application. This summary table is on page 20  
22 and 21 of your application. So this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 summarizes for the reviewers what your LEAs  
2 are participating in at the big picture level.

3 So you're showing a reviewer a picture of LEA  
4 participation across each of your Race to the  
5 Top plans. Does that make sense?

6 So here they are in horizontal  
7 versus vertical format but across the top are  
8 each of the different plans that you might  
9 have in your proposal and here they are again  
10 down the left. And now we're asking, So how  
11 many LEAs are participating in this and what  
12 percentage of the total participating LEAs  
13 does that represent. So that's the big  
14 picture snapshot of the detail that the  
15 reviewers are seeing.

16 Now, back to the detail table.  
17 Here's the signature place. This is where you  
18 say whether you've got signatures from these  
19 different groups, yes, no or not applicable.  
20 Not applicable obviously is only to be used  
21 for cases where this is no school board. It's  
22 -- I don't know -- mayoral control. Or maybe

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mayoral control but you did get the mayor's  
2 signature. So then you can just say yes. So  
3 yes, no or not applicable there. And again,  
4 you're going to transfer the signatures to the  
5 summary table.

6 This is what the summary table for  
7 the signatures looks like. The number of  
8 signatures you got in each of these  
9 categories, the number of signatures that are  
10 applicable. Because now we want you to tell  
11 us a percentage and we want to know only a  
12 percentage of the applicable signatures.

13 Okay. So before I go into the  
14 next part let me just see if that made sense,  
15 how all these tables feed into each other. So  
16 you start with the detailed table and then use  
17 the summary from that to feed into the summary  
18 tables. And you're going to produce two  
19 summary tables for the reviewers. You're also  
20 going to give them the detailed table in case  
21 they want to look up something in detail. But  
22 the first thing they're going to look at are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the summary tables.

2 Yes, we're good? Yes. Hang on.  
3 Let's get a mike up here.

4 MS. LEBO: I'm Cheryl Lebo from  
5 Arizona. My question is are you looking for  
6 -- at this part of the application are you  
7 looking for the percentage of LEAs who put in  
8 out of total LEA possibilities or are you just  
9 looking for the percentage for each of the  
10 points that they're going to sign up for. So  
11 this particular LEA is going to do three out  
12 of the four requirements that we've determined  
13 as part of our MOU and the rest are going to  
14 do 100 percent of the application.

15 MS. WEISS: No. So now -- let me  
16 make sure I'm answering your question. So a  
17 participating LEA is someone who's met the  
18 requirements you've set.

19 MS. LEBO: Right.

20 MS. WEISS: So now out of that you  
21 might have set requirements that don't require  
22 people to do everything though. Right?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEBO: Okay.

2 MS. WEISS: So out of the LEAs  
3 that have met your bar and are participating  
4 what percentage of them are participating in  
5 the different parts of your plan.

6 MS. LEBO: I see.

7 MS. WEISS: Because what you'll  
8 see in a minute that the reviewers are looking  
9 for is not a magic number. But they're trying  
10 to get a sense of whether they believe that  
11 this level of participation is going to be  
12 able to sort of move the needle in your state.

13 MS. LEBO: But while they're  
14 making that determination they're not looking  
15 at how many LEAs actually signed up out of the  
16 possible LEAs.

17 MS. WEISS: Yes. You'll see  
18 that's coming up in a minute.

19 MS. LEBO: Okay.

20 MS. WEISS: It's just --

21 MS. LEBO: All right.

22 MS. WEISS: So the first thing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're saying is of the LEAs that are  
2 participating what are they doing --

3 MS. WEISS: -- and then you're  
4 going to see in the next question it's now,  
5 tell us how many LEAs statewide are  
6 participating. So that is coming up in a  
7 minute.

8 MS. LEBO: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. WEISS: Yes?

10 MR. MILLER: Rick Miller,  
11 California. So we have a minimum bar we set  
12 and then with -- above that then we have some  
13 options people can -- they don't have to do  
14 everything.

15 MS. WEISS: Maybe.

16 MR. MILLER: So if we do that my  
17 question is, is that -- if we have different  
18 -- that's a choice but they fill it out  
19 differently. Is that still a standard MOU?  
20 Even though they check different things that  
21 still would be considered standard and we  
22 wouldn't have to check that as a non-standard

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MOU?

2 MS. WEISS: Right. The detailed  
3 table is asking the MOU terms and conditions.  
4 Are the terms and conditions changed? Have  
5 the terms and conditions changed?

6 MR. MILLER: Okay.

7 MS. WEISS: Not what they're  
8 signed up to do. We expect that to vary.  
9 That's why it's sort of in an attachment in  
10 the model MOU we did. But is the basic terms  
11 and conditions, because it's conceivable that  
12 you have an MOU -- you have an LEA that for  
13 whatever reason needed some specific thing for  
14 them.

15 MR. NELLHAUS: Jeff Nellhaus.  
16 Massachusetts. Is there any disadvantage to  
17 having LEAs sign on at the higher selection  
18 criterion level rather than for each of the  
19 specific sub-levels? So in other words, just  
20 signing on for (D) (2) in general and in doing  
21 that, implying they agreed to each of the sub-  
22 levels but not asking them to actually sign on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for each particular sub-level?

2 MS. WEISS: So the reason that in  
3 our example -- so you can choose how you want  
4 to do it.

5 MR. NELLHAUS: Uh-huh.

6 MS. WEISS: In the example the  
7 reason that we disaggregated it is for the  
8 reasons that maybe Kathy pointed out or  
9 somebody pointed out earlier, which is some of  
10 these things are tricky. And when we say that  
11 you've committed we mean that you've  
12 committed. The LEA doesn't later get to back  
13 out and say, No, just kidding.

14 So we wanted to actually have them  
15 put a check mark in and make sure they were  
16 having the hard conversation and not just  
17 assuming that by putting it up here it meant  
18 they could pick and choose. So even though  
19 the agreement presumably would say, When we  
20 say (D) (2) we mean everything, we felt like it  
21 was important for you guys as leverage to make  
22 sure you were getting specific with them in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some of these areas and making sure people  
2 really understood what they were signing up  
3 to. So whatever level of specificity you do  
4 your plan at I think should match the level of  
5 specificity you put in here.

6 MR. NELLHAUS: Okay. So --

7 MS. WEISS: But -- you know,  
8 because they're signing up to your plan. So  
9 it's up to you. And we're just giving you a  
10 tool and you need to decide how you use that  
11 tool. So there's no requirement about the  
12 level of specificity per se except to make it  
13 really clear and transparent to the reviewers  
14 so that they know how to judge it. Does that  
15 answer your questions?

16 MR. NELLHAUS: Yes. So I think  
17 it's not a requirement. We're not at any  
18 disadvantage. I understand what you say in  
19 terms of being sure your districts are really  
20 considering very seriously --

21 MS. WEISS: Know what they're  
22 signing up to.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. NELLHAUS: -- all of the  
2 things they're agreeing to. Thank you.

3 MS. WEISS: Was there another  
4 question over here?

5 (No response.)

6 MS. WEISS: Okay. So then let's  
7 look at the next part of the criterion because  
8 this is the one that's going to get to your  
9 question. So the next part of the criterion  
10 says that the LEAs that are participating in  
11 the state's Race to the Top plan will  
12 translate into broad, statewide impact.

13 So this is where we're saying, So  
14 tell us about the number and percentage of  
15 participating LEAs, how many schools that  
16 represents, how many K-12 students that  
17 represents, how many students in poverty that  
18 represents so that the reviewers can see the  
19 picture of the level of participation that  
20 you've enlisted across your state and how you  
21 think that's going to translate into goals  
22 that you're going to set around increasing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 student achievement, decreasing achievement  
2 gaps, increasing graduation rates, increasing  
3 college enrollment rates and increasing the  
4 number of students who complete at least a  
5 year's worth of college-bearing credit.

6 Yes?

7 MS. WOLFE: Hi. Betty Jean Wolfe  
8 from Louisiana. I have a two-part question  
9 that's somewhat philosophical. So it's  
10 directed to this but it's going to --

11 MS. WEISS: Philosophical  
12 questions were not one of the things on our  
13 little list.

14 (General laughter.)

15 MS. WOLFE: Well, it's simply  
16 this. This chart which we've looked at gives  
17 the reviewer and the state an indication of  
18 the deeper question regarding participating  
19 LEAs of breadth versus depth. Is the  
20 objective to have as many as possible  
21 participate willing to do as few reforms just  
22 to get that participation or is the objective

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to go really deep and only select as  
2 participating LEAs those that are willing to  
3 go all the way even if it represents  
4 proportionately a smaller number of LEAs?

5 MS. WEISS: So we have not set a  
6 specific number. When described the criteria  
7 for the reviewers we did not set any numbers  
8 in this section because what we have said is  
9 that it's the state's job to describe how the  
10 participation of these LEAs, breadth and  
11 depth, translates into moving the needle  
12 statewide on achievement. And that's why  
13 we've given you plenty of room for a  
14 narrative.

15 Because you're going to use the  
16 data in your narrative to build your case for  
17 why this group of -- this picture, this  
18 profile of LEA participation in your  
19 particular state's context will translate into  
20 statewide impact. So it's your argument to  
21 make. And it could be very specific and a  
22 very different argument in different states

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because of the context in each state.

2 Okay. So on this one then the  
3 evidence that we have asked for is the numbers  
4 and percentages of participating LEAs,  
5 schools, K-12 students and students in  
6 poverty. And let me show you back to the  
7 detailed table. I'm going to talk about the  
8 second piece of evidence in a second.

9 Back to the detailed table. The  
10 first part of the detailed table is LEA  
11 demographic information. So back to the one  
12 row per LEA. The first part says, So in your  
13 LEA how many schools are there, how many  
14 students do you serve and how many students in  
15 poverty. And that's going to get translated  
16 onto a summary table that looks like this. So  
17 here you're just painting the picture now, not  
18 of what percentage of your participating LEAs  
19 are doing different reforms, but what  
20 percentage of participating LEAs do you have  
21 signed up given the total picture of your  
22 state.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Okay.     And these are the four  
2 things we're asking.   How many LEAs relative  
3 to your total number of LEAs in your state;  
4 how many schools relative to the total number  
5 of schools; how many students; and how many  
6 students in poverty relative to the statewide  
7 percentage.

8           Again, there are no judgments  
9 being made on this.   This is just data you're  
10 providing to reviewers and that you're going  
11 to use in your narrative to build your case  
12 and your story.

13           The other piece of evidence we're  
14 asking for here then are tables, graphs,  
15 whatever that show the state's goals overall  
16 and by sub-group, together with your  
17 supporting narrative.   So this is where we  
18 say, So in your narrative provide whatever  
19 data and information you need to set your  
20 goals and describe how you think this is going  
21 to move the needle statewide in these four  
22 different areas over the course of the grant.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So you have some data we've  
2 required. We didn't create tables and graphs  
3 for your data on achievement and achievement  
4 gaps and those things because we think each of  
5 you has maybe a different way that you're  
6 going to describe and tell that story. But we  
7 would expect that you have data in this  
8 narrative that explains to the reviewers why  
9 all these pieces connect to moving the needle  
10 statewide and what that needle movement might  
11 look like.

12           Okay? So that takes us to the  
13 next criterion. We finally made it through  
14 one criterion. Trust me. The others get  
15 faster. Okay.

16           So (A) (2). (A) (2) is about  
17 capacity building. So (A) (2) is asking that  
18 you tell us about how at the state level  
19 you're going to build the capacity needed to  
20 implement, scale up and sustain the proposed  
21 reforms. The second part of this criterion is  
22 that you've got a broad group of stakeholders

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 who are invested in and have been part of and  
2 are supportive of the plans that you're  
3 building. And there are two parts to this.

4 One part is teachers and  
5 principals, which include at a minimum,  
6 teachers unions or statewide teacher  
7 associations and a variety of other critical  
8 stakeholders, your Legislature since we know  
9 that a lot of the criteria in here implicate  
10 legislative action, charter school  
11 authorizers, charter school associations,  
12 state and local leaders who might have come to  
13 the table to help put your application and  
14 proposal together, parents, teachers. So a  
15 whole variety of stakeholders.

16 This is not a requirement list.  
17 This is not a checklist of all the people  
18 you're supposed to have. This is simply to  
19 give you a sense of the fact that what the  
20 reviewers are looking for is do you have a  
21 whole state that's committed to your plan as  
22 opposed to, you know, a few people in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 state education agency who are committed to  
2 the plan.

3 So let's go back and talk about  
4 these parts of the capacity building. In a  
5 minute we're going to get into the budget.  
6 But I just wanted to make sure that there are  
7 no questions about this. So we've asked you  
8 to talk about your capacity in a number of  
9 different ways here in your narrative. None  
10 of these require particular evidence beyond  
11 whatever it is you want to put forward. We  
12 don't have evidence that's specified.

13 So the different things we've  
14 asked you to talk about are who's the  
15 leadership team that is going to implement  
16 this statewide, so who are the people that  
17 you're counting on to do this hard work.  
18 What's your plan for supporting your LEAs? So  
19 this isn't only about compliance. This is  
20 actually about supporting the LEAs and helping  
21 them successfully implement the practices.  
22 What's your thinking about how you're going to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 do that work, how you're going to evaluate the  
2 practices, how are you going to stop the  
3 ineffective ones and disseminate the ones that  
4 are proving effective across your state?

5           The next one is about effective  
6 and efficient operations and processes at the  
7 state level for overseeing and implementing  
8 the grant. The next one is about funds and  
9 budgets. We'll talk more about the budget  
10 process in a second. The other part of the  
11 funding question is how you're thinking about  
12 coordinating, reallocating, aligning funds  
13 from a variety of different sources around  
14 these goals. And the last one is how do you  
15 think about, after the period of the funding  
16 ends, sustainability of the items that you've  
17 proposed in your plan.

18           So let me take this question while  
19 the rest of you can process this.

20           MR. FOLDESY: And I'm Jody Foldesy  
21 from Arizona. I apologize for this. I was  
22 actually going to ask a question on Slide 88.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Eighty-eight.

2 MR. FOLDESY: Or before 88.

3 Pardon me.

4 MS. WEISS: This brings up a lot  
5 of questions for me, too.

6 MR. FOLDESY: Exactly.

7 MS. WEISS: Okay. This one? This  
8 one, tables and graphs?

9 MR. FOLDESY: Yes. Okay.  
10 Actually, so the question was about the folks  
11 who are going to be signing on, the  
12 stakeholder groups, the broad stakeholder  
13 groups.

14 MS. WEISS: Okay. This one.

15 MR. FOLDESY: So pardon me, 90.  
16 Oh, okay.

17 MS. WEISS: Yes, here it is.

18 MR. FOLDESY: And there's recently  
19 been some legislation passed in Arizona which  
20 could strengthen our application, or at least  
21 we believe it would strengthen our  
22 application. However, the -- there's been a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lawsuit that's been brought by one of these  
2 stakeholder groups. And if we were to mention  
3 this legislation in the document or at least  
4 in a positive way they may not sign on to our  
5 application. Does that make sense to you?

6 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh.

7 MR. FOLDESY: So I'm wondering if  
8 there is any guidance --

9 MS. WEISS: Yes, it makes sense.

10 MR. FOLDESY: -- of how to handle  
11 that dilemma where there's something that we  
12 may -- you know, we may really want to talk  
13 about and highlight and yet could actually  
14 keep us from getting the ten points here.

15 MS. WEISS: No. Now, we've left  
16 my messy world and entered your messy world.  
17 And I can't help with that. That's going to  
18 be a question you guys are going to have to  
19 deal with. And you'll -- I'm sure there's 50  
20 examples of that. So I think we have no -- we  
21 officially have absolutely no advice on that  
22 one.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. FOLDESY: I should have asked  
2 a question on Slide 88.

3 (General laughter.)

4 MR. HOUDE: Good morning. I'm  
5 Donald Houde, also from Arizona. When I look  
6 at -- I'm back on Slide 89. The -- when I  
7 look at -- when you define sustainability  
8 there are multiple components of  
9 sustainability. And we -- it's not -- it's  
10 more than just from my perspective keeping the  
11 status quo.

12 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh.

13 MR. HOUDE: It's about having the  
14 native agility to adjust as you have lessons  
15 learned. So when you talk about responding to  
16 (e) here we talk about the fiscal requirements  
17 of keeping something operational but also, the  
18 requirements about being able to do  
19 enhancements and stay natively agile to adapt  
20 to the changing ecosystem of education.

21 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh.

22 MR. HOUDE: So is that the type of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things that you're looking for, that we can  
2 define sustainability in our -- from our own  
3 perspective because of the multiple components  
4 that I would see?

5 MS. WEISS: Yes. And that's why  
6 the criterion says, you know, fiscal,  
7 political, human capital. But like, this is a  
8 broad question. So yes, you can certainly  
9 answer it in a broad way. The big picture  
10 question is to make sure that you haven't  
11 created a plan that has such a big funding  
12 cliff that the whole plan shuts down when the  
13 grant ends.

14 Okay. So now we're going to enter  
15 budget land and talk a little bit about the  
16 budget section, which is at the back of your  
17 application. Before we get into the budget  
18 section itself, the actual budget forms that  
19 you need to fill out and attach I wanted to  
20 just talk a little bit about the high-level  
21 budget guidance that we've provided to the  
22 states.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So what we have encouraged states  
2 to do here is this -- I know you already  
3 understand this, but in no way is this a  
4 formula grant, this is a grant where we're  
5 trying to actually fully fund the plans and  
6 programs that you are proposing to implement  
7 in your state. And in order to do that it  
8 means the onus is on you to put a budget  
9 together that matches the work that has to be  
10 done to implement those plans.

11           So we got a lot of requests from  
12 states for ballpark guidance and we've put  
13 that together and published it in the notice  
14 inviting applications. We did that based on  
15 the relative sizes of student population in  
16 each state. There are sort of natural breaks  
17 in these five places so in each of these five  
18 categories we put the states based on the size  
19 of the population and just gave a wide range  
20 of guidance. These are not binding numbers.  
21 You could put in a proposal that was below or  
22 above these numbers. But we wanted to give

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you some ballpark expectation within which to  
2 frame and think about your work.

3 We know there were a lot of  
4 questions about this initially. I think we've  
5 answered most of them but I just want to see  
6 if there are any questions about this one  
7 before we move on.

8 Yes?

9 MS. McGRATH: Melissa McGrath from  
10 Idaho. I know you just clarified this. But I  
11 just really want to make sure because we've  
12 had so many questions in our state about this.

13 So you can apply for more money and that will  
14 not hurt your application in any way? I mean,  
15 you obviously have to justify every budget  
16 number you put in place. But if we go outside  
17 -- we're in Category 5 -- if we're outside the  
18 \$75 million that's not going to hurt us as  
19 long as we can justify it?

20 MS. WEISS: Correct.

21 MS. McGRATH: Okay. Thank you.

22 MS. WEISS: Okay. So now let's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 talk about the budget. There are four parts  
2 to the budget. And we're going -- just like  
3 we talked about the detailed table and using  
4 that to fill in all the summary tables, we're  
5 going to talk about this one slightly out of  
6 order, also. So we're going to first talk  
7 about the budget summary narrative. Then  
8 we're going to talk about the project level  
9 detail tables and narratives. And then we're  
10 going to go back and talk about the big  
11 picture budget summary table. So all of these  
12 are on page 55 of your application if you're  
13 following along at home.

14 Okay. The budget summary  
15 narrative. There's a couple things that I  
16 want to say before we dive in. One is that  
17 remember, we do need to make sure that you are  
18 describing all of your expenses in enough  
19 detail for the Department to look at it and  
20 make sure that the costs you're proposing are  
21 necessary, reasonable and allowable.

22 This is not the judgment call

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about whether your plan -- whether your  
2 numbers add up to a credible job of  
3 implementing your plan. That's what the peer  
4 reviewers will do.

5 The Department has to do this  
6 whole separate review to make sure that what  
7 you're proposing is actually allowable,  
8 reasonable expenses. We've given you guidance  
9 on how to do that. But just a reminder. And  
10 there's a web site in here that you can look  
11 at if you want to see more information about  
12 that. I know a lot of you already know this  
13 stuff cold. So I won't spend any more time on  
14 it.

15 The other thing is -- the next  
16 thing is something that we talked about in the  
17 budget summary narrative. We are asking you  
18 to explicitly tell us how you're thinking  
19 about aligning federal, state and local funds  
20 to leverage them all together around  
21 accomplishing the reform agenda that you've  
22 set forth in your state.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           One of the things that I think you  
2 know we've been trying really hard to do at  
3 the Department is make sure that all of our  
4 programs that we're putting out there are  
5 aligned and consistent. So that, for example,  
6 the upcoming school improvement grants on  
7 school turnaround are completely and 100  
8 percent consistent with Race to the Top. So  
9 whatever you want to do there is the same  
10 stuff you can do in Race to the Top and the  
11 funds could be complimentary and used in  
12 whatever ways you want to.

13           So an example that we've been  
14 using is you could, for example, end up with a  
15 budget in Race to the Top that's slightly  
16 lower on school turnaround because you're  
17 saying, I'm doing all this work, I have a  
18 comprehensive plan for turnaround here that  
19 I've proposed but the budget is slightly lower  
20 than you might think I need because I'm using  
21 my school improvement grants in exactly a  
22 consistent way with this to fill in this part

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 of the budget.

2           So we want to give you -- and  
3 maybe the same on the state longitudinal data  
4 systems grant. So we want to just make sure  
5 that you have the freedom to look at all of  
6 your money in an aligned way around these same  
7 reforms and use it in a coherent and  
8 complimentary way. And this is the place for  
9 you to explain to us and to the reviewers how  
10 you're thinking about allocating and aligning  
11 those pots of money.

12           MR. REICHARDT: I'm Robert  
13 Reichardt from Colorado. On the state  
14 longitudinal data systems grant we're having a  
15 little internal debate about -- we've  
16 submitted one. We won't know whether we've  
17 received it before January 19. So the  
18 question is do we write our budget assuming  
19 we're going to get it or do we write our  
20 budget assuming we're not or are we to split  
21 the difference or --

22           MS. WEISS: I don't know that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have any magic answer to that one.

2 MR. REICHARDT: I got some  
3 political questions for you if you'd like.

4 MS. WEISS: That sort of is one.

5 MR. REICHARDT: Okay.

6 MS. WEISS: Okay. So then the  
7 last thing that you need to do is describe in  
8 the budget summary narrative the overall  
9 structure of and rationale for your proposed  
10 budget.

11 So we've introduced this new word,  
12 Project, because we know that you don't  
13 necessarily want to put together a budget for  
14 each of your plans. That might not be -- that  
15 might falsely create this weird structure  
16 within the SEA that isn't how you really want  
17 to organize things. You might want to  
18 organize things in a sort of project way. And  
19 we'll talk about some examples in a second.  
20 But so we've introduced this construct of as  
21 an SEA the money that I'm putting in the  
22 budget for my 50 percent is organized in these

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 big chunks of projects.

2           The narrative here is where we  
3 want you to say, We have seven projects, in a  
4 minute I'm going to give you the list of the  
5 budget for -- I'm going to show you the  
6 detailed budget for each of those, but I want  
7 you to understand the big picture of how we're  
8 organizing the work at the SEA level. So  
9 that's what the big picture narrative is  
10 asking.

11           And so these projects are  
12 basically things that you can design in  
13 whatever way best matches your proposal and  
14 your needs. A couple examples that came to  
15 mind to us is you might have one sort of over-  
16 arching management project that is the  
17 leadership team that's coordinating across all  
18 of your Race to the Top stuff. You might also  
19 have a human capital project that's overseeing  
20 everything that's happening in the whole (D)  
21 section of your proposal and that is a team  
22 that looks like this and has this kind of work

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and this kind of travel and other expenses  
2 attached to it.

3 So whatever is the way that you at  
4 the SEA want to put your org chart together  
5 and organize your project spending below it is  
6 an acceptable way for you to show us these  
7 expenditures. Does that make sense? Before  
8 we get into what the project budget details  
9 look like?

10 Okay. So then there is a project  
11 level budget table. And you would fill out  
12 one of these budget tables and a narrative  
13 that we'll show you in a minute for every  
14 project that you listed as, At the state level  
15 I have these five projects. You're going to  
16 have five of these sheets and five  
17 accompanying narrative sheets. And you're  
18 going to break these out by year and by budget  
19 category by line item there. Okay?

20 So you're going to put your total  
21 numbers in the budget table and then you're  
22 going to put a supporting narrative together

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that we have described pretty extensively in  
2 your application. It's on pages 59 to 60 of  
3 your application. These are a couple examples  
4 I just pulled out of the application.

5 And so for each of the line items  
6 here you're going to tell us the things you  
7 think are the relative pieces of information  
8 that we need to know to understand the  
9 personnel line adds up to -- you know, we're  
10 just going to give you the total personnel  
11 line by year on this budget table but here in  
12 the narrative we're going to tell you how it's  
13 disaggregated and how we've thought about it  
14 and why the number is what it is.

15 So now there was a question.

16 MS. LOPEZ: Hi. Nina Lopez from  
17 Colorado again. So one question that's come  
18 up in our discussions in Colorado is not what  
19 the 50 percent that goes out to the LEAs, but  
20 with a portion of the other 50 percent is  
21 whether we could intentionally plan for -- and  
22 I think the gentleman from Arizona sort of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 touched upon this -- the fact that there will  
2 be things that come up that we don't know  
3 exist. So how do you sort of plan for  
4 research and development and innovation? And  
5 my question is if we were to set aside let's  
6 say 5 percent of the grant and say, This is  
7 our R&D fund how do you complete this sort of  
8 project-level budget narrative when you don't  
9 know what those uses will be and is it  
10 acceptable to have a project-level budget for  
11 something like that?

12 MS. WEISS: So -- yes. I mean,  
13 yes, to the extent that it matches your plan  
14 and it's an allowable expense, which unless  
15 you're having a lot of alcohol in your R&D  
16 budget it's probably -- you're probably good.

17 You might say, I've got a project level  
18 innovation budget and I don't have any line  
19 items on the personnel and the whatever and  
20 I'm going to put it all in other and now in my  
21 narrative I'm going to explain to you how I'm  
22 going to use it and deploy it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Okay. So now, if we go back and  
2 look at the budget table you will notice that  
3 there's lines 11 and 12 that I do want to talk  
4 about. So one through eight are pretty  
5 obvious lines. Nine is the total. Ten is  
6 indirect costs, which I -- we've put the forms  
7 for applying for an indirect cost right in.  
8 But I am guessing all of you already have  
9 those percents allocated.

10           So lines 11 and 12 are the two  
11 that I want to talk a little bit more about.  
12 And these are things that came up earlier. So  
13 let's start with line 11 which is called  
14 Involved LEAs as opposed to Participating  
15 LEAs.

16           So Involved LEAs -- we had an  
17 example earlier that's maybe even a better  
18 example than the one we have here. An  
19 Involved LEA might be one who's not eligible  
20 at all for Title I but wants to participate in  
21 your plan. You would put down here as an  
22 activity LEA B and here's the purpose and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here's the amount of money that we want to  
2 fund them at annually. And you would explain  
3 that even though they're not eligible for  
4 Title I you're using some of your 50 percent  
5 to fund them and they're fully participating  
6 and here's the evidence or whatever other  
7 information you want to provide to us so that  
8 the reviewers can see that.

9 Another example of an Involved LEA  
10 is that the question came up actually during  
11 the public comment period that said, What if  
12 somebody really -- an LEA isn't interested in  
13 participating fully in the state's plan but  
14 there are things that really require full  
15 statewide implementation. An obvious one that  
16 comes to mind might be that as the state is  
17 transitioning to a new set of standards there  
18 are all kinds of statewide professional  
19 development activities. You don't want to  
20 just run them for the participating LEAs, you  
21 want to run them for everybody. Can you do  
22 that within this budget? And the answer is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 yes, this is the place you would do that.

2 So you would have as an activity  
3 for all the LEAs who are not participating and  
4 don't already have funding to attend this  
5 here's money that we're putting aside for  
6 release time or for travel or for whatever so  
7 that they can participate in all of the  
8 statewide activities that I really need them  
9 all to come to and be part of. So this is  
10 sort of the catch-all place for LEAs who are  
11 not participating LEAs but who you do want to  
12 give some grant money to.

13 And then there's the other  
14 question of what if you are a participating  
15 LEA but we want to supplement you above what  
16 your share would be. And we've contemplated  
17 two reasons that you might want to do that.  
18 The first reason is that there might be some  
19 special pilot activity -- and examples of that  
20 have already come up this morning -- that  
21 require additional funding.

22 That would be a place where you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could now say, Only these LEAs or only these  
2 schools or whatever are participating in this  
3 particular pilot activity, we're funding it  
4 separately out of our 50 percent and here's  
5 what that funding looks like. Or you might  
6 say that an LEA, because their Title I share  
7 is very low but they want to fully  
8 participate, needs to be kind of trued up to a  
9 higher level. You could -- that's the second  
10 reason, a participating LEA that has a low  
11 share. You might supplement them so that they  
12 can fully participate because their share  
13 isn't enough for them to do it otherwise.

14 So those are two reasons we  
15 thought of. But any reasons that you want to  
16 give more money to a participating LEA than  
17 their share would go here. And I'll take a  
18 question in a second. And in these cases what  
19 we would expect is you might have examples  
20 where the first column is here's an activity.

21 So here's a program, here's a pilot, here's  
22 an activity that a number of LEAs are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 participating in and here's the cost.

2 In the second case it's probably  
3 organized in your budget. In your budget  
4 narrative the backup is organized by LEA.  
5 This LEA has a low Title I share, we want to  
6 supplement it with this much money so that  
7 they can fully participate. So that row is by  
8 LEA. So you can give it to us either way, by  
9 LEA or by activity on this one.

10 Okay. Question?

11 MS. GAITHER: Kathy Gaither,  
12 California. So I want to clarify that a low  
13 Title I share might be a share of zero so that  
14 an LEA that has no Title I share is allowed to  
15 participate in Race to the Top. Is that  
16 correct?

17 MS. WEISS: Yes. So what we've  
18 said is that we would call those Involved  
19 LEAs. So I would have put those on line 11 if  
20 I did that right. I think it's line 11 for  
21 Involved LEAs. So we would have called them  
22 Involved LEAs. [Note Correction: see pages

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 163-165 of transcript for additional  
2 discussion of this issue "if you have an LEA  
3 that wants to participate that doesn't receive  
4 Title I, they still may be participating LEAs,  
5 but it has to come out of the state's 50  
6 percent share, not the 50 percent share that's  
7 strictly for the Title I participating LEAs"].  
8 And that's a place where you would say, This  
9 LEA doesn't have any Title I share but they  
10 want to participate fully and so here's out of  
11 our 50 percent the money that we're going to  
12 grant to them. And this other says, We do  
13 have a contract with this group, they're  
14 participating LEAs and we want to supplement  
15 because their Title I share is low. So either  
16 one you can accommodate. You just stick them  
17 in different places in the budget.

18 MR. FANGMAN: Kevin Fangman from  
19 Iowa. On Slide 100 number one can that be  
20 competitive or can we just choose to work with  
21 one of our intermediary agencies about who the  
22 schools would be or which ones there would be?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: You can pick those  
2 schools in any way that you want to.

3 MR. FANGMAN: Thank you.

4 MS. WEISS: I think there's a  
5 question back there.

6 MS. DOYLE: Hi. This is Betsy  
7 Doyle from Massachusetts. I just want to  
8 reconcile the MOU clarity that you provided  
9 before with this clarity around the budget for  
10 participating LEAs just to make sure I'm  
11 hearing it correctly.

12 So earlier, which was really  
13 helpful, we talked about the MOU really  
14 needing to allow everyone to opt in, not using  
15 competitions, you know, not picking a few  
16 districts to do a few initiatives and that we  
17 also didn't need to get more specific than  
18 just saying that 50 percent was going to go to  
19 participating LEAs. So now when we're talking  
20 about calling out some of these specific  
21 pieces in the budget narrative it sounds like  
22 it is okay to recognize a subset of LEAs for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pilots provided that that money is coming out  
2 of the state's own 50 percent?

3 MS. WEISS: Correct.

4 MS. DOYLE: So then though -- in  
5 other words, that that 50 percent that's being  
6 passed through to participating LEAs shouldn't  
7 be used for proof of concept or piloting  
8 models?

9 MS. WEISS: Well, it can be. But  
10 if you want to supplement -- I mean, it could  
11 certainly be used for that purpose if that's  
12 what your plan is. But if there's a financial  
13 need to supplement then it comes out of this  
14 other 50 percent part.

15 MS. DOYLE: Okay.

16 MS. WEISS: So the other 50  
17 percent is yours and you have a lot of  
18 flexibility over who you pick and how you pick  
19 them and what you do with that and whether you  
20 supplement it, what you keep at the state  
21 level. So that's all up for grabs.

22 But we do want a detailed budget

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of that part. We're not going to ask you for  
2 a budget for the 50 -- the other 50 percent  
3 that's being sub-granted out. We are asking  
4 you for a budget that totals the full other 50  
5 percent even if parts of that are being sub-  
6 granted back to the LEAs.

7 MS. DOYLE: Okay.

8 MS. WEISS: We want to see that.

9 MS. DOYLE: So if we're assuming  
10 that for a given pilot that the sub-granting  
11 money would more than cover that, it's  
12 actually not something that would need to be  
13 called out specifically?

14 MS. WEISS: Right.

15 MS. DOYLE: Okay.

16 MS. WEISS: It would be just in  
17 your plan described. Okay. Does that --

18 Okay. So then we're back to the  
19 --

20 Oh, sorry.

21 MS. HALL: Tiffany Hall, Utah  
22 again. Question on the MOU then. Is it my --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it's my understanding then that the  
2 participating LEAs, they need an MOU. If they  
3 were this other group they would not be a  
4 part. Or do they need that, as well?

5 MS. WEISS: The Involved LEAs  
6 we're not asking you for any information  
7 about.

8 MS. HALL: Okay.

9 MS. WEISS: You can do whatever  
10 you'd like. So if you want to have an MOU or  
11 some agreement with them, if there's something  
12 big you're asking them to do, you're welcome  
13 to do that. You don't need to provide us any  
14 evidence of that. That would just be  
15 something you're doing for your own protection  
16 as you're managing your grant funding.

17 MS. STEELE: Christine Steele.  
18 This is a -- just a kind of a clarification on  
19 the budget table that's up there. I'm  
20 assuming that for words like expenditure and  
21 supplies that we use the Edgar definitions  
22 that are for this. And then I guess is there

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a difference between benefits and fringe  
2 benefits? I'm not real sure what the word  
3 fringe up there means. Or is that not --

4 MS. WEISS: No, it's --

5 MS. STEELE: I don't know. Just  
6 benefits?

7 MS. WEISS: It's benefits.

8 MS. STEELE: Okay. And then  
9 indirect costs. So you can take indirect  
10 costs. Okay.

11 MS. WEISS: And in the budget --  
12 in the application if -- there's the form to  
13 get an indirect cost rate if you don't have  
14 one.

15 MS. VAUGHN: Sally Vaughn,  
16 Michigan. Because there's really nothing in  
17 the regs that says anything about the SEA  
18 administered set aside should we assume that  
19 SEA administrative costs can be built into the  
20 budget for the overall plan?

21 MS. WEISS: Yes, you should  
22 absolutely assume that. I mean, building the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 SEA's capacity is the point of some of this.  
2 So, yes.

3 Okay. So then what you're going  
4 to do is there's the budget summary table  
5 which is really the first table in the budget  
6 section. It's on page 56. And that is,  
7 literally take each of the individual project  
8 sheets, total them up and put the numbers here  
9 and you have your budget summary table. It  
10 would be our great hope and expectation that  
11 the total number at the bottom equals what  
12 you're asking for in your grant.

13 Okay? You can see because of that  
14 we have added a line 14 to the summary table  
15 which says, Put the total of your LEA sub-  
16 grants for participating LEAs here so that the  
17 bottom line does, in fact, equal your full  
18 grant request. Okay? So you're just giving  
19 us budget detail on the other 50 percent and a  
20 one-line shot on your LEA sub-grants. Okay?

21 This, I believe, is what I just  
22 said. So again, just a one-liner on the LEA

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sub-grants. And the obvious disclaimer that  
2 it's a ton of money and we do expect that you  
3 will have much more detailed budgets and plans  
4 ultimately if you win this grant with the LEAs  
5 who are participating and you'll track all of  
6 the expenditures and be sure they're in  
7 accordance with everything they're supposed to  
8 be in accordance with and know that they're  
9 subject to audit from the Department. So the  
10 records matter. But you don't need to give  
11 them to us in the front end.

12 Did you have a question?

13 MS. LEBO: Cheryl Lebo from  
14 Arizona. In this -- before we leave budget  
15 this is a comment and more than a question.  
16 When we look at page 93 -- Slide 93 and the  
17 categories of funding it's obvious it was all  
18 done per pupil, which is what most grants are  
19 built on or built off of, which is very  
20 understandable.

21 It would be really nice at some  
22 point in time if other considerations were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 given, as far as geography or space or rural  
2 areas -- rural states, because it costs a  
3 whole lot more to deliver some of those  
4 services and to provide some of that over  
5 large amounts of land than if you have a very  
6 contained state. So just something to think  
7 about. Hopefully, at some point in time some  
8 of our grants will recognize some of that and  
9 afford some opportunity.

10 MS. WEISS: Well, and let me just  
11 point out it -- we did this -- we put this in  
12 response to states saying, What's the  
13 ballpark. This is not a formula. The grant  
14 to you is not a formula. You're figuring out  
15 what your budgets need to be to do the work  
16 you're proposing. And that's what you're  
17 being judged based on. So there is enormous  
18 flexibility for all of you. We're not giving  
19 you formulaic grants here, and it's your job  
20 to step up to the plate and figure out what it  
21 costs to do the work that you're proposing in  
22 your plans.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Okay. So now standing between you  
2 and lunch is (A) (3). Okay. So (A) (3) is  
3 about track record. (A) (3) is about what  
4 progress you've made over the past several  
5 years in each of the four reform areas that  
6 you want to tell us about. And it's about how  
7 you have improved student outcomes overall and  
8 by sub-group --

9           And this, Jeff, is where we're  
10 going to get into the sub-group answer in a  
11 minute.

12           -- since at least 2003 and explain  
13 the connections between the data and the  
14 actions that have contributed to increases in  
15 student achievement, in reading, language arts  
16 and math, decreasing the achievement gaps,  
17 increasing high school graduation rates. So  
18 taking these sort of big three historic  
19 measures, talk the reviewers through the  
20 history of what's happened in your state and  
21 how the data connects to the actions you've  
22 taken and why that should compel reviewers to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 believe that you've got a credible plan that  
2 leads to them thinking that you can either  
3 continue this trend, accelerate this trend,  
4 whatever it is that you have proposed in the  
5 prior criterion.

6           Couple things before we talk in a  
7 little bit more detail about this. The first  
8 is that we have asked you in the evidence for  
9 the NAEP and ESEA results since at least 2003.

10 You can certainly go back farther than this  
11 but in NAEP some of you don't have data to go  
12 back farther than this. Hence, the 2003  
13 deadline. But if you've got more historic  
14 data that you want to bring to bear you're  
15 welcome to do that.

16           We've asked you in the appendix to  
17 include the data that we've requested so that  
18 if peer reviewers want to go back and look at  
19 your raw data they can. I know this is yucky.

20 But you can just print out your raw data.  
21 You don't need to analyze it for the purposes  
22 of the appendix. In your narrative we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 absolutely expect that you will do an analysis  
2 of this data and put together a story around  
3 your data that explains to the reviewers the  
4 answers to the questions that we've posed  
5 here.

6 But in your appendix you can just  
7 include the raw data so that if in your story  
8 and your tables and your charts and your  
9 graphs, whatever you've provided, if the  
10 reviewers want to go look up the data it's in  
11 the appendix and they can do so easily. So  
12 please do provide that data to the -- put  
13 yourself in the shoes of the reviewer and try  
14 to just organize your raw data in a way that  
15 allows them -- that's well indexed so they can  
16 find easily the different things they might  
17 want to look up. And put that in as part of  
18 your appendix.

19 Before I go into the sub-group  
20 question, we've asked for both NAEP and ESEA  
21 in the original application. In the original  
22 notice we asked only for NAEP. Based on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comments we received in part from some of you  
2 in this room, we've added the ESEA numbers to  
3 -- or data to this.

4 The reason we're asking for both  
5 NAEP and ESEA data is because this grant, we  
6 know, will cross a period of time over the  
7 next few years when we'll be transitioning  
8 from No Child Left Behind to whatever ESEA re-  
9 authorization looks like. And NAEP is the  
10 only common measuring stick we'll have to look  
11 across the entire totality of this grant. And  
12 so we wanted to have the historic data, as  
13 well so that we could look sort of backwards  
14 and forwards across this grant to see what was  
15 happening.

16 The ESEA data is in there  
17 obviously because that's the data that you  
18 guys are managing to and care about most. So  
19 we've asked you to tell us the story in  
20 whatever way you want to around both of those  
21 different instruments.

22 Okay. Go ahead. Yes, Kathy, if

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you have a question, go ahead. And then I'll  
2 get into the sub-group question.

3 MS. GAITHER: Thank you. Kathy  
4 Gaither, California. So I don't know if this  
5 is the right place to ask it, but since we're  
6 talking about 2003, one of the questions that  
7 we've had about the definition of persistently  
8 low-achieving school is the length of time.  
9 And we were wondering if you would prefer that  
10 that length of time be consistent with this  
11 set of data, as well. So is 2003 kind of your  
12 benchmark year or is there something else that  
13 you're looking for?

14 MS. WEISS: Yes. We don't have a  
15 benchmark year. We've just asked you -- I  
16 mean, I think different states have taken on  
17 this problem in different periods of time. So  
18 in that -- we'll talk about that more when we  
19 get to criterion -- to Section E. But, no,  
20 we're not necessarily saying that 2003 rules  
21 the whole application. It's just applicable  
22 to this particular question.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Okay. So as we were writing the  
2 application it became apparent to us that if  
3 we put all of the statutory references and  
4 things in the application every single time we  
5 talked about NAEP or ESEA it was going to be  
6 even more unreadable. So we put them all in  
7 one spot in application requirement g. And  
8 here's what that application requirement says.

9           When we say sub-groups, with  
10 respect to NAEP here is what we're talking  
11 about. We're talking about race, ethnicity,  
12 socio-economic status, et cetera. We're also  
13 asking that you tell us the exclusion rate for  
14 students with disabilities, the exclusion rate  
15 for English language learners and your  
16 policies or practices for determining whether  
17 students with disabilities or English language  
18 learners should participate in NAEP and  
19 whether they need accommodations.

20           Those things can all go in  
21 appendices. You don't need to take up your  
22 valuable narrative space with this, but you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 must provide it. And anything like this that  
2 we ask for you should definitely in your  
3 narrative have a clear reference to the place  
4 in the appendix where this is included so that  
5 again, it's easy for reviewers to flip back  
6 there and look up the information.

7           When we're talking about -- when  
8 we use the word sub-groups and we're talking  
9 about high school graduation, college  
10 enrollment, college credit accumulation rates  
11 or the assessments required under ESEA we're  
12 talking about the ESEA sub-groups. And we've  
13 listed them there.

14           And then we have some other places  
15 where we're just broadly talking about the  
16 assessments required under ESEA. And what we  
17 mean there is, Here's your statutory  
18 reference. And then we also ask that when  
19 you're talking about data that you note any  
20 factors like changes in proficiency level cut  
21 scores or things that could impact the  
22 comparability of data from one year to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 next. So that you don't hide that stuff  
2 you're required to make it really transparent  
3 to peer reviewers that if proficiency went way  
4 up or way down because of cut score change  
5 that it is different and the reviewers are  
6 told that it is different from it went way up  
7 or way down with no cut score changed.

8 Okay? So this is the place where  
9 we just shoved all the details into one spot  
10 for you. So did this answer your question?

11 MR. MILLER: Rick Miller,  
12 California. Actually, I want to go back a  
13 slide. My -- I had a question on what you  
14 mean by raw data. You want the raw data that  
15 responds to our narrative? You're not asking  
16 -- are you asking for every grade level and  
17 every subject of raw data, which would be a  
18 huge thing for us? We're happy to provide it.

19 But can't imagine you want it. So that's --

20 MS. WEISS: So what we've asked  
21 for in the criterion --

22 MR. MILLER: Because we need more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 paper.

2 MS. WEISS: -- is we're asking  
3 about increasing student achievement in  
4 reading, language arts and math on NAEP and  
5 ESEA. We haven't necessarily asked you by  
6 grade level. We've asked you in each of those  
7 two areas. So you can give to it us however  
8 you have it. By saying raw format we just  
9 meant we don't want you to spend a ton of time  
10 doing summaries and analysis and extra tables  
11 and charts.

12 So if it's gigantic and that's the  
13 easiest way to give it to us, it's okay to  
14 give us the gigantic thing. Just really  
15 again, put yourself in the mind of a peer  
16 reviewer. They're not going to be going  
17 through all your data. But what they might  
18 want to do is based on something you said in  
19 your narrative they want to look up the raw  
20 data. So just index that thing so they can  
21 actually find what they're looking for easily  
22 and they don't get frustrated and take it out

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on you.

2 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

3 MS. WEISS: That was a joke. For  
4 the camera.

5 (General laughter.)

6 VOICE: They won't do that.

7 MS. WEISS: Okay? And that, I  
8 believe, takes us to lunch. Oh, no. We  
9 actually wanted to come back -- I'm sorry. I  
10 meant to do this before I got started. We  
11 wanted to come back to the question that was  
12 asked and we said during the break, Well,  
13 we'll figure out the answer and get back to  
14 you on it. We did that during the break and  
15 have an answer for you that Jane Hess, Esquire  
16 will now provide.

17 MS. HESS: So, Robert, you asked  
18 before the break about, I think, making some  
19 distinctions among LEAs.

20 MR. REICHARDT: Yes.

21 MS. HESS: And I have a feeling  
22 that some of your questions were maybe

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 answered by the subsequent conversations. But  
2 do you want to repeat your question?

3 MR. REICHARDT: I'll tell you what  
4 I think the answer was.

5 MS. HESS: Okay.

6 MS. WEISS: Wait. Hang on. Let's  
7 get a microphone to you.

8 MR. REICHARDT: I'm Robert  
9 Reichardt from Colorado. So my question was  
10 about differentiating strategies between  
11 districts based on their geographic location.

12 And so my assumption was the answer is you  
13 set the same goals for all districts but that  
14 you may differentiate your strategies for  
15 helping districts get to those goals.

16 MS. HESS: Right. And you can --  
17 your strategies may differ. I think the thing  
18 that you have to be careful about is remember  
19 that for the participating LEA that receive  
20 Title I and that get the sub-grant that -- I  
21 assume that then they're distribution will be  
22 equal according to your plan.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So you can't do something that  
2 will be kind of like a tricky way of trying to  
3 have set up a geographic or a demographic  
4 distinction among those Title I participating  
5 LEAs.       But obviously, your plan can  
6 distinguish among the things that they need to  
7 do.

8           MR.     REICHARDT:       And I'm  
9 interpreting tricky way as a way that would  
10 create incentives to include or exclude  
11 particular geographic regions.

12           MS. HESS: Right. Exactly.

13           MS. WEISS: Right.

14           MS. HESS:     So if they can be  
15 legitimate strategies for differentiation that  
16 are -- that makes sense. They can't be tricky  
17 ways of setting up a barrier to exclude  
18 somebody.

19           MS. WEISS: Right, because it is a  
20 formula sub-grant to that group of LEAs, which  
21 is why, you know, we've said you can't have  
22 competitions, you can't geographically

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 distinguish, all of those kinds of things. So  
2 it can't be just kind of a way to game that  
3 then say, Oh, well, we didn't do it  
4 geographically, we did it this way.

5 MR. REICHARDT: Okay. Thank you  
6 for helping me with that.

7 MS. HESS: Okay.

8 MS. WEISS: Wow. That's sparked  
9 tons -- ten more hands to go up.

10 MR. FOLDESY: Jody Foldesy,  
11 Arizona. And so sort of as a follow-on to  
12 that, what I've picked up from the  
13 conversation is if you wanted to from the  
14 other 50 percent kick more funds to say, rural  
15 LEAs because of the increased cost of  
16 delivering professional development --

17 MS. WEISS: That's fine. Right.

18 MR. FOLDESY: -- that's no  
19 problem. And, frankly, that would also be  
20 used as an enticement for them to become  
21 participating LEAs in the program to begin  
22 with.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Right. That's  
2 correct.

3 MS. HESS: Exactly. And that  
4 touches upon the other thing that I think  
5 maybe was -- the woman from California -- that  
6 you should go back and look at your  
7 definitions of participating LEA, as well as  
8 the Involved LEAs, because if you have an LEA  
9 that wants to participate that doesn't receive  
10 Title I, they still may be participating LEAs,  
11 but it has to come out of the state's 50  
12 percent share, not the 50 percent share that's  
13 strictly for the Title I participating LEAs.

14 MS. WEISS: So did I answer that  
15 wrong before? So would you put it on that  
16 line?

17 [Note earlier discussion of this topic on page  
18 141 of transcript].

19 MS. HESS: Yes.

20 MS. WEISS: Would you put it on  
21 the participating LEAs line?

22 MS. HESS: I would put both on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that line.

2 MS. WEISS: And you would have  
3 them sign an MOU and be on the participating  
4 LEA along --

5 MS. HESS: Right. That -- and  
6 that's clear in the participating LEA  
7 definition. And you still can have that other  
8 sub-group that Joanne talked about that  
9 Involved LEAs who may not be, you know,  
10 participating in a significant way but in  
11 pieces. And again, their part of whatever you  
12 might fund would come out of the state's 50  
13 percent share, not the participating Title I  
14 LEA share.

15 MS. WEISS: Okay. So did you guys  
16 get that? Because that means I answered  
17 Kathy's question wrong earlier. [Note earlier  
18 discussion of this topic on page 141 of  
19 transcript]. So let's just like, go back and  
20 make sure it's clear. So if somebody has zero  
21 Title I share but wants to sign up as a  
22 participating LEA --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HESS: They may.

2 MS. WEISS: -- they may. And that  
3 share -- and how much they get would be  
4 decided by you and put on your -- what -- I  
5 think it's line 12 of your budget for  
6 participating LEAs. And you would in your  
7 budget narrative explain that they had zero  
8 share but you were giving them this money and  
9 they weren't participating.

10 Would you also include them in  
11 your participation charts? You would, right?

12 MS. HESS: Yes.

13 MS. WEISS: So they would all be  
14 included in your summary detail and summary  
15 tables, as well.

16 MR. FANGMAN: Joanne, I just want  
17 to make sure I'm clear on this. You know your  
18 example --

19 MS. WEISS: Good. So me, too,  
20 probably.

21 MR. FANGMAN: It's not this. It's  
22 something else with budget. But when you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 said, for example, if the state would say your  
2 minimum requirement is that everyone has to  
3 participate in all of D, let's say, in all the  
4 criteria in order to sign up for your MOU and  
5 that would be acceptable to the state as a  
6 level of participation that you would receive  
7 funding. Let's say you identify two other  
8 areas. And so some districts choose to go  
9 above that and sign up for that.

10 Then when the funding is given out  
11 it's just -- it's the same -- the formula is  
12 the same regardless of how much they signed up  
13 for. So my district may sign up for  
14 everything but that's not going to get me more  
15 money in the formula. Now, as the state, if I  
16 want to supplement that from the state portion  
17 I can.

18 MS. WEISS: Yes.

19 MR. FANGMAN: But the money  
20 generated through the formula is the same.  
21 That doesn't change if you sign up for more or  
22 just some minimum. Correct?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Right. Correct. And  
2 that's one reason for all or a significant  
3 portion so that you're making sure that  
4 everybody's really participating at a pretty  
5 high level that warrants the grant that you're  
6 going to pass through to them.

7 MS. WOLFE: I have a question  
8 regarding -- oh, I'm sorry. Betty Jane Wolfe,  
9 Louisiana.

10 MS. WEISS: It's not  
11 philosophical. Right?

12 MS. WOLFE: No, it is not. From  
13 what I read between the announcement and the  
14 application regarding Involved LEAs I felt  
15 that the -- it was more pronounced in the  
16 announcement than it was in the application.  
17 And so there was some confusion for me  
18 regarding the rule or the Fed's expectation  
19 around Involved LEAs. And I'm wondering if  
20 you can speak to that, because there did seem  
21 to be a higher emphasis on Involved LEAs in  
22 the announcement than there was in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 application.

2 MS. WEISS: So what do you mean by  
3 announcement?

4 MS. WOLFE: In the actual -- I  
5 didn't bring it with me on paper. But in the  
6 executive summary on the changes that were  
7 made, all -- everything that was released on  
8 November 14 or November 13.

9 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh?

10 MS. WOLFE: It was 120-page  
11 document that went through the Race to the  
12 Top, the regulations.

13 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh.

14 MS. WOLFE: But then when you got  
15 to the actual application it seems as if the  
16 rule of Involved LEAs is somewhat downplayed.  
17 It's not mentioned to the degree that it was  
18 in the regulations. And I'm just curious  
19 about that.

20 MS. WEISS: I don't know that  
21 there's any intention behind it. I mean, I  
22 think we just wanted to -- I mean, so Involved

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 LEAs are not full participants, they're not  
2 sort of part of your core group that's doing  
3 this work. But we recognize that there are  
4 places where it might make sense to involve  
5 others beyond just the participating LEAs in  
6 some of your plans if you really want to  
7 accomplish your reform agenda. So I don't  
8 know that there was any intent or at least,  
9 none that we --

10 MS. WOLFE: There was a -- I'm  
11 sorry. There was interest in collecting  
12 signatures for Involved LEAs in the regs that  
13 -- no?

14 VOICE: No.

15 MS. WOLFE: All right. Just  
16 checking.

17 MS. HESS: I think the only other  
18 distinction is that in the notice of final  
19 priorities Involved LEAs is something that we  
20 didn't have in the publication in the summer.  
21 And so for there we would have more  
22 discussion just to explain why it was being

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 added.

2 MS. WEISS: Right. So that was  
3 something that was not in our preliminary  
4 notice and we added it in response to public  
5 comment from really, a lot of you guys saying,  
6 You know, what if I've got things that I  
7 really need to do statewide and I want to  
8 spend some money on that, can I? So it was  
9 put in there in the final regulations.

10 And so as Jane pointed out, in the  
11 notice of final priorities we have to do a  
12 response to all public comments. That's why  
13 that document is so large. And so we did have  
14 a whole discussion of it because it was  
15 comments we got. And in response we made a  
16 change and we wrote a whole discussion about  
17 that change. But I don't think that we were  
18 trying to say anything beyond that.

19 MS. KOESTNER: Hi. Leah Koestner  
20 from Arizona. I heard how the two-part  
21 question back on Slides 85 and 86 about -- so  
22 just again to clarify between participating

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 LEA and Involved LEAs, now we're saying that  
2 it is a requirement to have them complete all  
3 of the same things as participating LEAs or to  
4 -- I'm sorry -- the Involved LEAs. So now  
5 we're saying they should be listed in all the  
6 --

7 MS. WEISS: No, no, no, no, no.  
8 Sorry. Sorry about that. That was probably  
9 my putting them in when I --

10 MS. KOESTNER: So you're saying to  
11 strengthen our application -- I'm sorry -- to  
12 strengthen our application we can list them in  
13 participating LEAs and give the data on them?

14 MS. WEISS: No. So if an LEA that  
15 is not interested in participating, if there's  
16 something you want them to do and participate  
17 in, some statewide professional development,  
18 some whatever, they would go on the Involved  
19 LEAs' budget. So your money for that would go  
20 there. If you've put a call out to all of the  
21 LEAs in your state and some LEAs have said, I  
22 want to be a participating LEA but I am not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 eligible for any Title I share, that's the  
2 group that I had mistakenly -- I had miscast  
3 before. So that group would sign a MOU, would  
4 count in your numbers. But the money that you  
5 grant them would be at your discretion, taken  
6 out of your 50 percent.

7 MS. KOESTNER: Right. And I guess  
8 that group is the group I'm referring to. Now  
9 we have to collect the data as if they were a  
10 participating LEA?

11 MS. WEISS: Yes, because they've  
12 signed an MOU. So the MOU's an agreement  
13 between you and them.

14 MS. KOESTNER: Okay.

15 MS. WEISS: And they've signed up  
16 as a participating MOU with that agreement.  
17 They're just getting their money out the other  
18 50 percent instead of the sub-grant --

19 MS. KOESTNER: Right.

20 MS. WEISS: -- so they have to go  
21 on that special line in the budget, line 12 in  
22 the budget.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. KOESTNER: Okay. And then my  
2 second question. You mentioned the LEAs can  
3 sign on after the -- after we've submitted an  
4 application and after we've even received the  
5 grant? Is that -- no?

6 MS. WEISS: So what we've said is  
7 that until -- if you receive an award we've  
8 said that you'll have 90 days for the LEAs who  
9 are participating LEAs to get their final  
10 scope of work put together for you during that  
11 period. Now, they have to put a scope of work  
12 together that matches their preliminary scope  
13 of work. During that period if there are some  
14 additional LEAs who've come on in the meantime  
15 you could add them to the application. And at  
16 the end of the 90 days you can sort of lock  
17 the number of participating LEAs and figure  
18 out and calculate the share.

19 MS. KOESTNER: So --

20 MS. WEISS: Later on after you've  
21 submitted your application but before 90 days  
22 after you've been granted the award.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. KOESTNER: So those LEAs, when  
2 they're coming in and filling out these graphs  
3 and saying what percentage of them are high  
4 poverty, you know, so obviously, these are  
5 going to be changing numbers.

6 MS. WEISS: -- will probably  
7 change.

8 MS. KOESTNER: How often do we  
9 have to update that?

10 MS. WEISS: You don't. So --  
11 unless, of course, existing LEAs drop out.  
12 That's the problem that we talked about with  
13 Kathy before. But if you've just got some  
14 more who have come on because they couldn't  
15 get their act together fast enough but you  
16 still want -- you know, they still want to be  
17 included, they've got more time. You don't  
18 have to redo those numbers until the very end.

19 We probably will come back to you and ask you  
20 to lock the numbers in and stuff. But you  
21 don't have to give us constant updates.

22 MS. KOESTNER: Okay. Thank you so

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 much.

2 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh.

3 MS. DeBACKER: Diane Debacker from  
4 Kansas. Is that 90 days from the announcement  
5 of the award or 90 days from the award?

6 MS. WEISS: (No response.)

7 MS. DeBACKER: Ninety days from  
8 cash or 90 days from Wahoo?

9 MS. WEISS: No, it's not from --  
10 it's 90 days from Wahoo because it's --

11 MS. HESS: It will probably be the  
12 90 days from what your grant award says, you  
13 know.

14 VOICE: Right.

15 MS. WEISS: Yes.

16 MS. WEISS: It's 90 days from a  
17 piece of paper, though, not from a check.

18 MS. HESS: Right.

19 MS. McGRATH: This is Melissa  
20 McGrath from Idaho. I just want to make sure.  
21 Are you going to talk about that 90-day  
22 window later? Because I still have the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question about whether the state has the  
2 discretion over whether LEAs can sign up after  
3 the award is announced.

4 MS. WEISS: Okay. So --

5 MS. McGRATH: And how do we deal  
6 with that with our budget?

7 MS. WEISS: Go ahead.

8 MS. HESS: You need to do your  
9 budget based on what you have at the time of  
10 your application. And you do have the  
11 flexibility of adding in additional LEAs  
12 within that 90-day time period. And you'd  
13 have to adjust your budget.

14 MS. WEISS: Do they have the  
15 flexibility of not?

16 MS. McGRATH: Do we have to sign  
17 up --

18 MS. HESS: No.

19 MS. McGRATH: -- if an LEA comes  
20 to us? So we can choose to let them but we do  
21 not have to?

22 MS. HESS: Right.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. McGRATH: Okay. But then it's  
2 not like we're going to go back to the U.S.  
3 Department of Education and say, Hey, we had  
4 five more sign up.

5 MS. WEISS: It doesn't matter  
6 because your 50 percent isn't changing. It's  
7 the share to the others that's changing --

8 MS. HESS: Right.

9 MS. WEISS: -- when new ones sign  
10 on.

11 MS. McGRATH: So if new ones sign  
12 on we will --

13 MS. WEISS: So your budget  
14 wouldn't change anyway necessarily. The total  
15 amount of your 50 percent is constant. It's  
16 how much the others are getting when new  
17 people sign on. That's the number that's  
18 going to be changing.

19 MS. McGRATH: So just to clarify  
20 though, if we apply for \$75 million based on X  
21 number of LEAs, I mean, are we going to get  
22 more if more sign on?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HESS: No.

2 MS. WEISS: No.

3 MS. McGRATH: No?

4 MS. WEISS: You're going to re-  
5 allocate -- you're going to re-allocate their  
6 50 percent across more people.

7 MS. McGRATH: Okay. Thank you.

8 MS. HESS: And you'll be judged by  
9 the number that you came in with --

10 MS. WEISS: Right.

11 MS. HESS: -- in your application.

12 So if you -- but if say, there was someone  
13 you were negotiating with that you really  
14 wanted but they just couldn't get it together  
15 by the time of the application and then --

16 MS. WEISS: You could let them in.

17 MS. HESS: Then you could let them  
18 in. But it wouldn't alter your grant amount,  
19 it wouldn't alter the way you were judged.

20 MS. McGRATH: And it is your  
21 choice?

22 MS. HESS: And it's your choice.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: And it's your choice.  
2 When you set that deadline.

3 Rick? Hang on. Wait for the  
4 mike, if you don't mind.

5 MR. MILLER: Just to follow that,  
6 too. You could theoretically also hold back  
7 -- say, hold back 5 percent of your 50 percent  
8 for possible entry of another LEA and then use  
9 that to fund it, to fund additional LEAs that  
10 come in?

11 MS. HESS: Sure.

12 MS. WEISS: Yes.

13 And I think there was a -- wasn't  
14 there a question here?

15 MS. DeBACKER: Again, Diane  
16 DeBacker from Kansas. So we have lots of  
17 questions in Kansas as to how much they may  
18 receive. And we really have no way of telling  
19 them what they could receive because we won't  
20 know that until we finally know the last  
21 number of LEAs that are participating. That's  
22 the bottom line.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Uh-huh.

2 MS. DeBACKER: Okay.

3 MS. WEISS: Yes. We realize it  
4 sets up an interesting dynamic.

5 MS. DeBACKER: Thank you.

6 MS. WEISS: Talk to Congress about  
7 that.

8 Are we all questioned out and  
9 ready for lunch?

10 MS. HESS: Can I just say one  
11 thing, Joanne?

12 MS. WEISS: Yes.

13 MS. HESS: I just wanted to  
14 clarify that anyone can ask questions. Just  
15 when you ask, just say where you're from if  
16 you're not from the SEA just please identify  
17 where you're from. But anyone is welcome to  
18 ask questions.

19 MS. WEISS: Yes. We got a  
20 question whether people who were not from a  
21 state, who were just members of the public  
22 could ask questions. And the answer is yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Just say what your organization is when you  
2 ask a question. So, yes, it's a public  
3 meeting and anyone can ask.

4 All right. Thank you so much.  
5 And we will see you back in here at 1:15. So  
6 a little over an hour from now for the  
7 afternoon session. The strap-yourself-in part  
8 is over. Now we get into the more pedestrian  
9 parts. So thank you.

10 (Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the  
11 hearing was adjourned, to reconvene this same  
12 day, December 3, 2009 at 1:15 p.m.)

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 momentum out there and initiatives regarding  
2 states coming together in consortia to build  
3 common standards and then on down the line to  
4 build common assessments aligned to those  
5 standards. And so part of the purpose of  
6 these criteria is to support that because we  
7 think that's a good thing to not have 50  
8 different goalposts out there.

9 The other major thing we're doing  
10 in this section is we realize that there's a  
11 lot of hard and important work to do once you  
12 actually have those standards, once you have  
13 enhanced standards and high quality  
14 assessments, to actually translate them into  
15 practice that's relevant in the classroom.  
16 And so this is also about supporting that.  
17 And I'll talk about that more in a second.

18 Okay. So we're going to start  
19 with (B) (1), which is on common standards.  
20 And I just want to make a note. You'll see a  
21 bunch of text that's in red and you probably  
22 saw this earlier. The red is -- it's not to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 indicate what's important. It's not like the  
2 peer reviewers are going to use the red text  
3 more than other things. They're just things  
4 we want to help you get clarity on in today's  
5 session. So --

6 So (B) (1) on common standards has  
7 two main points. The first is regarding the  
8 state's participation in a consortium  
9 regarding common standards. And that itself  
10 breaks into two points, A and B.

11 First, whether the consortium is  
12 working towards jointly developing and  
13 adopting a common set of standards that are  
14 supported by evidence that they're  
15 internationally benchmarked and will prepare  
16 students for success in college and careers.  
17 And you'll notice that we have a definition  
18 here, common set of K-12 standards that I'm  
19 not going to go in depth on, but you should  
20 just refer to that.

21 The second part of the state's  
22 participation in a consortium is the extent to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 which that consortium includes a significant  
2 number of states. And actually going to skip  
3 forward a few slides. So we've gotten  
4 questions on what does a significant number of  
5 states mean. And so this is a case where  
6 reviewer guidance is particularly worth noting  
7 -- if the number of states in your consortium  
8 are a majority or more of the country you  
9 would get high points, and you would get  
10 medium or low points if it's less than a  
11 majority.

12 So you may ask, what are high and  
13 what are low points? So in the application on  
14 page 77 we've put a table that says, For  
15 criteria of different point values what should  
16 a high quality response to that criterion  
17 earn, what should a medium quality response  
18 earn and what should a low quality response  
19 earn. The point of this is so that reviewers  
20 are scoring things consistently and something  
21 that's high quality in one application would  
22 be, you know, scored similarly to something in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 another. They're ranges in that for all of  
2 those things. It's on page 77 of your  
3 application. So this tells the reviewers what  
4 ranges they should score this part of that  
5 criterion based on the number of states in the  
6 consortium.

7 So now I'm going to go back and  
8 now we're going to go to the second part of  
9 (B) (1) (ii). And this is regarding the state's  
10 adoption of standards. And we've put in  
11 slightly different aspects of the criterion  
12 for Phase 1 applicants and for Phase 2  
13 applicants. So for Phase 1 applicants it's  
14 the state's high quality plan demonstrating  
15 commitment and progress to adopting by August  
16 2, 2010 or at a minimum, by a later date that  
17 the state specifies in 2010.

18 And you may ask what does "at a  
19 minimum" mean. So I'm again going to skip  
20 forward here. At a minimum signals that it is  
21 better and you get more points if your plan  
22 has made progress towards adoption by August

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 2. So under this criterion a Phase 1  
2 applicant would be in the high points range if  
3 they show commitment to and progress towards  
4 adoption by August 2. There isn't a median  
5 points range for this criteria. You'd get low  
6 points if, regarding the "at a minimum", you  
7 display a high quality plan to get to adoption  
8 by a later date in 2010 that you specify.

9 And this is similar for Phase 2  
10 applicants. So for Phase 2 applicants it's  
11 about adoption of standards by August 2, 2010.

12 That's what you have to do to get high  
13 points. And then or at a minimum, say at a  
14 later date in 2010. And that could get you  
15 low points.

16 So now we're going to go to the  
17 evidence for this criterion. Seeing no  
18 questions.

19 MS. WEISS: Wait. There we go.

20 MR. BENDOR: Oh, I prompted one.

21 MR. UNDERWOOD: I'm Steve  
22 Underwood from Idaho. And so my question

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about the adoption process is our state  
2 requires a certain procedure for the adoption  
3 standards, including adoption by the board and  
4 adoption by the Legislature and all that type  
5 of stuff. So it's not within the realm of  
6 possibility to my knowledge to actually get it  
7 done by the end of 2010. So if we have  
8 legislative procedures in place that prevent  
9 that is there any type of waiver available or  
10 anything to mitigate that point loss.

11 MS. HESS: No. Sorry.

12 MR. BENDOR: You could explain  
13 that and then go for the "by a later specified  
14 date in 2010".

15 All right. So now we're on the  
16 evidence for (B) (1) (i). And so it's pretty  
17 straightforward. It's the copy of your  
18 agreement showing you're part of a standards  
19 consortium. We haven't specified what form  
20 that agreement should take. It's just, Show  
21 us evidence that you are part of the  
22 consortium you say you're a part of. Then a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 copy of the standards if they're final, a copy  
2 of the final standards. If they're a draft, a  
3 copy of the draft standards. Documentation  
4 that they are or will be internationally  
5 benchmarked and will prepare students for  
6 college and careers. And then the number of  
7 states participating in your consortium and  
8 which states those are.

9 So just a quick note. Reviewers  
10 will be judging -- and we talked about high  
11 quality standards earlier in (B)(1). What  
12 they'll be judging is this documentation that  
13 you give them. They won't be looking afresh  
14 at the standards you sent them and doing a new  
15 analysis of that. They'll be looking at the  
16 evidence you give them under bullet three here  
17 of the document.

18 Okay. Questions?

19 MS. LEBO: Cheryl Lebo from  
20 Arizona. If you're adopting the common core  
21 I'm wondering what the copy of the final  
22 standards should be. If you would have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 documentation from the State Board of  
2 Education, for example, in the State of  
3 Arizona they're the ones who approve. So if I  
4 have the minutes and it's a board agenda item  
5 the approval of the common core standards  
6 becoming the Arizona standards we would still  
7 have to provide a copy of standards or just  
8 the documentation that that's been taken care  
9 of?

10 MR. BENDOR: You should provide  
11 those standards.

12 MS. WEISS: Go back to the  
13 question. I mean, like, on the slides.

14 So you're being judged on a bunch  
15 of things. The copy of the standards and the  
16 participation in a consortium is for  
17 (B) (1) (1).

18 MS. LEBO: Okay.

19 MS. WEISS: And then go on. The  
20 documentation of adoption is for (B) (1) (ii).  
21 So they're each worth different points so you  
22 want to provide them both.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEBE: Okay. All right. So  
2 we can just -- can't just provide the common  
3 core standards and just put Arizona on top of  
4 it and that's it?

5 MR. BENDOR: So you're --

6 MS. WEISS: Yes.

7 MS. LEBE: Because if you're  
8 adopting that's different than aligning. If  
9 you're adopting --

10 MS. WEISS: Right.

11 MS. LEBE: -- the term would be  
12 you're just adopting.

13 MS. WEISS: Right, right, right.  
14 So, yes. So all I'm saying is just make sure  
15 that you're responding to both parts of the  
16 criteria.

17 MS. LEBE: I see. Okay. All  
18 right.

19 MS. WEISS: But, yes. If you're  
20 adopting, you're adopting. And you say you're  
21 adopting and actually, you don't even need to  
22 -- I mean, yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LEBE: Because that's just a  
2 whole lot of pages, et cetera, et cetera to  
3 send in if it's the same set of --

4 MR. BENDOR: Yes.

5 MS. WEISS: You mean if you send  
6 in the actual standards?

7 MS. LEBE: The standards  
8 themselves. Right. Exactly.

9 MR. BENDOR: We'll be talking  
10 about this more in a second. But --

11 MS. LEBE: Okay.

12 MR. BENDOR: -- the way you're  
13 going to submit this is on a CD or DVD.

14 MS. LEBE: Okay. All right.

15 MR. BENDOR: So --

16 MS. LEBE: Thanks.

17 MR. MUENKS: Michael Muenks from  
18 Missouri. I noticed in the definitions there  
19 was no definition of internationally  
20 benchmarked. And so I was wondering do you  
21 have any comments about that, because it's  
22 hanging out there. I'm not quite sure what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the level of expectation is there.

2 MR. BENDOR: So I don't know if  
3 other folks want to comment on that. But, you  
4 know, you have the criterion and the guidance  
5 we've given reviewers is what we've put in  
6 here. So it's -- there is nothing sort of  
7 else that's hidden that we're planning to give  
8 them that we haven't given you.

9 MS. WEISS: Yes. But the goal  
10 here is not that the Department is deciding  
11 whether they've been internationally  
12 benchmarked. It's that you're doing that work  
13 as part of your consortium and you're just  
14 providing documentation to show what you did  
15 and how you did it. So there is no, as Josh  
16 said, other standard out there that we're  
17 holding you to. It's literally what did you  
18 do to show that your standards are  
19 internationally benchmarked. Describe it.

20 MR. MILLER: Rick Miller,  
21 California. This -- I'm going to do this in  
22 the context of the standards question but it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 really actually goes to the whole application  
2 in the sense -- if our Legislature adopted  
3 standards through a bill but said, Contingent  
4 on getting Race to the Top funding -- and you  
5 can really say that for anything -- how would  
6 that impact our -- the application?

7 MS. WEISS: So we did get this  
8 question from somebody sent to our e-mail  
9 line. And we will be putting out an answer to  
10 it in the frequently asked questions notice.  
11 I guess you asking it makes it now frequent.  
12 Now we have -- so, yes, we need to just sort  
13 of get back to you with an answer to this  
14 question of what if something is passed  
15 contingent on an award. So we'll get back to  
16 you with an answer to that question.

17 Clearly, though, I want to put in  
18 a commercial for saying we hope that what  
19 we're incenting people to do is the right  
20 thing, whether or not they win an award. So  
21 that would be our official hope.

22 MR. BENDOR: Okay. So -- and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're now going to look at the evidence. The  
2 evidence regarding adoption, which we got  
3 ourselves towards a little bit. So this is  
4 pretty straightforward.

5 For Phase 1 applicants it's going  
6 to be the legal process in your state and your  
7 plan, your status and your time frame for how  
8 you're going to get to adoption. So for Phase  
9 1 applicants -- for Phase 2 applicants it's  
10 evidence that you have adopted or if you  
11 haven't, the same information we're asking for  
12 from the Phase 1 applicants.

13 We've --

14 MS. WEISS: There's a question.

15 MR. BENDOR: There's a question?  
16 Yes, please.

17 MS. LOPEZ: I assume I know the  
18 answer but I just want to check. So if you  
19 apply in Phase 1 you've joined a consortium  
20 with a majority of states, you have every  
21 intention of adopting them and you don't  
22 because you don't have the final standards,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just, you know, theoretically speaking. And  
2 when you do get them they don't actually align  
3 to what you want to adopt. You receive an  
4 award, let's just say, and you've -- you know,  
5 that -- there's a point between March and  
6 August. Right? If you're -- if you don't  
7 ultimately adopt them in good faith, not you  
8 didn't -- you know, it wasn't intentional when  
9 you submitted the grant, I assume then that  
10 the award itself would be contingent upon the  
11 actual adoption by August or no?

12 MR. BENDOR: Jane, do you want to  
13 --

14 MS. HESS: You're talking about  
15 Phase 1 application. Well, I don't think that  
16 -- I mean, for this part of the points for  
17 Phase 1 you've committed to adopting. And we  
18 haven't in the rubric, you know, made  
19 something different for what happens if you  
20 don't. But the points for Phase 1 are based  
21 on your commitment to adopt.

22 MR. BENDOR: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. CURRAN: Cynthia Curran from  
2 Alaska. And we are one of two holdouts on  
3 common core. So I have to ask this question.  
4 We're losing the 40 points if we were to  
5 apply in Phase 2. There's nothing that  
6 precludes us from applying because we aren't  
7 willing to sign on to common core, but we're  
8 just willing to monitor. Correct?

9 MR. BENDOR: This is not an  
10 eligibility requirement. You are eligible to  
11 apply even if you wouldn't get points under  
12 this criterion.

13 MS. HESS: Well, and -- which I  
14 think also kind of goes back maybe to the  
15 original Idaho question that it's not like  
16 there's a waiver in place. But you just might  
17 not get points under this section. And it's  
18 conceivable that you could still have a  
19 successful application without it.

20 MR. BENDOR: All right. That was  
21 good. And now we have more questions.

22 MR. PARMAN: Dennis Parman from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Montana. There's nothing in what I've seen --  
2 this is a question. There's nothing in what  
3 I've seen here that suggests that the state or  
4 consortium of states must adopt the CCSSO/NGA  
5 common core standards. It's the process that  
6 a consortium and the states in that consortium  
7 would go through to, in whatever method that  
8 they see fit, develop a set of internationally  
9 benchmarked standards and their description of  
10 how it is they went through that. Is that  
11 correct?

12 MR. BENDOR: This notice doesn't  
13 take a position on a specific set of  
14 standards.

15 VOICE: Can you say that again?

16 MS. HESS: We're not endorsing.

17 MS. WEISS: We're not -- the  
18 Department isn't here to endorse a particular  
19 consortium over another consortium. So we  
20 have made this consortium-neutral. It doesn't  
21 specifically refer to the common core or any  
22 other consortium. We're just saying we think

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 common is an important thing in this country.

2 That's worth rewarding. The fact that so  
3 many states have come together around one  
4 thing is great. But we're not requiring or  
5 endorsing that one thing.

6 Try it again.

7 MR. HINTON: Kent Hinton from  
8 Hawaii. So when you say common it doesn't  
9 have to be the Common Core standards, it just  
10 has to be that the nation has started it --  
11 it's a common core standards that the  
12 consortium could be developing or could adopt  
13 the nation common core?

14 MS. WEISS: Wait. So -- see, ours  
15 doesn't say Common Core. Ours just says we  
16 have -- we're using the word common in a  
17 common way. So we are -- so in our document  
18 we have said there's a common set of K-12  
19 standards shared across the members of the  
20 consortium. So this is not common core with  
21 capital CC. Is that your question?

22 MR. HINTON: That's my question.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Thank you.

2 MR. BENDOR: And the criterion  
3 includes certain things that you will get  
4 points on, certain criteria that you would get  
5 points on based on the information about your  
6 common standards, the states in the  
7 consortium, your partner states adoption.

8 So these slides we have seen.  
9 These were about the points related to  
10 significant number of states. Points related  
11 to adoption. Now we're on to Criterion  
12 (B) (2). Criterion (B) (2) is about the  
13 development of common, high-quality  
14 assessments that are aligned to common  
15 standards.

16 Because most of the assessment  
17 work is done in the separate Race to the Top  
18 assessment competition that some of you may  
19 have been in this fine city for, also, you'll  
20 notice that this criterion is not worth as  
21 many points as the one before. That's not  
22 because we think it's not important, just

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because there is also work being done on it in  
2 another competition. And for that reason it's  
3 also just about the extent to which they start  
4 participating in the development of common  
5 assessments and doesn't actually ask them to  
6 go in details into their plans.

7 So the evidence here. Again, we  
8 ask for a Memorandum of Agreement. We haven't  
9 specified an exact format for that. This is  
10 again, just evidence that you are in the group  
11 that you say you are in or we have -- give you  
12 different options here, or documentation that  
13 you have applied or intent to apply for the  
14 separate Race to the Top assessment consortium  
15 or other evidence that you're planning to  
16 develop and adopt common high-quality  
17 assessments. And then we also ask you for the  
18 number of states participating in your  
19 consortium.

20 So as you noticed in this  
21 criterion, one of the points is the extent to  
22 which the assessment consortium includes a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 significant number of states. So again, we've  
2 defined what that means in terms of the  
3 points. We've defined it in the same way as  
4 we have for Criterion (B)(1).

5 Some of you may have noticed this,  
6 and we've gotten some questions on this, but  
7 there is a requirement in the notice -- and  
8 this is related to the fact that we have this  
9 separate assessment competition -- that you  
10 can't use funds awarded under this Race to the  
11 Top competition to pay for costs related to  
12 statewide summative assessments, such as the  
13 state assessments required under the ESEA.

14 That's because we're planning to  
15 fund it in a common way through this other  
16 competition. And so we don't want the funds  
17 under this competition going to lots of states  
18 doing this independently when we're funding it  
19 in a common way elsewhere. This doesn't refer  
20 to, you know, interim assessments, unit or  
21 lesson tests, those sorts of things.

22 Before I take questions I just

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 want to note we've gotten a number of  
2 questions on this and we are working on FAQs  
3 in response. So if you've sent us your  
4 question by e-mail, let's skip it here, and  
5 we'll get back to you that way. Otherwise,  
6 let's see. But I may go quickly on this one.

7 Do you still want to ask? Okay.

8 MR. FOLDESY: I'll take a shot.  
9 Jody Foldesy, Arizona. We've had a lot of  
10 interest in what are called board exams or  
11 board assessments, specifically International  
12 Baccalaureate, Edexcel, Cambridge. Can these  
13 be funded under Race to the Top?

14 MR. BENDOR: I think that's the  
15 kind of thing that we want to get back to you  
16 on in these FAQs that we're preparing that  
17 we'll answer some of the stuff more broadly,  
18 unless anyone here wants to speak to that  
19 specifically.

20 MS. WEISS: No, I think that's  
21 right. There's been a bunch of different  
22 permutations that we've gotten questions

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about. That's one, and we just want to sort  
2 of go back and think about it in a  
3 comprehensive way and get one set of guidance  
4 out to folks on this.

5 MR. BENDOR: Yes. So let me  
6 actually go forward, because I'm running late  
7 on time on this section, and we can come back  
8 to questions on these if there's time at the  
9 end, and especially given that we're doing the  
10 FAQ coming up on this.

11 So now we're moving on to  
12 Criterion (B) (3). So we know that this is  
13 where a lot of the really hard work is in  
14 terms of you've actually got better standards,  
15 better assessments that you've developed, now  
16 you actually need to translate them into  
17 practice, so things like developing  
18 instructional materials, professional  
19 development is both challenging and important  
20 and expensive. So this is a part in the  
21 notice where we want you to lay out your  
22 plans, and it also provides a hook for those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sorts of things to be funded in your plan.

2 One thing I want to note here is  
3 there's a requirement in the notice that some  
4 of you may have seen about sharing work, so if  
5 you're developing work under this grant and  
6 it's not protected by some law or contract  
7 otherwise, we say you have to share that on  
8 some website that we're going to point you to,  
9 or in some other ways.

10 The reason we're doing this is  
11 because states that have now developed  
12 standards in common with each other and are  
13 doing this sort of work will be developing  
14 things that are useful to each other, and so  
15 we want to create a system where people are  
16 benefitting from each other's work, especially  
17 after the competition period is ended, rather  
18 than all having vulcanized things and  
19 duplicating the same work. And if you're  
20 curious, that program requirement is on page  
21 95 of the application.

22 Most of this criterion itself is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 actually a list where we give you examples of  
2 the kinds of activities you could engage in,  
3 in this area. So, and we do this in a number  
4 of places in the notice where we give you an  
5 example list. You don't have to do all the  
6 things there, you could do other things as  
7 well, but this is to provide some color and  
8 clarity so that you understand what we're  
9 talking about.

10 Any questions here? Okay. Yes --

11 MR. UNDERWOOD: Steve Underwood,  
12 Idaho. And it goes back to the idea of the  
13 two different grant competitions between the  
14 -- I don't know which that one, if it's an  
15 enhanced grant assessment type of thing or  
16 not, but if they're both competitive grants,  
17 and let's say we get the Race to the Top grant  
18 approved, but we don't get funded under the  
19 other grant, and then we have adopted new  
20 standards by the end of the year, we would  
21 also have to research and develop new tests by  
22 the end of the next school year, which

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requires a lot of funding, especially if we  
2 don't have -- I mean we have the consortium  
3 states with the standards, but not a  
4 consortium with the assessments, and so then  
5 we'd be left in a pretty big bind if we don't  
6 have any money to make that match. So any  
7 guidance on that?

8 MS. WEISS: Yes, so the way  
9 they're thinking about the Race to the Top  
10 assessment competition is that, to the extent  
11 that the groups that win that competition to  
12 develop new assessments are developing  
13 assessments that might match your standards,  
14 even if you're not in that consortium, we're  
15 thinking that we are hopefully creating sort  
16 of a portfolio or market of assessments that  
17 you'll be able to pick from even if you're not  
18 in the consortium and use.

19 So our hope is not that everybody  
20 now replicates times 50 a new set of  
21 assessments that match these standards, but  
22 rather that this competition, whether you're

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in a winning consortium or not, is funding a  
2 bunch of assessments that will be applicable  
3 to you if the standards match what you're  
4 trying to accomplish. The whole -- so that's  
5 one part.

6 The other part of your question  
7 was a timing question, and that is a  
8 transition issue that I think we're all trying  
9 to work through, and we'll try to put out some  
10 guidance for how we'll provide time for people  
11 to make the transition from one to the other  
12 without being in the bind you're talking  
13 about, about suddenly having to have a test  
14 like this because you've adopted standards and  
15 tomorrow you're supposed to be testing against  
16 them.

17 So we'll try to come out with some  
18 more orderly transition guidance there that  
19 will not be instantaneous. It's part of the  
20 reason that in here we said that the  
21 assessments -- that the standards will be  
22 adopted or be implemented in a thoughtful way

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 over time. Just because they're adopted today  
2 doesn't mean they're in use period by  
3 everybody tomorrow. You need to think of an  
4 implementation plan that makes sense for your  
5 state also.

6 MR. UNDERWOOD: So if our adoption  
7 -- if our plan said something like we're  
8 adopting them, but they're going to have an  
9 effective date of such and such. Okay. Thank  
10 you.

11 DR. MATTSON: Dirk Mattson,  
12 Minnesota. Just a quick clarification on 122.  
13 The second bullet on slide 122 talks about  
14 classroom level exams designed and used at the  
15 local level. I'm assuming, or am I assuming  
16 incorrectly, does that prohibit the state from  
17 facilitating formative or interim assessments  
18 with its 50 percent? This is -- I guess the  
19 thing about designed and used at the local  
20 level is throwing me off. It does not  
21 prohibit the state from facilitating that as  
22 part of its plan?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Right. No, it does  
2 not.

3 DR. MATTSON: Thank you.

4 MS. WEISS: I mean the idea is  
5 that we know that assessment is an integral  
6 part of improving teaching and learning, so we  
7 weren't trying to sort of prohibit work on  
8 assessments, we think they're critical to the  
9 whole teaching and learning process that  
10 you're trying to implement here. It was just  
11 we don't want states rebuilding or investing a  
12 lot of money in their current assessments --

13 DR. MATTSON: Makes sense.

14 MS. WEISS: -- while we're putting  
15 this other competition out there to do them  
16 differently.

17 DR. MATTSON: Thank you.

18 MR. BENDOR: All right. Let's go  
19 forward then.

20 So (B) (3) has optional performance  
21 measures. You'll see this is a few more cases  
22 and I'm going to highlight sort of what does

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 optional mean here. So sometimes performance  
2 measures are optional. We've requested  
3 performance measures only where we want to  
4 report on the data nationally. You can  
5 include optional measures if you want. So  
6 people have asked us what does that mean.

7 So reviewers are going to judge  
8 your plan and that's going to include the  
9 goals and evidence you lay out, and we -- as  
10 Meredith talked about on page 4 of the  
11 application, there's directions on the sorts  
12 of things that are supposed to be included in  
13 the state's plan. So if the way you're  
14 putting together your plan lends itself to  
15 performance measures, the performance measures  
16 would make our plan make more sense, be more  
17 persuasive, be clearer, you might want to  
18 include performance measures in this case, or  
19 in other cases where they're optional.

20 If that wasn't the case, if it  
21 wouldn't add clarity to your plan, then you  
22 don't need to do it. We're not going to have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a box in the reviewer form where, for this  
2 criteria, and since performance measures are  
3 optional, well, they'll be -- they are  
4 supposed to say, did the state have  
5 performance measures. So you won't be  
6 penalized for not having them. Does that make  
7 sense?

8 MS. WEISS: C.

9 MR. BENDOR: C. All right. Data  
10 Systems. So there are three criteria under C.  
11 We've got one state reform conditions  
12 criterion, so that's the "what have you  
13 accomplished" that Meredith was talking about  
14 earlier; that's actually the one she used as  
15 an example. And then there are two reform  
16 plan criteria, and these are plan related.

17 Just to give you a quick overview  
18 of how these relate to each other, the first  
19 is regarding what elements exist in your  
20 statewide longitudinal data system when you  
21 apply; the second is about access to and use  
22 of data in your statewide longitudinal data

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 system; and the third is about data systems at  
2 the local level to improve instruction at the  
3 local level.

4 So (C)(1), you've seen this, but  
5 we didn't talk about the substance. It's  
6 pretty straightforward. You'll note that the  
7 scoring works -- so you get two points per  
8 America COMPETES element. There 12 elements,  
9 therefore this is worth 24 points. You'll see  
10 that on this slide as well as in the reviewer  
11 guidance. We've included the America COMPETES  
12 elements as a definition in the notice, just  
13 so you have a handy reference to them. This  
14 slide is an abbreviated version of them.

15 Wow. That was straightforward.  
16 Okay. Going on to (C)(2).

17 MS. WEISS: No, no.

18 MR. BENDOR: No, no? It wasn't?

19 (General laughter.)

20 MR. BENDOR: Only until I  
21 threatened to move on was it.

22 MR. FOLDESY: Jody Foldesy,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Arizona. So I think it's a pretty simple  
2 question, if you don't have it, do you write  
3 anything, do you skip it entirely? Is there  
4 any value in writing -- so for example student  
5 level college readiness test scores, number 10  
6 or whatever.

7 MR. BENDOR: Yes.

8 MR. FOLDESY: Leave it blank?

9 MR. BENDOR: So, you know,  
10 reviewers are going to evaluate based on what  
11 you see here to the extent to which you have  
12 them in place currently, so.

13 MR. FOLDESY: Okay. Thanks.

14 MR. BENDOR: And that's why you'll  
15 notice this one has a relatively short  
16 recommended page length. And the evidence  
17 you're supposed to provide is just  
18 documentation of the ones you have.

19 Yes.

20 MR. PENNINGTON: Could you go back  
21 to the slide, to that America COMPETES Act?

22 Hi. This is Jay Pennington from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Iowa. You know, I've seen different  
2 iterations of this slide. If we look at the  
3 ARRA funding legislation, you know, these are  
4 sort of broken up. Just as an example, one,  
5 two, three might include not just K through 12  
6 education, but also K through 12 plus higher  
7 ed.

8 And so just as an example, you  
9 know, in Iowa we have a unique student  
10 identifier. However, not all students  
11 throughout the entire P20 system have that  
12 unique ID. In other words, those from the K-  
13 12 system certainly that articulates on, but  
14 for those that may not start in the K-12  
15 system, that may start later on, a unique ID  
16 hasn't been assigned to them.

17 And so it's somewhat -- I'm just  
18 trying to get a gauge of is this the actual  
19 list, or -- because I've seen different  
20 versions of it --

21 MR. BENDOR: Don't use this slide.

22 So what you should use is the definition that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we give in the notice which you can find on  
2 page 11 of the application, I believe. Yes,  
3 it's page 11 of the application. So we use it  
4 "as defined in this notice" because we want to  
5 use that definition, and, you know, you're  
6 going to provide documentation that you have  
7 these, and so if you think something is  
8 somehow in between the documentation, you  
9 could explain --

10 MR. PENNINGTON: Well, in my  
11 particular example, so if it did include, you  
12 know, the entire spectrum of, you know, K-12  
13 plus higher education, we can technically  
14 answer the question for most of the students.

15 Right? Not those that originate, that start  
16 in post-secondary? Am I making sense? So do  
17 I just say that, you know, essentially --

18 MR. BENDOR: Yes, I mean --

19 MR. PENNINGTON: -- so we can  
20 leave the --

21 MR. BENDOR: -- you should explain  
22 it in your application. If it doesn't fit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 neatly into one for the boxes -- you should  
2 just explain what you have, and if it doesn't  
3 fit neatly, explain how it fits closely. And  
4 that's a judgment that reviewers are going to  
5 be making, so, you know, there's -- yes.

6 MS. KOESTNER: Leah Koestner,  
7 Arizona. Just going off of what Jody said, so  
8 if we have a plan to put it in place, it's --  
9 that's rearranged --

10 MR. BENDOR: Yes, this is not a  
11 plan.

12 MS. KOESTNER: Okay. No points.

13 MR. BENDOR: This is not a plan,  
14 this is what you have.

15 MS. KOESTNER: Okay. Thank you.

16 DR. PLATO: Hi. Kathleen Plato,  
17 Washington State. This ties into the  
18 gentleman's question about the definition of  
19 the America COMPETES Act elements and the  
20 bridge between the state SFSF application and  
21 the Race to the Top application. I know that  
22 there was great effort made to try to align

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these, but this is an exact example of where  
2 they don't align.

3 So the SFSF specifically asks for  
4 pre-K through post-secondary whether you have  
5 the 12 elements, and I don't believe that the  
6 Race to the Top asks for pre-K through  
7 secondary. And I have -- I brought my SFSF  
8 application because that's on my plate as  
9 well. So I would be in the position of  
10 answering on the SFSF whether we have a pre-K  
11 through post-secondary set of America COMPETES  
12 Act elements and the answer would be one way.

13 In the Race to the Top application focusing  
14 just on K-12 would be actually a different  
15 response.

16 MS. WEISS: So can we ask that you  
17 submit that to our e-mail address, submit your  
18 question, because our understanding is that  
19 these elements, they say within the element  
20 this is P16, this is higher ed down for  
21 element number, for example, 11. So send us  
22 your question so we can go back and pull the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 documents and actually look at this and read  
2 it.

3 DR. PLATO: Okay.

4 MS. WEISS: That'd be great.  
5 Thanks. And we'll get that back out in an FAQ  
6 to people.

7 MR. BENDOR: Anything else?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. BENDOR: So now we're on to  
10 (C) (2). (C) (2) is about accessing and using  
11 the data that's in a state system. This is a  
12 plan criterion, so you're talk about your plan  
13 to enable this. And this is in regards to the  
14 statewide longitudinal data system contrasting  
15 with what we'll talk about shortly in (C) (3).

16 Any questions about this one?

17 MS. McGRATH: Melissa McGrath from  
18 Idaho. I just want to clarify. So (C) (1) is  
19 about what you already have --

20 MR. BENDOR: Yes.

21 MS. McGRATH: -- and (C) (2) is  
22 about what you plan to do.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: (C) (1) is about what  
2 you have, (C) (2) is what you plan to do --

3 MS. McGRATH: You can include what  
4 you already have, but it's mostly about what  
5 --

6 MR. BENDOR: Right.

7 MS. McGRATH: -- you plan to do to  
8 --

9 MR. BENDOR: But notice that  
10 (C) (2) talks about your access and use of that  
11 data to engage stakeholders and policy makers.

12 MS. McGRATH: Okay. So what do  
13 you mean by that? Sorry. Do you mean just  
14 that what we plan to do to access and use of  
15 data?

16 MR. BENDOR: Right.

17 MS. McGRATH: Okay. I just want  
18 to make sure because we're -- as many of you  
19 know, Idaho is pretty far behind in SLDS. I  
20 just thought I would ask that.

21 MR. BENDOR: So, just to be clear.  
22 (C) (1) is about the elements that you have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 currently in your system, (C) (2) is about your  
2 plan to use your system so that data is  
3 accessible and used to inform key  
4 stakeholders.

5 Anything else on (C) (2)?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. BENDOR: Okay. This one was  
8 -- is that right?

9 So (C) (3), so we're a big believer  
10 in using data to improve instruction, and that  
11 means getting data not only to policy makers  
12 at the state or the federal level, but it  
13 means getting it to teachers and principals so  
14 they can use it on a running basis to improve  
15 what's going on in their school and their  
16 classroom. And that may have different needs  
17 than the policy makers at the state or federal  
18 level.

19 So we talk about what we call  
20 instructional improvement systems in this  
21 criterion, and there's a definition for that.

22 But basically that's technology-based tools

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that provide teachers, principals,  
2 administrators with meaningful support and  
3 data so they can continuously improve  
4 instruction.

5 I'm not showing a slide on the  
6 definition; it's just kind of too much right  
7 here. That's the basics of it, and then we go  
8 into more such as of what that system could do  
9 or what it could include.

10 And this criterion itself has  
11 three different parts. So the first part (i)  
12 is about increasing the acquisition adoption  
13 and use of instructional improvement systems.

14  
15 Romanette ii is supporting LEAs  
16 and schools in using those systems. So  
17 helping them use them more effectively,  
18 providing effective professional development  
19 on how to use those systems, and the data so  
20 that it does, in fact, they're not just  
21 sitting there somewhere out in the ether  
22 existing, but the data does result in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 continuous improvement to instruction.

2 And then the third part is about  
3 making this data accessible. So this is in  
4 addition to (C)(2) which was about making the  
5 state data accessible; this is about making  
6 the local instructional improvement systems  
7 data accessible to researchers so they have  
8 detailed information with which to evaluate  
9 what's working in the classroom and inform  
10 practice in the classroom.

11 And part of the idea here is that  
12 you may have a lot more data points in time in  
13 a local instructional improvement system, so,  
14 you know, you have a lot more information  
15 about what the students are doing that's  
16 feeding into the system than a statewide  
17 system which may get things less frequently.  
18 And so you may have a lot more data that  
19 researchers can use to really figure out  
20 what's working and what's working for  
21 different kinds of learners.

22 MR. HOUDE: Yes, this is Donald

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Houde from Arizona again. Part of the  
2 clarification for me is going back an earlier  
3 question about rural versus urban. A lot of  
4 our large school districts have local  
5 instructional improvement system in place. We  
6 at the state are building instructional  
7 improvement systems that rurals and locals --  
8 smalls and mediums can use.

9 But that doesn't seem to fit your  
10 definition. So when you say local  
11 instructional improvement system, it can be  
12 used locally, or is it housed locally?

13 MS. WEISS: Used locally.

14 MR. HOUDE: Used locally?

15 MS. WEISS: Yes.

16 MR. HOUDE: Yes. Okay.

17 MR. BENDOR: We're not taking a  
18 position on exactly how you should develop it.

19 MR. HOUDE: On how we should  
20 develop it. Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. BENDOR: Other questions on  
22 this one?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (No response.)

2 MR. BENDOR: Okay. So now we're  
3 moving on to the teachers and leaders section,  
4 the Great Teachers and Leaders section. And  
5 the basic principle behind this section is  
6 just a really strong belief that great  
7 teachers and leaders matter tremendously, that  
8 they make a huge difference in students'  
9 lives.

10 And as a result, you'll see this  
11 section has a tremendous number of points, and  
12 that's because of the emphasis we place on  
13 having more effective teachers, improving the  
14 effectiveness of teachers, and making that  
15 have a difference in the classroom.

16 So there are five criteria here.  
17 The main purposes are, first, building high  
18 quality evaluation systems that provide both  
19 meaningful and useful information; using those  
20 evaluation systems and key personnel decisions  
21 -- allocation decisions in professional  
22 development; and then assessing and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understanding the quality of teacher  
2 preparation and principal preparation  
3 programs, and then expanding the  
4 effectiveness.

5 So, start with (D)(1), and (D)(1)  
6 is a reform conditions criterion. So, again,  
7 this is looking at what you have in place at  
8 the time you apply. And there are three parts  
9 to it. The first two parts are about  
10 alternative routes to certification and the  
11 third part is not exclusively about that.

12 So the first part is the extent to  
13 which your laws, et cetera, allow alternative  
14 routes to certification, as we've defined it,  
15 particularly routes that allow for providers  
16 other than institutions of higher education.  
17 And I'm going to skip forward to our  
18 definition here because the definition for  
19 this criterion is particularly important.

20 And this is an excerpt, it has  
21 most of the key stuff, but this is -- this  
22 definition is in the section on definitions in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the application, page 7.

2 So we've talked -- we've included  
3 five elements here of what it means for this  
4 purpose to have an alternative certification  
5 program. The first one is especially  
6 noteworthy because as we saw in the criterion,  
7 it said particularly alternative routes to  
8 certification that allow providers other than  
9 institutions of higher education. So this  
10 (A)(1) is going to be particularly important  
11 as the reviewers evaluate this.

12 So we're actually going to look at  
13 that right now. So this is the rubric  
14 guidance on criterion (D)(1)(i). Not all of  
15 criterion (D)(1) -- we only have for criterion  
16 (D)(1) we only specific guidance on (D)(1)(i).

17 And what we've done, and it's sort  
18 of a parallel structure for high, medium and  
19 low points, is you get -- it's based on the  
20 extent to which you have what was element A  
21 before, so that can be provided by providers  
22 other than institutions of higher education,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and then also how many of the total elements.

2 So for example, high points is if you have  
3 element A and then you need at least four of  
4 the five elements, so you'd need at least  
5 three of the other four ones. Medium and low  
6 work similarly, they'll have different things  
7 plugged in there.

8 DR. VAUGHN: Sally Vaughn,  
9 Michigan. In terms of the alternate routes to  
10 certification, you didn't in the regs make  
11 distinctions between elementary and secondary.

12 So it's our understanding that it's the  
13 Department's intention that such alternative  
14 routes would be available for teachers of all  
15 grade levels and all subjects?

16 MS. WEISS: Yes.

17 DR. VAUGHN: Thank you.

18 MR. REICHARDT: Robert Reichardt  
19 from Colorado. So on slide 142, D  
20 significantly limit the amount of course work.

21 So ours is a standards-based system so we're  
22 silent on course work. So we don't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 significantly limit it because we don't  
2 require it.

3 MS. WEISS: And so can somebody  
4 therefore test out of it by demonstrating  
5 proficiency on a standard, because that would  
6 also --

7 MR. REICHARDT: The provider has  
8 to demonstrate how they get that person to  
9 that standard, but it doesn't have to use  
10 course work to show that.

11 MS. WEISS: So this is a good  
12 place to make a commercial for your friendly  
13 attorney general, because this type of  
14 criterion, all the criteria where you're  
15 discussing legally how things work in your  
16 state are places where you need to just  
17 describe how it works and the attorney  
18 general's going to look at it and say, Yeah,  
19 this description is accurate, and that's your  
20 job, your job is to sort of describe how --  
21 the truth about how your laws work relative to  
22 these criteria.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. REICHARDT: Okay.

2 MS. WEISS: Did you guys have  
3 anything you want to add to that?

4 MR. REICHARDT: They're your  
5 friendly general counsel.

6 MS. WEISS: That's right.

7 MR. REICHARDT: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. BENDOR: Anything else on  
9 this?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. BENDOR: Okay. Yes? Arizona.

12 MS. LEVIN: Okay. Sue Levin from  
13 Oregon. So this is just for --

14 MR. BENDOR: Can you --

15 MS. LEVIN: -- clarification --

16 MR. BENDOR: -- we can't quite  
17 hear you.

18 MS. LEVIN: Sue Levin from Oregon.

19 This is just a clarification; I think you  
20 said this earlier. This criteria would have  
21 21 points, it's dividing into the three  
22 sections. There's no evidence required for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (iii) but there are seven points available for  
2 each Roman numeral?

3 MR. BENDOR: Uh-huh.

4 MS. LEVIN: Okay.

5 MR. BENDOR: Yes. And that  
6 provides a good transition -- oh, no, because  
7 we have a question.

8 MR. FOLDESY: Yes, and this Jody  
9 Foldesy, Arizona. This is quick as well.  
10 Principals evenly weighted with teachers, or  
11 --

12 MR. BENDOR: So let's look at the  
13 reviewer guidance there. I'm not sure --

14 FEMALE VOICE: It says don't  
15 forget to count your teachers --

16 MR. BENDOR: Yes.

17 FEMALE VOICE: -- and principals.

18 MR. BENDOR: Yes. Yes.

19 MR. FOLDESY: Great. Thanks.

20 MR. BENDOR: Okay. So now we're  
21 going to look back at parts two and three of  
22 this criterion. And part two the extent to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 which those routes are in use, and part three  
2 is not about alternative routes, it's about  
3 whether you have a process for determining  
4 teacher and principal shortages and filling  
5 those areas of shortage.

6 So the evidence for (D)(1) pretty  
7 much mirrors the language we use in the  
8 criterion itself, you're supposed to describe  
9 the relevant laws and the information on the  
10 elements that we've given in the definition  
11 which we just discussed.

12 The evidence for (D)(2), we  
13 basically want information on your preparation  
14 program so the reviewers can determine the  
15 extent to which they're in use. So a list of  
16 the programs, the elements, referring again to  
17 the definition, and the number of teachers and  
18 principals that complete them, and then also  
19 statewide the number of teachers and  
20 principals certified so we have some basis for  
21 comparison.

22 There's no evidence as you noted

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for (D) (1) (iii), no specific evidence, so  
2 you're supposed to provide the information  
3 that you believe answers that criterion.

4 MR. REICHARDT: Robert Reichardt  
5 from Colorado. Minor point, a significant  
6 number of our teachers and principals are  
7 certified statewide, or prepared in other  
8 states; we have a pretty liberal system. So I  
9 assume that what you want there is a total  
10 number of teachers and principals certified  
11 statewide from our state preparation programs.

12 MR. BENDOR: Yes.

13 MR. REICHARDT: Okay.

14 MR. BENDOR: Right. Because we're  
15 comparing the alternative routes in your state  
16 to the other routes in your state.

17 We've discussed this, also this.  
18 Now on to (D) (2). So actually before I get  
19 into the details on (D) (2), so (D) (2) has 58  
20 points, it's one of the highest in the whole  
21 competition. And the big picture here is this  
22 about building useful evaluation systems and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that -- good useful evaluation systems and  
2 then using them effectively.

3 And there are a number of  
4 different pieces in this criterion. They do  
5 all fit together, and so what I wanted to do  
6 is try to walk you through how they do all fit  
7 together because it -- for people who haven't  
8 spent many, many hours on this yet it may not  
9 be clear.

10 MS. WEISS: Yet.

11 MR. BENDOR: Yet. So part one is  
12 about establishing clear measures to measuring  
13 student growth, and we've defined growth,  
14 student growth in this notice, and basically  
15 we've defined that as the change in student  
16 achievement between two or more points in  
17 time. There's a bit more to that definition,  
18 that's on pages 7 to 11 of the application.  
19 But otherwise it leaves a fair amount of  
20 flexibility for local decision makers to  
21 determine how you're going to measure student  
22 growth.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           Then the second part of this  
2 criterion is now you've got your plan for how  
3 you're going to get to measuring student  
4 growth and now it's about what your plan to  
5 design and develop rigorous transparent fair  
6 evaluation systems for teachers and  
7 principals, and there's a fair amount packed  
8 in here, so -- and there are two specific  
9 things we call out. They differentiate  
10 effectiveness using multiple rating  
11 categories. So if it's just a system that  
12 allows for a teacher to be rated as  
13 satisfactory or unsatisfactory, that's not  
14 satisfactory.

15   (General laughter.)

16           MR. BENDOR: And they should take  
17 into account data on student growth, and  
18 you've talked about your plan for having a  
19 person measure student growth in a prior part  
20 of this as a significant factor. And then B,  
21 that they're designed and developed with  
22 teacher and principal involvement.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The gentleman from California.

2 MR. MILLER: Rick Miller,  
3 California. So I actually have a few  
4 questions on this. First, does it need to be  
5 in place, the growth model used for this  
6 school starting in August, or what -- do you  
7 have a date when you need this to be in place?

8 MR. BENDOR: This is a plan  
9 criterion, so this is about you putting  
10 together your plan, and we're going to look at  
11 the performance measures shortly. But what  
12 reviewers are going to judge, you see here,  
13 the second line, are a high quality plan and  
14 ambitious yet achievable annual targets to  
15 doing these things. So you should figure out  
16 what is, in terms of your targets, ambitious  
17 yet achievable. Okay.

18 MR. MILLER: I have a few more,  
19 sorry, on this one. So the next one is one of  
20 -- the data tables we have to fill out have a  
21 lot owing from effectiveness. We don't have  
22 this in place yet to answer that. If we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 commit to having a plan, if the legislature  
2 passes it, we're on the road before even we  
3 submit our application, but don't have the  
4 data, how do we handle that in terms of the  
5 data tables?

6 MR. BENDOR: If you don't have  
7 data, don't make it up.

8 (General laughter.)

9 MR. MILLER: Okay.

10 MS. WEISS: And hang on, because  
11 when we get to those tables in a minute we're  
12 going to go through those tables and talk  
13 about them and then you might have a more  
14 specific question.

15 MR. MILLER: So and I guess --  
16 they say -- it says how many effective  
17 teachers do you have, we just simply say we  
18 don't know.

19 MR. BENDOR: Right. And you may  
20 want to explain that, but --

21 MR. MILLER: Okay. And then so  
22 this also, we have an accountability model

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's part of our workbook with you that's  
2 separate and distinct from this. So our  
3 question is, if we do a new accountability  
4 model and put it in Race to the Top and you  
5 approve it, how does that affect our workbook?

6 MS FARACE: I'm going to answer  
7 this one for OESE. That wouldn't be an  
8 approval of a new amendment to your workbook.

9 So if you want to do something new for your  
10 accountability under ESEA, you need to submit  
11 that to the Department, we would look at that  
12 to see how that works with the laws and  
13 regulations under ESEA. So don't assume if  
14 you have a new model under Race to the Top  
15 that that changes your workbook and that's an  
16 approval to your workbook.

17 MR. MILLER: So we have multiple  
18 accountability models until we get additional  
19 approval? Is there a way to change that to  
20 get our work --

21 MS FARACE: So when you're talking  
22 about accountability models under teachers,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 how does that come into play with your  
2 accountability models under Title I?

3 MR. MILLER: Well, we wouldn't  
4 create -- yes, we wouldn't create two  
5 different growth -- the growth model we would  
6 --

7 MS FARACE: Oh, your growth model.  
8 I see.

9 MR. MILLER: -- use as our  
10 accountability model.

11 MS FARACE: So the definition of  
12 growth here, and stop me if I'm wrong, is  
13 fairly broad, the definition of growth --

14 MR. MILLER: I may be in the wrong  
15 area, but I am saying if we adopt growth --

16 MS FARACE: I see what you're  
17 saying. Right.

18 MR. MILLER: -- we're going to use  
19 it for our accountability model.

20 MS FARACE: I understand. So the  
21 definition of growth here is fairly broad.  
22 The definition of what is a growth model under

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Title I regulations has particular  
2 principles, and if it doesn't meet those  
3 principles, then we wouldn't be allowed to  
4 approve it under ESEA.

5 MR. MILLER: No, I understand  
6 that.

7 MS FARACE: Okay.

8 MR. MILLER: So I'll give you a  
9 specific example. We're looking at the  
10 Colorado growth model. If we adopt it, the  
11 Colorado growth model, which you've already  
12 said is acceptable, and you say Race to the  
13 Top, you're good, and you've adopted that  
14 model, can we then -- you know, how do we  
15 reconcile that. We still have our old growth  
16 model as what was in our workbook.

17 MS FARACE: So you would need to  
18 submit it to the Department for review for  
19 your accountability to make sure, because we  
20 need to make sure that everything is in line  
21 with ESEA, and that's -- RTT isn't under ESEA,  
22 so I know that's confusing, but --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   You maybe want to add on that --

2                   MR. MILLER:    I mean is there way  
3 you could reconcile that on your end?

4                   MS FARACE:    In the Colorado -- I  
5 know they have a growth model they use for  
6 state purposes, but is Colorado's growth model  
7 approved for growth under ESEA?    I mean I'm  
8 not sure that they --

9                   MR. MILLER:    As I understand it,  
10 it is.

11                   MS FARACE:    -- use that growth  
12 model for ESEA purposes.    They have it as  
13 state growth model.    And their growth model is  
14 a little different for ESEA purposes.    It's  
15 very complicated.    I wouldn't assume that if  
16 you're picking up a state's growth model for  
17 Race to the Top purposes,    that that's  
18 necessarily going to meet the ESEA  
19 requirements.

20                   MR. MILLER:    I'll find out --

21                   MS FARACE:    Okay.

22                   MS. WEISS:    So we are trying to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 make sure that all these things are aligned,  
2 so if things will be looked on favorably, but  
3 we have to look at them through the lens of  
4 the particular governing statute, so don't --  
5 as Meredith said, don't make assumptions that  
6 it's automatically approved in one place if  
7 it's approved in another.

8 Help us by bringing to our  
9 attention that you want to make a change in  
10 the other place too and explain that you're  
11 doing it to align with Race to the Top, and  
12 we'll look at it with as aligned a lens as we  
13 can, given the statutory language that we're  
14 obligated to fulfill.

15 And we're sorry in this transition  
16 period. We will do our best to make it as  
17 easy on you guys as we can, but there's only  
18 so much that we can do. But we do intend to  
19 try to make this as aligned as possible. Race  
20 to the Top does indicate the directions we're  
21 trying to move towards, so doing things in  
22 this direction we hope will be good.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. LOCKWOOD:    Tim Lockwood from  
2 Wyoming. Will there be an expectation this is  
3 for classroom teachers only, because in  
4 Wyoming we have instructional facilitators,  
5 you've heard them called mentor-teachers,  
6 things like that. They don't necessarily have  
7 a specific set of students that they work  
8 with. They work with the teachers in the  
9 classroom. And so would this evaluation  
10 system only be expected to measure the  
11 classroom teachers? Thanks.

12                   MS. WEISS:    Yes, so I think that  
13 the big picture lens that we're hoping people  
14 look at all of this through is what's best for  
15 kids, and do we have systems for holding the  
16 adults in the system accountable for doing  
17 what really makes a difference for kids. So  
18 with that lens you'll have to look at the  
19 different types of classifications of teachers  
20 you have and decide what evaluation systems  
21 are appropriate for them and how, over time,  
22 to design and develop and roll those out.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think we would submit that any  
2 good HR system is any part of the United  
3 States has a system for evaluating every  
4 person in the system. It's not like we're  
5 trying to specify or exempt, we're asking you  
6 to sort of think big picture about what it  
7 takes to have a high functioning human  
8 resources system for education.

9 MR. LOCKWOOD: And I understand  
10 that. I agree, but what my concern is, is you  
11 say specifically that it has to be tied to  
12 student data, and if those instructional  
13 facilitators don't have that student data tied  
14 to their work, but it's tied to the teachers  
15 that are underneath them, that's my concern.

16 MS. WEISS: Yes, but it's the same  
17 for principals. Right? Principals have  
18 teachers underneath them and kids underneath  
19 them, so I mean I think we're just saying  
20 don't try to like check the boxes if it's a  
21 teacher -- it's not about splitting hairs  
22 about what's the definition of a teacher, it's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about trying to design a human resource system  
2 that make -- that does the best we can for  
3 making sure that great people are in front of  
4 kids and making sure that people are always  
5 continuously improving their skills.

6           Within that, you're going to have  
7 to put your plan together around each of these  
8 elements. We don't have specific -- we  
9 haven't defined what's a teacher in this  
10 document.

11           MR. BENDOR: Yes.

12           MR. FANGMAN: Kevin Fangman from  
13 Iowa. On the evaluation system one, I just  
14 want to clarify that. For example, for fine  
15 arts teachers you could set up growth over  
16 time based on assessments that are appropriate  
17 in an art classroom and music classroom. And  
18 the other question I have, that I think I just  
19 lost accidentally here, but -- oh, what was I  
20 going to say here -- when we look at  
21 developing the -- working with LEAs to set up  
22 like the evaluation system, could it be that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 part of it is the same statewide as far as  
2 what the categories of performance are, but  
3 then assessment-wise they can, through working  
4 through their consortia within a state, they  
5 can come up with different ways of what that  
6 looks like within districts. Correct? All  
7 right.

8 MR. BENDOR: I'm not sure if I  
9 follow you on the second question. The first  
10 one we'll get to that in a bit, so let's just  
11 let it there. But the second one --

12 MR. FANGMAN: Well, I guess it  
13 says that we work with LEAs that want to set  
14 up the evaluation system, and maybe I'm  
15 looking at that wrong, but does that mean that  
16 you have a template for the whole state that  
17 all teachers use, or does it just mean there's  
18 guidelines but yet there is room for it to --

19 MR. BENDOR: So we don't have a  
20 position on that one way or another, you know,  
21 no more --

22 MR. FANGMAN: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: -- than what's here,  
2 so --

3 MR. FANGMAN: All right.

4 MR. BENDOR: -- you should put  
5 together a plan that makes sense for your  
6 state and your LEAs.

7 MR. FANGMAN: Okay.

8 MS. MARTIN: Rayne Martin with  
9 Louisiana. I should have probably asked this  
10 in the State Success Factors, but I was  
11 reminded here.

12 MR. BENDOR: Yes.

13 MS. MARTIN: In the application it  
14 talks about union support signing off on your  
15 partnership agreement. And there's various  
16 references to "if applicable." So it's not  
17 clear -- obviously the intent is to try to get  
18 as many signatures as possible, but if you're  
19 in a situation where you're a right-to-work  
20 state or there's no collective bargaining,  
21 does that make a difference whether or not you  
22 have a signature or not?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MR. BENDOR:           So the "where  
2 applicable" means if you don't have a union,  
3 then we're not telling you to get a signature  
4 from the non-existent union.

5                   MS. MARTIN:       No, I'm not asking  
6 specifically about the union, I'm talking  
7 about collective bargaining, if you don't have  
8 a collective bargaining agreement.

9                   MR. BENDOR:   I'm not following --

10                  MS. WEISS:   But you have a union?

11                  MS. MARTIN:       Right.       We --  
12 correct.   We have, for instance, statewide  
13 unions, some have local supports in their  
14 LEAs, some don't, but not all LEAs have  
15 collective bargaining agreements.

16                  MR. BENDOR:   And so your --

17                  MS. WEISS:   So your question --

18                  MR. BENDOR:   Yes.

19                  MS. MARTIN:       And then on the  
20 partnership agreement for the participating  
21 LEAs, they say they want you to have the local  
22 union rep, if applicable. So I guess what I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 trying to distinguish, if possible, and maybe  
2 it's not possible, is does it make a  
3 difference if there's a collective bargaining  
4 agreement with that particular district or  
5 not?

6 MS FARACE: You still have a union  
7 rep.

8 MS. WEISS: So you still do have a  
9 union rep that could sign it?

10 MS. MARTIN: Yes, yes. And they  
11 -- and we're going to work to get their  
12 signature, I'm just asking if it makes a  
13 difference or not in terms of the review of  
14 the application.

15 MS. WEISS: Yes, I think if  
16 there's a union rep then it's applicable.

17 MS. MARTIN: Okay. All right.

18 MS. WOLFE: Let me, one, just  
19 qualify that just for a second, because there  
20 is going to be a union rep; the unions exist  
21 and teachers within an individual building may  
22 be a part of that union. But the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 superintendent and the school board for that  
2 LEA are not obligated to arrange their --  
3 right. So it's absence of collective  
4 bargaining, so in the event that we had a  
5 participating LEA and everyone signed off on  
6 it except for the union rep and there was no  
7 collective bargaining, would that be an issue?  
8 Right. There's no collective bargaining.

9 FEMALE VOICE: There's no barrier.

10 MS. WOLFE: There's -- right.

11 MS. WEISS: No, I think we  
12 understand what you're saying, but I think we  
13 have to just sort of go with what's written in  
14 here, and what we've said is the union leader  
15 signs it if there is one.

16 In a minute when Josh gets to  
17 other parts of (D)(2), you'll see the parts  
18 that really impact collective bargaining and  
19 to the extent that there is no collective  
20 bargaining agreement, presumably those  
21 districts might have an easier time of  
22 implementing some of these changes faster if

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they're interested in doing so, than another  
2 situation in which there was collective  
3 bargaining that had to happen first.

4 So there's places where that will  
5 help or hurt. Probably that signature that  
6 you're talking about isn't necessarily the  
7 most important place. Some of these other  
8 plans are places where that will come into  
9 play.

10 MS. FARACE: And one other thing  
11 that came to mind. If you -- if it isn't  
12 applicable because you don't have a union,  
13 it's probably best that you say N/A because we  
14 don't have a union, because if you leave it  
15 blank, it might be hard for the reviewers to  
16 know whether you didn't have a union it wasn't  
17 applicable, or you just didn't get the  
18 signature.

19 DR. VAUGHN: Sally Vaughn,  
20 Michigan. At one point you've been talking  
21 about student growth has to be a significant  
22 factor in the evaluation, can you offer any

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 guidance on significant?

2 MR. BENDOR: We've said what we've  
3 said. I don't think we want to say anything  
4 more about that.

5 MS. WEISS: Yes, again, we don't  
6 have magic numbers here. This is about you  
7 guys making decisions and -- with your  
8 districts that you think are the right  
9 decisions for those particular contexts.

10 MR. BENDOR: And, you know, if --  
11 you may end up explaining in your response to  
12 (D)(2)(ii), you know, why this is significant,  
13 if that fits in that context.

14 So let's move on, because I think  
15 some of these questions are actually related  
16 to things that come later, to (D)(2)(iii) and  
17 (iv). So in (i) and (ii) you put together  
18 your plans for establishing measures for  
19 student growth and then you put together  
20 systems for student -- for developing  
21 evaluation systems based on that.

22 Now, in (iii) it's about your

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plans for conducting annual evaluations using  
2 those systems and including timely and  
3 constructive feedback, and including student  
4 growth data provided in those evaluations.

5 Everyone there?

6 MR. MILLER: Rick Miller,  
7 California. I have a question on annual  
8 evaluation. Does the annual evaluation have  
9 to be exactly the same, which is to say most  
10 of our districts, and current Ed Code is every  
11 other year they have to evaluate, and there's  
12 actually a good reason for that on just the  
13 capacity of the principal to do significant  
14 evaluations every year.

15 So if you still kept the criteria  
16 in this, which you still looked at student  
17 achievement data, you still looked to these  
18 key factors, but you did a different level of  
19 evaluation one year and then more intense the  
20 next year but still kept the major criterion  
21 here, would that be acceptable?

22 MR. BENDOR: That's a case you'd

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have to make to peer reviewers in your plan,  
2 in your response to this.

3 MR. FANGMAN: Kevin Fangman, Iowa.  
4 Just a little different spin on that  
5 question. We have a model where every three  
6 years they do an annual and it's based on our  
7 teaching standards and it's a lot more in-  
8 depth based on observation and the student  
9 achievement and those things. Then the two  
10 off years they have the professional  
11 development plan that they meet with their  
12 principal and it's based on student  
13 achievement data and those kinds of things.

14 But my understanding is teachers  
15 need to be rated highly effective, or  
16 effective, or -- and we don't have that on  
17 those two years where they do an individual  
18 career development plan. So if we can make it  
19 -- if we're doing what you're asking for but  
20 don't mark them as highly effective or  
21 effective, is that okay or is that something  
22 we need to look at changing within that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 system?

2 MR. BENDOR: Yes, I mean, I think,  
3 again, it's a case you're making your plan for  
4 why it fits the criterion, so.

5 MS. WEISS: And just remember that  
6 this isn't necessarily the opportunity to  
7 explain what you do, it's to explain what you  
8 think you should do and to build plans that  
9 you think are right and ambitious and all  
10 that, so just sort of keep it in mind that  
11 this is -- also gives you maybe a lever for  
12 doing things differently if you think you  
13 should.

14 So just sort of use it as an  
15 opportunity to rethink all of these things,  
16 and I think it's our job to keep pushing you  
17 guys to think big picture, not describe what  
18 you are doing but think about what should be  
19 done and see if this gives you a lever or the  
20 opportunity to do those things.

21 MR. BENDOR: Let's take -- so  
22 you've heard me talk a little bit, so let's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 all take a seventh inning stretch for just 30  
2 seconds. I feel like people are getting a  
3 little antsy, and --

4 MS. WEISS: Yes.

5 MR. BENDOR: -- I could use a walk  
6 around. So let's take 30 seconds and then  
7 we'll come back.

8 MS. WEISS: Thirty seconds and  
9 then we'll come back to you.

10 (Whereupon, a short recess was  
11 taken.)

12 MR. BENDOR: So let's get back to  
13 (D) (2). We've made it through three of the  
14 four Romanettes.

15 MS. WEISS: Yay.

16 MS FARACE: Yay.

17 MR. BENDOR: And maybe we haven't,  
18 because we have a question on the third one.

19 DR. DeBACKER: Diane DeBacker from  
20 Kansans, and it's really -- it's kind of  
21 related to this but it goes back to this  
22 morning's session on page 35 of performance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 measures.

2 MR. BENDOR: Okay.

3 MS. WEISS: All right.

4 DR. DeBACKER: It talks about the  
5 percentage of participating LEAs with  
6 qualifying evaluation systems. What -- how is  
7 qualifying defined? I haven't found that --

8 MR. BENDOR: So I will skip  
9 forward to answer that.

10 DR. DeBACKER: Oh, good. Thank  
11 you.

12 MR. BENDOR: And what we said --  
13 and this is the performance measures for  
14 (D)(2), we'll come back to this in more detail  
15 in a second, but basically qualifying, as we  
16 say here, qualifying evaluation systems are  
17 those that meet what we said in (D)(2)(ii).  
18 So it's just our shorthand for (D)(2)(ii).  
19 Does that make sense?

20 DR. DeBACKER: No.

21 (General laughter.)

22 MR. BENDOR: No? So --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Go back to (D) (2) (ii).

2 MR. BENDOR: -- (D) (2) (ii) was  
3 this criterion where we are talking about your  
4 plans to design and develop evaluation systems  
5 that are good in all these ways. And so in  
6 the performance measures for (D) (2), when we  
7 talk about qualifying evaluation systems,  
8 that's shorthand for evaluation systems that  
9 met the criterion under (D) (2) (ii).

10 DR. DeBACKER: Okay. Thanks.

11 MR. BENDOR: All right. So (iv)  
12 is -- okay, we have these evaluation systems,  
13 we're using them annually, now -- we're using  
14 them annually to evaluate teachers, now let's  
15 use them to inform decisions regarding these  
16 four areas, and those are: developing  
17 teachers and principals, compensating and  
18 providing and retaining them, granting tenure  
19 and/or full certification, and removing  
20 ineffective teachers and principals.

21 So, as we mentioned earlier, going  
22 back to the detailed scopes of work that LEAs

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are going to fill out in your MOUs, we've  
2 broken those down by the sub-criteria here.  
3 So this is one line, this is one line, this is  
4 another line, and, you know, we've done this  
5 because we realize that these are  
6 significantly separate issues, that LEAs might  
7 be willing to sign on to some of them but not  
8 all of them, and LEAs should, as Joanne was  
9 saying, they shouldn't be putting a check mark  
10 by one of these things if they haven't  
11 actually had some of the hard conversations  
12 here.

13 Okay. Any questions on this  
14 before I move to definitions and performance  
15 measures?

16 Yes?

17 DR. VAUGHN: Sally Vaughn,  
18 Michigan. When we're looking at the  
19 administrative principal certification, does  
20 it -- is it better to grandperson people in  
21 who have already been in the position, or is  
22 it better as they're getting certified, or is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it better to allow them three years or so to  
2 obtain a certification?

3 MR. BENDOR: I'm not sure if I  
4 follow --

5 Do you guys follow? No?

6 DR. VAUGHN: Yes, well, in  
7 Michigan we don't have required administrator  
8 certification, so we will be implementing it.

9 So we will have people that are in that  
10 position that don't have that certification,  
11 so what we're struggling with is do we allow  
12 them to be grandpersoned in, or do we say,  
13 You've got three years to become certified.

14 MR. BENDOR: And so what I would  
15 say is that's something that you should make  
16 the decision that you think is best and make  
17 your case in the application for why you  
18 thought it was the best decision.

19 DR. VAUGHN: Thank you.

20 MR. BENDOR: Anything else on this  
21 before we move to some relevant definitions?

22 (No response.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: Okay. So there are a  
2 number of definitions that you've seen popping  
3 up in this section that I just want to spend a  
4 little bit of time on. So we have four  
5 definitions regarding effective and highly  
6 effective teachers and principals. They  
7 follow pretty similar structures, so hopefully  
8 once I walk you through one it will get you  
9 all of them.

10 So effective -- and what we have  
11 here are slightly abridged versions. Now the  
12 full versions are in your applications, pages  
13 7 to 11. So an effective teacher we say means  
14 a teacher whose students achieve acceptable  
15 rates of student growth, say, for example, at  
16 least one grade level in an academic year.  
17 And let me stop there for a second.

18 So, you know, we got some  
19 questions, especially in the comment period,  
20 does that mean all teachers would have all  
21 students growing at at least one grade level  
22 in an academic year? No, that's why it's an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 e.g., because we're not making -- trying to  
2 make this a requirement. There may be certain  
3 student populations, students with  
4 disabilities, that you want to look at  
5 differently here. But we do expect that, you  
6 know, generally it seems to make sense that an  
7 effective teacher would not have their  
8 students fall behind in an academic year.

9 And then the second part is that  
10 it must include multiple measures provided  
11 that teacher effectiveness is evaluated in  
12 significant part by student growth. And so  
13 that mirrors what we saw in the criterion  
14 earlier.

15 The definition for effective  
16 principal is basically the same. What we  
17 haven't included here is our examples of what  
18 other multiple measures could be. Again,  
19 those are examples for illustrative purposes.

20 The definition of highly effective  
21 teachers and principals follow a similar  
22 format. What's different is that we talk

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about students achieving high rates for growth  
2 instead of acceptable rates of growth, and the  
3 e.g. we give is one and a half grade level.  
4 Again, the same caveats apply to that e.g..

5 Questions on these definitions? I  
6 knew we'd get some.

7 (General laughter.)

8 MS. HALL: Tiffany Hall, Utah.  
9 When we talk about teachers whose students  
10 achieve acceptable rates more or less, you  
11 know, as we define that a grade level year, do  
12 you have any -- again, we keep using this  
13 term, but magic number for the percentage of  
14 students? I mean if a teacher has 80 percent  
15 of their students meeting that --

16 MR. BENDOR: We don't have a magic  
17 number. We don't seem to like magic numbers.

18 (General laughter.)

19 MR. BENDOR: Yes?

20 MS. AYBAR: Liz Aybar from  
21 Colorado. And I'm sure you get this piece a  
22 lot and it's about the non-tested subject

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 areas. And in addition to the non-tested  
2 subject areas in terms of the comparable  
3 across schools that we have standards that are  
4 statewide, but local control within districts  
5 and they might have different approaches to  
6 the tests that aren't -- the subjects that  
7 aren't tested by our state test. So how do  
8 you expect states to tackle those issues?

9 MR. BENDOR: So that leads me to  
10 the definition of student achievement here, so  
11 let me talk about that and see if I answer the  
12 question.

13 MS. AYBAR: Thanks. Hope I cued  
14 you up okay.

15 MR. BENDOR: Hopefully. I  
16 appreciate it.

17 So here we have, again, an  
18 abridged version of the definition of student  
19 achievement, the full one's in the  
20 application. And what's important here is  
21 that you have to figure out how you want to  
22 approach this, both for tested and non-tested

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 grades and subjects. For tested grades and  
2 subjects, you should use the test. You may  
3 use other things as well. And in all cases it  
4 should be rigorous and comparable across  
5 classrooms in a district.

6 Does that -- yes. If you wanted  
7 to make them more comparable --

8 MS. WEISS: So some of these  
9 things could be defined locally if that's what  
10 you choose as a state to do in your plan.

11 MR. BENDOR: And so just the way  
12 these all tie together is student achievement  
13 is sort of our foundation, student growth is  
14 the change in student achievement between two  
15 or more points in time, and then the  
16 definition of student growth gets filled into  
17 these definitions of effective teachers and  
18 principals as well as to certain parts of the  
19 criterion as we discussed.

20 Any more questions on this?

21 MS. WEISS: Josh, the middle.

22 MR. BENDOR: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. GAITHER: Kathy Gaither,  
2 California. I think we're struggling a little  
3 bit with this definition of effective and  
4 highly effective when it comes to principals  
5 and teachers, partly because we don't know how  
6 this applies to students who are at grade  
7 level already. So for instance it's easy to  
8 use an example for a low-achieving student or  
9 a low-achieving school, but if you have a  
10 high-achieving school where students are at  
11 the expected level and they grow at the  
12 expected rate, then this would imply that you  
13 can't ever have a highly effective teacher at  
14 a high-performing school.

15 And so we're struggling with how  
16 to actually implement this and how you  
17 actually define grade levels.

18 MS. WEISS: So I'm confused about  
19 why you couldn't have a highly effective  
20 teacher in a high-performing school. What  
21 about our definition makes you think that  
22 would be incompatible?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. GAITHER: That you must -- or  
2 your students must grow at least one and a one  
3 half grade levels in one year in order for the  
4 teacher to be highly effective. So if I'm a  
5 ninth grade student and I go to the tenth  
6 grade and I learn everything I'm supposed to  
7 learn in the tenth grade, my teacher is barely  
8 effective. They are not highly effective  
9 under your definition, and so we're struggling  
10 with this in California because this is kind  
11 of an important topic for our stakeholders.

12 MS. WEISS: Yes, I mean -- so I  
13 understand -- I think what you're saying has  
14 actually nothing to do with high-performing  
15 schools. If I'm understanding it, your  
16 example actually has to do with high school,  
17 and of growth models --

18 MS. GAITHER: I could --

19 MS. WEISS: -- at the high school  
20 level, because --

21 MS. GAITHER: I could easily --

22 MS. WEISS: -- there's no reason

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that a high-performing kid can't grow more  
2 than a year and, in fact, you would argue that  
3 many high-performing kids that's exactly what  
4 they do. So I think your problem is that in  
5 high school growth models are hard and the  
6 answer is, yes, and that's one --

7 MS. GAITHER: Okay.

8 MS. WEISS: -- reason we didn't --

9 MS. GAITHER: Elementary school  
10 then. Third grade. It doesn't really matter  
11 what grade we're talking about, the concept is  
12 a normal student in a normal class with a  
13 normal teacher will progress a year in an  
14 academic year. Some students will progress  
15 more than a year.

16 If you have low-achieving students  
17 and you have great interventions and a highly  
18 effective teacher, yes, that low-achieving  
19 student may progress more than one grade level  
20 in a year and may progress farther towards  
21 proficiency.

22 But if you have students who are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 already proficient or above proficient, how  
2 does a teacher become high effective, because  
3 the measurement of the student growth is not  
4 -- they can't personally grow as much as a  
5 low-achieving student.

6 MS. WEISS: Right. So what you're  
7 really, I think, highlighting is a problem in  
8 our current ESEA assessments that doesn't let  
9 them measure out-of-grade-level so you can't  
10 find out if a student is at a higher --  
11 performing at a higher grade level. So it's  
12 really not about a teacher is what I'm trying  
13 to say. A teacher could be high effective or  
14 not with high-performing or low-performing  
15 kids.

16 It's that maybe the tools that you  
17 have to measure that aren't fine-grained  
18 enough to catch the effectiveness at the ends  
19 of the spectrum and that is a problem that, A,  
20 we're trying to look at with our assessment  
21 competition, the next generation of  
22 assessments being finer-grained across the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 continuum of performance levels, and, B, you  
2 do in your states now, I think, have tools  
3 like advanced and other things that you could  
4 use, because remember this is just an example.

5           You need to think about what your  
6 definitions are in the spirit of this to say,  
7 so maybe they're getting more to advance. I  
8 mean you have to just sort of think in your  
9 context about what this means. We, again,  
10 don't have the magic answer for you. But I  
11 would submit your example is not really about  
12 bad teachers, it's about our ability to  
13 capture and measure it.

14           MS. GAITHER: I'm sorry to -- and  
15 if I'm not grasping this, perhaps it's my own  
16 fault, but I guess I'm really struggling with  
17 this idea of whether it's the teacher or  
18 whether it's the student. The definition that  
19 you're using in your guidelines would appear  
20 to imply that you cannot be a highly effective  
21 teacher if some proportion of your students do  
22 not advance by more than one grade level per

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 year.

2 MS. WEISS: Yes. That is what a  
3 highly -- right. A highly effective teacher  
4 is one whose students grow faster than you  
5 might expect if they hadn't --

6 MS. GAITHER: And so my question  
7 is, suppose you have a classroom of gifted  
8 students, and they're all two years above  
9 their normal grade level already. And so that  
10 teacher helps them grow one more grade level.  
11 They're still two years above grade level,  
12 but they didn't gain two years in that year.

13 MS. WEISS: Right.

14 MS. GAITHER: Does that mean --

15 MS. WEISS: But if that teacher  
16 helped them grow two years during that one  
17 year, then they did. So, yes, I mean, Kathy,  
18 I think you are understanding it properly --

19 MS. GAITHER: Okay.

20 MS. WEISS: -- I think there just  
21 might be a disagreement on the --

22 MS. GAITHER: Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: -- definition then of  
2 -- yes.

3 MR. BENDOR: Let's go over here.

4 MR. UNDERWOOD: Steve Underwood  
5 from Idaho. So, okay, so as I look at that,  
6 the definition says achieve high rates of  
7 student growth. And then the example says  
8 grade level. So the example is talking about,  
9 like you mentioned, our current ESEA system  
10 where we have, you know, standards at grade  
11 level that measure, you know, a specific scope  
12 and sequence.

13 Could our definition of highly  
14 effective teacher not contextualize itself  
15 solely within grade levels and talk about like  
16 -- I mean because when I think about our  
17 content standards, I think about an objective.

18 And then there's the other side of that,  
19 there's performance levels with that  
20 objective, and you talk about a huge -- high  
21 complexity, low complexity, all that.

22 MR. BENDOR: So I think what I'd

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 say is when say e.g., we really do mean e.g.  
2 And so if you don't want to follow the exact  
3 wording in the e.g., and you have some other  
4 way that you think is persuasive and good for  
5 kids, then --

6 MR. UNDERWOOD: So we could make  
7 it something about, you know, complexity and  
8 high-order thinking.

9 MS FARACE: Yes, I think you're  
10 bringing up a point about potentially high  
11 school too being an issue because you're going  
12 from biology to chemistry but, you know, that  
13 one grade level isn't necessarily growth in  
14 science. It's different things, and so you  
15 have to think about it differently in some  
16 cases.

17 MR. UNDERWOOD: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. BENDOR: One more.

19 MR. FANGMAN: I just wanted to  
20 clarify something I thought about when Kathy  
21 was talking, but when I look at A under  
22 student achievement means, if you have a state

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 assessment that only shows if they're grade  
2 level or not, but then you can take into  
3 account the other assessments to determine  
4 that high effective if you need to. So I mean  
5 we're not just looking at one measure.

6 MS. WEISS: Right. Correct.

7 MS. SCHUNCK: Hi. I'm Joan  
8 Schunck from the New Teacher Project. I just  
9 had a quick question. I think the answer is  
10 probably -- I think I already know the answer  
11 based on you guys are really clear about  
12 what's not defined, it's not defined. But  
13 when you talk about acceptable rates of  
14 growth, do you have a position on whether  
15 that's criterion referenced or norm  
16 referenced, or is it the state should decide  
17 that based on their circumstances?

18 MS. WEISS: The latter.

19 MR. BENDOR: States should decide  
20 based on their circumstances.

21 MS. SCHUNCK: Okay. Yes, I didn't  
22 know it was actually a triple. Thank you very

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 much. Thanks.

2 MR. BENDOR: Okay. So maybe we'll  
3 get to some questions later, but we need to  
4 move on because we have more to get through.

5 So, now we get to the performance  
6 measures for (D) (2). We've previewed these a  
7 little bit. Remember, these are the goals  
8 you're setting under this criterion, which is  
9 a big criterion. And as such, they should  
10 make sense in connection with your plan, and  
11 your plan should provide -- and this is one of  
12 the things we say in the application, plans  
13 should provide the rationale for why these  
14 goals make sense. So don't -- please don't  
15 view them as something disconnected from your  
16 plans. They are supposed to be very much  
17 integrated with your plans.

18 And so generally here we're asking  
19 for what percentage of your LEAs over time are  
20 going to be doing these things. So the  
21 conversations we've had today about, you know,  
22 conversations with unions taking time, that's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 something you should be taking into account  
2 when you're forming these goals.

3 If a conversation with a union is  
4 going to take a certain amount of time before  
5 you can actually change a bargaining  
6 agreement, if you need to, then you shouldn't  
7 have a goal that's 100 percent in the first  
8 year if you know it's going to take you a year  
9 to fix your bargaining agreements.

10 We're also asking you for data at  
11 the time of application. This is pretty  
12 straightforward data, this is just so we can  
13 make some calculations. We're not going to  
14 ask you for this data later.

15 And we are also going to ask you  
16 for some other data later, not in terms of  
17 performance measures so you're not being  
18 judged on this in the application, but this is  
19 data that we want to get later because we  
20 think it's important, and we're just giving  
21 you a heads up now so that you can take this  
22 into account in your planning. But you don't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 need to do anything here, that's why it's all  
2 blacked out.

3 Okay. I'm going to move to --  
4 okay, one last question on (D) (2) and then I'm  
5 moving.

6 MS. PFANNENSTIEL: I'm Judy  
7 Pfannesnstiel from Kansas. In terms of -- you  
8 said not to fabricate data, if we don't have  
9 baseline data, which is always a good way to  
10 start figuring out what you're projections are  
11 for the next few years, shall we just say that  
12 that will be collected as one of the first  
13 steps, collecting the baseline data and then  
14 make some reasonable guesstimates?

15 MR. BENDOR: Yes, so if you don't  
16 have baseline data, you still need to fill out  
17 your goals, but we put a space in there for,  
18 you know, if you need to clarify or explain  
19 anything, so if you don't have the baseline  
20 data, you can say why and you can say, We  
21 think we're going to gather that.

22 MS. PFANNENSTIEL: There's some --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we'll at least have some reasonable targets.  
2 Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. BENDOR: Okay. So we're going  
4 to move on (D) (3). So (D) (3), the basic idea  
5 here is that it's incredibly important to have  
6 great teachers and principals in the classes,  
7 in the schools that need them most.

8 And so the first part here is  
9 about equitable distribution of teachers and  
10 principals between, on the one hand schools  
11 that are high-poverty and high-minority, and  
12 on the other hand schools that are low-poverty  
13 and low-minority. And we're looking at that  
14 in two ways, one in terms of the highly  
15 effective teachers compared between those two  
16 kinds of schools, and the other in terms of  
17 ineffective teachers in those two kinds of  
18 schools.

19 So this is really about your  
20 distribution of teachers over time and the  
21 performance measures, as we'll see in a  
22 moment, will provide the data that'll allow

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that comparison.

2 Note also that we know you've been  
3 working on some of these issues in your  
4 teacher equity plans and so when we say  
5 "informed by reviews of prior actions and  
6 data", that's to give a nod to that and say,  
7 you know, inform your plan based on what  
8 you've learned in the previous years on this.

9 The second part of (D)(3) is about  
10 having effective teachers and principals in  
11 hard to staff subjects and areas, and so there  
12 isn't a comparison between groups. And then  
13 lastly we have examples of the kinds of  
14 incentives and strategies that you could use  
15 for these two. Once again, when we say  
16 examples, we really do mean examples.

17 Anything on this? Yes.

18 MS. KUSIO: You were talking  
19 really quickly -- sorry, Kerry Kusio,  
20 Michigan. You were talking really quickly,  
21 and I may have missed this, but --

22 MR. BENDOR: Sorry.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. KUSIO: -- in the teacher  
2 plan, the state plan, our understanding is  
3 that's an HQT plan, a highly qualified teacher  
4 plan and this is effective teachers, which is  
5 not the same thing.

6 MR. BENDOR: And that's why the  
7 only thing we say is "informed by reviews of  
8 prior actions and data", so you should learn  
9 what you can learn from these activities  
10 you've taken and use that to make a good plan  
11 here.

12 MS. KUSIO: Okay. Thank you.

13 MR. BENDOR: Okay. So the  
14 evidence for this is pretty straightforward  
15 that you should submit your definition of  
16 high-minority and low-minority schools as you  
17 define them in your state teacher equity plan.  
18 And that's how we've defined those terms  
19 elsewhere in this notice.

20 And I'm getting confused looks  
21 from Colorado.

22 Just a question.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. REICHARDT: Just one member of  
2 the Colorado team, the rest of the team is  
3 right on top of it.

4 (General laughter.)

5 MR. REICHARDT: But being  
6 extremely optimistic --

7 MR. BENDOR: Yes

8 MR. REICHARDT: -- assuming we're  
9 asked to come for the interviews and we're not  
10 --

11 (General laughter.)

12 MR. REICHARDT: No --

13 MS. WEISS: No, no, I'm with you.  
14 Go on.

15 MR. REICHARDT: So not only am I  
16 confused but I'm entertaining. But --

17 (General laughter.)

18 MR. BENDOR: Well, getting a punch  
19 line in there.

20 MR. REICHARDT: Yes, throw them a  
21 bone.

22 But my assumption is that if we --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 let's say we don't have baseline data on the  
2 number of districts that are using performance  
3 blah, blah, blah, that we would be asked to  
4 produced that data when we come to our  
5 interview, or we should produce that data, is  
6 that -- am I assuming wrong, or am I just too  
7 optimistic, or both? I know it's --

8 MS. WEISS: You actually are not  
9 going to be able to bring brand new data out  
10 of your hip pocket into those situations, so  
11 you're going to be judged on what you submit  
12 at the time of your application. And so if  
13 you don't have baseline data, like that's the  
14 reality, you don't have it and you should put  
15 that in here in explain it and still build  
16 your plans around it. But, no, you're not  
17 allowed to bring brand new data into those  
18 interviews, just because it's been -- anyway,  
19 yes.

20 MR. REICHARDT: But there is a  
21 possibility that some of our plan might say we  
22 intend to do this rather quickly, and if we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 say we intend to do this rather quickly,  
2 should we expect to be able to report on the  
3 --

4 MR. BENDOR: Progress.

5 MR. REICHARDT: -- the progress of  
6 our intentions -- thank you for that word --  
7 the progress of meeting our intentions?

8 MS. WEISS: I think that the --

9 MR. REICHARDT: And then maybe if  
10 --

11 MS. WEISS: -- credibility of your  
12 plan is only enhanced by doing what you said  
13 you'd do when you said you'd do it, but you  
14 can't magically produce a whole new set of  
15 data in the interview and have it count.

16 MR. REICHARDT: Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. BENDOR: So performance  
18 measures for (D)(3)(i), it looks like a lot of  
19 them, but basically it's what is your  
20 percentage of teachers in high-poverty and  
21 high-minority schools that are highly  
22 effective. The same question for the low-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 poverty and low-minority schools, or either  
2 low-minority or low-poverty, or both. And  
3 then similar questions for the ineffective  
4 teachers.

5 MS. WEISS: And principals.

6 MR. BENDOR: And principals. And  
7 principals.

8 And, again, this is your goals  
9 over time, they should fit with your plans,  
10 they shouldn't be disconnected. Again, we're  
11 asking you for some general data in the  
12 beginning that we'll just allow us to make  
13 certain calculations, but we won't be asking  
14 for it later necessarily. And a heads up on  
15 data we'll be asking for later.

16 For (D) (3) (ii) there are, again,  
17 performance measures. (D) (3) (ii) is about  
18 having effective teachers in hard to staff  
19 subjects and specialty areas, and so the  
20 performance measures ask about that. We're  
21 also asking you for some general data, just at  
22 the time of application, and a heads up on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 data that we'll be asking for later.

2 Okay. (D)(4). So, we get a new  
3 criterion. This criterion is about improving  
4 the effectiveness of teacher and principal  
5 preparation programs, and it does that in sort  
6 of two big picture ways. One is shining a  
7 spotlight and getting more information, and  
8 the second is on using that information.

9 So, in (i) we're asking you to  
10 link student achievement and growth data to  
11 teachers and principals and link that back to  
12 the preparation programs where those teachers  
13 and principals were trained and publically  
14 report that information.

15 And in number (ii) -- then I'll  
16 stop for questions -- we're asking you to  
17 expand preparation and credentialing options  
18 that are successful at producing effective  
19 teachers and principals. And probably your  
20 action, you know -- yes.

21 Any questions on this?

22 MS. WEISS: Move on.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: Move on. Performance  
2 measures on this one are pretty  
3 straightforward. It's about the percentage of  
4 programs that can show this data for teachers  
5 and principals. Again, we're asking for some  
6 general data at the beginning, and there's a  
7 heads up on data we'll be asking you for  
8 later.

9 Okay. Last criterion within the  
10 teachers and leaders sections. Wow. So  
11 (D) (5). (D) (5), you know, we've touched on  
12 professional development in a number of places  
13 in the application. This criterion is all  
14 about professional development. And part of  
15 the thing here is, you know, since education  
16 hasn't been so good at making sure  
17 professional development is effective in  
18 increasing student learning and knowing when  
19 it is, and this criterion is about starting to  
20 change that.

21 So we've got two parts. We've got  
22 first the part on actually providing effective

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 data-informed professional development, and  
2 most of this criterion is actually a "such as"  
3 list. And, again, when we say examples we do  
4 mean examples. And then the last part of the  
5 criterion is on measuring, evaluating and  
6 continuously improving the effectiveness of  
7 your professional development supports.

8 Any questions on this one?

9 MS. COULTER: Trisha Colter from  
10 Michigan. To hop back just for a second to  
11 the preparation program data, I'm assuming you  
12 want those reported for both all certs and  
13 traditional prepared?

14 MR. BENDOR: Yes. We've said for  
15 each program. Yes, for each credentialing  
16 program in the state.

17 MS. COULTER: Okay. So there's --  
18 but there's no expectation of aggregating them  
19 by those two broad divisions?

20 MR. BENDOR: No, you're supposed  
21 to do this --

22 MS. COULTER: For a program.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: -- for each program.

2 MS. COULTER: Okay.

3 MR. BENDOR: If you want to do  
4 other things, you're welcome to. And if it  
5 was in your plan, you know, we think in  
6 addition -- once we have this data, we're  
7 going to do these other things. Godspeed.

8 (General laughter.)

9 MR. BENDOR: Anything else on  
10 (D) (4) or (D) (5)?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. BENDOR: Everyone wants a  
13 break. Okay. I think we're done with this  
14 section, let's take a break. And we are back  
15 at -- what time are we back at?

16 MS. WEISS: Let's take a 15-minute  
17 break, so 3:10.

18 MR. BENDOR: Fifteen-minute break,  
19 back at 3:10.

20 (Whereupon, a short recess was  
21 taken.)

22 MS. WEISS: Okay. Everybody,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're going to start getting you back into  
2 your seats and get going. Coming down the  
3 home stretch on the criteria. We are going to  
4 dive in -- some time, as soon as I find where  
5 we are -- we're going to dive into the Turning  
6 Around Lowest Achieving Schools section, which  
7 is nice and short, although I think that might  
8 be why the number of questions you'll have.

9 But still there's two criteria in  
10 this section, and the big picture idea here is  
11 that we're trying to get states to really  
12 think very hard about what it will take to  
13 turn around the lowest achieving of the low-  
14 achieving schools that you might have out  
15 there.

16 This is, I should say before I go  
17 on, fully aligned, we hope, not withstanding  
18 anything you'll show us to show us how we  
19 didn't quite catch all the things, but our  
20 hope is that this is fully aligned with both  
21 the stabilization fund notice as well as  
22 upcoming school improvement grant notice that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is going to come -- oh, it just went out --  
2 that just went out.

3 So it is our hope and intention  
4 that these are fully aligned with that program  
5 so that everything that happens in one or the  
6 other is identical. You can come up with one  
7 list of schools and it's the same list in  
8 everything, and you're focusing your resources  
9 in whatever ways you want to and think are  
10 most impactful and effective in your state  
11 around the exact same problem.

12 So with that, the state reform  
13 condition criterion in this one is the extent  
14 to which the state has the legal, statutory  
15 and regulatory authority to intervene directly  
16 in states' persistently lowest achieving  
17 schools and in the LEAs that may be in  
18 improvement or corrective action status.

19 The evidence here is the sort of  
20 standard evidence for these legal framework  
21 questions which is describe your state's  
22 applicable laws, and this is one of the ones

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that your attorney general would look at and  
2 say, Yes, that description is accurate.

3 I'm going to actually, I think,  
4 handle this definition of persistently lowest  
5 achieving schools in a minute when we talk  
6 about (E) (2). Let me just talk instead for a  
7 second about the reviewer guidance on this.  
8 This, because, again, most of these reform  
9 conditions criteria are a little more black  
10 and white.

11 I say a little more because we  
12 know that laws are never black and white, and  
13 when we get to the charter section in a minute  
14 you will see the heroic efforts we made to try  
15 to make sense of the thousands of different  
16 permutations out there in these laws. But so  
17 this one is basically 10 points if you can  
18 intervene in both low-achieving LEAs or  
19 schools, five points if you can do one or the  
20 other, but not both, and no points if you  
21 don't have any ability to intervene if there's  
22 a school that's really under-performing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dramatically.

2 So that's (E) (1). Yes, Rick?

3 MR. MILLER: Rick Miller,  
4 California. So this may be a distinction, but  
5 we have the authority to intervene or have the  
6 authority to intervene to reform schools, but  
7 we would not in the sense that we would only  
8 do so through the LEA, we would never directly  
9 intervene in the school as the state. That's  
10 not a problem. I just want to make sure.

11 MS. WEISS: So you're just going  
12 to have to explain your law and just explain  
13 how it works, and the reviewers are going to  
14 have to make that judgment call in the end.

15 Okay. So (E) (2) is about actually  
16 turning around these schools. This is one of  
17 the criteria that has a lot of points attached  
18 to it, so it's one criterion that's got 40  
19 points attached to it. And there are two  
20 parts to it. Part one is identify the  
21 persistently lowest achieving schools and the  
22 other part is, support your LEAs in turning

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these schools around.

2           So it's pretty straightforward in  
3 the words. I know that underneath the covers  
4 there's a lot of stuff going on here. Let me  
5 start by going back to that definition of  
6 persistently lowest achieving schools and see  
7 if we can make sure that this one is clear to  
8 folks. It's the same definition that you'll  
9 find in all the other grant programs, but  
10 particularly the school improvement grants.

11           In this definition, a persistently  
12 lowest achieving school is any Title I school  
13 in improvement corrective action status or  
14 restructuring. So already an under-performing  
15 school. So of those under-performing schools,  
16 it's among the lowest achieving. Five percent  
17 of those schools, or five, whichever is  
18 greater. Or it's a high school that has a  
19 graduation rate that's less than 60 percent.  
20 So it's either what we've been referring to as  
21 persistently having high dropout levels, or  
22 it's really the lowest of the low-achieving

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 schools.

2 And we know that a lot of  
3 secondary schools are eligible for, but not  
4 receiving Title I funds, same set of criteria  
5 for those, the lowest 5 percent of those, or  
6 any of the secondary schools with graduation  
7 rates less than 60 percent.

8 MS. GALLOWAY: For those secondary  
9 schools that are eligible for -- sorry. Mary  
10 Alice Galloway, Michigan. For those secondary  
11 schools that are eligible for but not  
12 receiving Title I funds, when we put them into  
13 this designation as among those lowest  
14 performing 5 percent, then may they receive  
15 Title I funds?

16 MS. WEISS: So in the school  
17 improvement grant, you can use those funds for  
18 these schools.

19 MS. GALLOWAY: In the school  
20 improvement grant, it's my understanding that  
21 we can let -- that we can grant the money to  
22 the LEA based on the Title I schools that are

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the lowest 5 percent, but then the LEA may  
2 choose to also service the -- to schools that  
3 are not receiving Title I dollars. Does that  
4 mean flat out that they don't get Title I Part  
5 A?

6 MS. WEISS: Can we ask you to  
7 submit that question? We just want to make  
8 sure that we get the answer exactly right --

9 MS. GALLOWAY: Definitely.

10 MS. WEISS: -- to it.

11 MS. GALLOWAY: Sure.

12 MS. WEISS: And so then the  
13 question is, well, it's up to your discretion  
14 to figure out how to identify which of these  
15 schools are the lowest achieving, and we've  
16 providing guidance on that that says look at  
17 the academic achievement of the all students  
18 groups in the school in terms of proficiency  
19 on your ESEA tests and look at the student --  
20 at the school's lack of progress on those  
21 assessments over time.

22 Again, we have not specified what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time period, you sort of can look through your  
2 data and decide how you think you should look  
3 at this. What we're trying to say is, if  
4 you're a school that's low-achieving, but  
5 you've made dramatic progress, you don't  
6 necessarily have to get classified this way.  
7 This is a way for you to take the schools that  
8 are stagnating at very low levels and  
9 designate them.

10 MR. MILLER: Rick Miller,  
11 California. Does a high school include  
12 alternative high schools? And so -- sorry, go  
13 ahead.

14 MS FARACE: Are these alternative  
15 high schools under the SEA?

16 MR. MILLER: They -- no, usually  
17 in a county office is the way it is. So a  
18 court school or a --

19 MS. HESS: Well, do they meet the  
20 ESEA definition of secondary?

21 MR. MILLER: They do. They do.

22 MS. HESS: Then I think that's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       okay then.

2                   MR. MILLER:   So then we ask next,  
3       then so these are one of the problems we have,  
4       so we have court schools and the like that  
5       have high, high mobility rates and likely very  
6       few of the students, if any, will likely be in  
7       the school for a year.

8                   And so figuring out where the  
9       accountability lies is hard.   And so we  
10      actually have an alternative accountability  
11      measure for those schools in California.  So,  
12      and if we just put them in with all other  
13      schools and compared them in terms of 5  
14      percent, it would be a not appropriate  
15      comparison.  So do you have any advice on how  
16      we handle that?

17                  MS. WEISS:   That would be a no at  
18      the moment.  But you can certainly send it in  
19      and we'll get the people who actually might  
20      know the answer to that to respond to your  
21      question.

22                  MR. MILLER:   Okay.  Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. OLSON: Mary Olson with IBM.  
2 I was wondering on your definition for the  
3 persistently low-achieving schools, does that  
4 apply to all the schools in the state, or just  
5 those that are participating in the -- are  
6 participating LEAs?

7 MS. WEISS: This particular --  
8 let's go back to the criterion text itself --  
9 this particular one is not necessarily about  
10 participating LEAs. In the stem here we say  
11 it's the extent to which the state has a high  
12 quality plan to do these things. We say  
13 participating LEAs when we mean participating  
14 LEAs, so in this case it could be a statewide  
15 look at your schools.

16 MS. OLSON: Okay. Thanks.

17 MS. GAITHER: Kathy Gaither,  
18 California.

19 MS FARACE: I think there's a  
20 question.

21 MS. GAITHER: Oh.

22 MS. WEISS: Sorry, there's a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question up here, if somebody wants to run a  
2 mike in the meantime.

3 Yes, Kathy, sorry. Go ahead.

4 MS. GAITHER: So one of our  
5 questions that we've had from our LEAs is I  
6 think we understand that the lowest 5 percent  
7 are required to do one of the turnaround  
8 measures. The question is, are those LEAs  
9 required to participate in Race to the Top, or  
10 are they required only to participate in the  
11 intervention and turnaround strategies, that  
12 are presumably funded through the school  
13 improvement grant.

14 MS. WEISS: So LEAs opt into  
15 whether they're participating in Race to the  
16 Top. Separately you can have your list of the  
17 schools that you've identified for turnaround.

18 To the extent that there is overlap, the  
19 participating LEA can use some of its Title I  
20 share, if you'd like to, to turn around these  
21 schools, or you can provide supplemental  
22 funds, or you can use your school improvement

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 grant funds. So you have a lot of different  
2 funding sources to address this list, but it  
3 is not like being on that list makes it so  
4 that an LEA must sign the MOU and participate  
5 even if they're not interested. That would  
6 kind of go against what we're trying -- the  
7 community that we're trying to create here --

8 MS. GAITHER: Thank you.

9 MS. WEISS: -- for you.

10 Yes?

11 MR. FOLDESY: Jody Foldesy,  
12 Arizona. So I have two questions. The first  
13 relates to if your state has a different  
14 method of assessing who the lowest performing  
15 schools are in the state, that is it's -- I  
16 mean it's just not the same as this. I mean  
17 it identifies a lot of the similar schools,  
18 but it's just not the same. Is there any  
19 guidance on how that would be viewed if it's  
20 not changed in time for phase one application?

21 MS. WEISS: The school improvement  
22 grant does require you to use this method of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 identification. And so to the extent that  
2 you're trying to align your programs, I think  
3 we're trying not to encourage unalignment  
4 among these things, so I don't know enough  
5 about your state context and shouldn't comment  
6 on that anyway, but I think what we've said in  
7 here is what we mean here is how to identify  
8 them.

9 MR. FOLDESY: Okay. That's good.

10 And then the second question relates to the  
11 number, or I guess maybe the staging of how  
12 you intervene with the schools. So 5 percent,  
13 you know, let's -- I don't know, let's just  
14 make up a number, it's 15 schools or something  
15 like that. Are you expected to intervene in  
16 all -- in those 15 schools in year one? Once  
17 you've intervened, let's say you do intervene  
18 in those schools in year one, are you expected  
19 to intervene in another 15 schools in year  
20 two? So just curious about the staging.

21 MS. WEISS: So let me use that as  
22 a segue to the evidence and performance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 measures that go along with this, because  
2 that's where we try to answer that.

3           The evidence that we've asked you  
4 to provide is to the extent that you have been  
5 doing turnarounds for a while in your state,  
6 if you have, tell us what approaches you've  
7 used, how many schools you've done it on, and  
8 some of the sort of key results and lessons  
9 learned from that experience. So just trying  
10 to get a sense of whether this is new or  
11 something that you've been doing for a while  
12 and what that looks like as part of the  
13 evidence here.

14           On the performance measures, what  
15 we ask you to do is to tell us each year of  
16 the grant the number of schools in this pot  
17 that you are going to be taking on and turning  
18 around. You don't, for the purposes of this,  
19 have to say what that -- what models you're  
20 using. All of that stuff can be figured out  
21 over time. It's sort of your big picture plan  
22 at the district level for how you're going to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sequence taking on this problem, so it's not  
2 15 a year, it's not turning around the lowest  
3 5 percent annually, it's over the course of  
4 the grant.

5 Let's see if there's anything else  
6 I skipped. A couple of things to talk about  
7 in terms of the school turnaround models,  
8 there are four different models, they're  
9 described in a separate appendix. Again, this  
10 is identical language to the school  
11 improvement grant. There are four models, a  
12 turnaround model, a restart model, a closure  
13 model, and a transformation model.

14 The only restriction is that the  
15 transformation model, if it's an LEA that has  
16 more than nine schools that you've identified  
17 as persistently low-achieving, they can't use  
18 the transformation model on more than half of  
19 them. And here's sort of a quick overview of  
20 the models, but, again, do look at Appendix C  
21 for the detailed descriptions of the models.

22 Anything else about that before we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 move on to F? I think there's a question over  
2 here. Is that a hand up? Yes. Just go a  
3 little higher because I think our mike people  
4 are missing it.

5 FEMALE VOICE: Sorry. I'm short.  
6 I did have a question. On the four models  
7 there's been some change back and forth in  
8 terms of the recommended action with respect  
9 to the principal.

10 MS. WEISS: Oh, yes.

11 FEMALE VOICE: And then in the  
12 final application it says that the principal  
13 must be replaced if they weren't -- if they  
14 were the principal before the transformational  
15 model was undertaken.

16 MS. WEISS: In the final notice,  
17 and I'm not going to -- you should look at the  
18 exact language, but basically it says that the  
19 -- for the turnaround or transformation  
20 models, you do need to take action on  
21 replacing or changing out the principal unless  
22 there's a model that's been underway for less

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 than two years, and that person stays in  
2 charge and can keep leading it if you think  
3 they're the right person to do so.

4 FEMALE VOICE: Correct. So is  
5 there a technical definition for what  
6 constitutes a model that's in place, if a  
7 superintendent has, in fact --

8 MS. WEISS: What we said in the  
9 notice is it's one of these four models in  
10 place, or something substantially similar to  
11 these -- one of these models, so basically the  
12 --

13 FEMALE VOICE: But is the evidence  
14 of that -- is there something that would have  
15 been either filed with the Department or  
16 something that -- or can it just be the  
17 superintendent said, Yes, we undertook a  
18 transformation, we changed this principal, we  
19 started this process two years ago, here's  
20 where we are in it, and now we want to  
21 accelerate it.

22 MS. WEISS: Yes, I mean I think

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that would be up to the state to figure out  
2 how to manage that and understand --

3 FEMALE VOICE: Okay.

4 MS. WEISS: -- that they were  
5 really doing what you thought they said they  
6 were doing.

7 FEMALE VOICE: Okay. Great.

8 MS. WEISS: Okay. So now we're  
9 going to get into the last set of criteria,  
10 most, or all of which are actually state  
11 reform conditions criteria, so none of these  
12 plans.

13 So the first one is around making  
14 education funding a priority, the next one is  
15 around charters, and the last one is around  
16 other significant conditions in your state  
17 that you've put in place and think are  
18 important to creating the conditions for  
19 reform in your state.

20 So let's take each of them. I  
21 have a feeling the charter one is going to be  
22 the one that's going to take us the longest to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 get through. The first one is about  
2 maintenance of effort and equitable funding.  
3 Now the maintenance of effort, one, as you  
4 know, has been very important to the  
5 Department to make sure that we're trying to  
6 encourage states to take education funding as  
7 a very serious priority in the state.

8 I do want to say though that in  
9 recognition of the really tough economic year  
10 everybody has had over the past year, we put a  
11 relatively low number of points on this one.  
12 And so that was sort of our way of giving a  
13 clear nod to the fact that we're certainly not  
14 oblivious to the hard decisions that states  
15 have had to make over the past year, and the  
16 Solomonic choices that they've had to make.

17 So one is about maintenance of  
18 effort and two is about equitable funding.  
19 The evidence that we ask you to provide for  
20 this is financial -- the appropriate financial  
21 data.

22 And the reviewer guidance is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pretty straightforward, you get high points if  
2 the percentage of total revenue used to  
3 support education increased year on year,  
4 medium points if it remains substantially  
5 unchanged, and low points if it decreased.

6 Okay. Let's go to (F)(2) then.  
7 So this is the charter criterion. There is in  
8 the original -- in the notice that we sent  
9 out, there were four parts to the charter  
10 criterion, caps, authorizers and  
11 accountability, funding and facilities. We  
12 added a fifth one in response to public  
13 comments, and so we're going to just sort of  
14 take you through these quickly one at a time  
15 and see if we can answer any questions that  
16 you might have about them.

17 I'm also going to do a little bit  
18 in the deck of flipping back and forth between  
19 the criterion and the evidence because the  
20 evidence and the rubric helps elucidate the  
21 criterion, and so you kind of have to look at  
22 them together to really understand how this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will be judged.

2 So the first one is about caps and  
3 it's about charter school laws that don't  
4 prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the  
5 number of high-performing charter schools in  
6 the state as measured by the percentage of  
7 total schools in the state that are allowed to  
8 be charter schools or otherwise restrict  
9 charter school enrollment.

10 So, flipping forward, the evidence  
11 for this is, first of all, describe your laws.

12 The second piece of evidence is tell us the  
13 number of charter schools allowed under state  
14 law and the percentage this represents of the  
15 total number of schools in the state.

16 And then tell us the number and  
17 types of charter schools operating in the  
18 state, Types is whatever you mean it to be.  
19 There are some states that have different  
20 types of charter schools. And if you're a  
21 state that under law has different types of  
22 charter schools this is just asking you to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 disaggregate that list and explain to the peer  
2 reviewers what you do in your state. So this  
3 is just giving them background information  
4 they need to understand what you're trying to  
5 do.

6 And this is where now we get into  
7 the reviewer guidance from hell. I will just  
8 stand up here and admit that this was not our  
9 easiest task over the past couple of months to  
10 make sense of all these laws and try to come  
11 up with guidance that worked because the ways  
12 that the political compromises have resulted  
13 in some extremely arcane and difficult to  
14 understand laws here. So we were trying to  
15 sort of make it make sense for reviewers who  
16 might not have expertise in this area. And  
17 here is what we came up with.

18 High points are earned if a state  
19 has no cap. Then it's really easy. If you  
20 have no cap this is an easy criterion. For  
21 everyone else if a high cap is designed as a  
22 cap such that if it were filled at least 10

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 percent of the total number of schools in the  
2 state could be charter schools. And then on  
3 top of it the state doesn't have a whole bunch  
4 of other restrictions that stop you from  
5 creating charter schools.

6 And on the next slide -- because  
7 this was so complicated we couldn't even in  
8 10-point type fit it on one slide for you.  
9 And the next slide I'll show you the list of  
10 restrictions.

11 Medium points are earned if such a  
12 cap were filled then between 5 and 10 percent  
13 of the schools in the state were charters, and  
14 low points are earned if fewer than 5 percent  
15 of the schools were allowed to be charters.

16 And then we have the giant  
17 disclaimer to reviewers that says, Charter  
18 laws are complex and these are guidelines to  
19 you. They are not hard and fast rules so you  
20 reviewers are going to have to use some level  
21 of expert judgment as you're looking through  
22 this. And we have in this list provided you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with a number of restrictions -- a number of  
2 different ways that states calculate this.

3 Some states don't calculate this  
4 based on the number of schools -- they  
5 calculate it instead based on funding -- how  
6 do you convert funding to numbers and make an  
7 equivalence there? And then there's a bunch  
8 of different restrictions, and we try to go  
9 through the types of restrictions that may be  
10 onerous and the types of restrictions that may  
11 be okay.

12 So smart caps may be okay if they  
13 do this and their restrictions are maybe less  
14 okay if they do that. So you can read through  
15 this and see how we're telling reviewers to  
16 judge the information that you provide to them  
17 on this one. And I'm just going to assume  
18 that that silence means that everything's good  
19 and move quickly on.

20 MR. REICHARDT: I'm sorry. I even  
21 have to go back prior. The types -- when you  
22 say types that's for the -- who authorizes

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       them? Or is it the grade level served?

2                   MS. WEISS: No, no, no. Types of  
3 charter schools in this context are that some  
4 states have different categories and types of  
5 schools that they -- different types of  
6 charter schools under their law. So it's not  
7 about grade levels and those things. You can  
8 just lump all of that into one category if you  
9 want.

10                   MR. REICHARDT: It's about  
11 authorization kind of -- okay. Thank you.

12                   MS. WEISS: Okay. So (F)(2)(ii)  
13 is about authorizers. This one is important  
14 but a little easier. So it saying what laws,  
15 statutes, regulations, or in this case they  
16 may be guidelines regarding how charter school  
17 authorizers approve, monitor, hold  
18 accountable, reauthorize, and close charter  
19 schools.

20                   So this is asking about  
21 accountability and do you have a strong  
22 accountability system in your state for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recognizing which charter applications ought  
2 to be approved at the front end and for  
3 monitoring and holding them accountable and if  
4 the schools are not living up to their charter  
5 for closing them down.

6 So the evidence for this one is a  
7 description of the state's approach to  
8 accountability and authorization again, and  
9 then some data that we've asked you to  
10 provide. So for each of the last five years  
11 the number of -- and I think this is same as  
12 SFSF -- yeah, it's SFSF. I think this is  
13 information we're asking you for in SFSF as  
14 well, so you'll have it there.

15 The number of charter school  
16 applications that have been made in the state,  
17 the number that have been approved, the number  
18 denied and the reasons for the denial, and the  
19 number of charter schools closed. So basic  
20 data -- you can obviously use this then in  
21 your narrative to explain what you're doing on  
22 accountability.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (F) (2) (iii) is about equitable  
2 funding. So this one is saying that charter  
3 schools receive equitable funding compared to  
4 traditional public schools. And the evidence  
5 for this one again is tell us your laws and  
6 tell us the amount of funding passthrough to  
7 charter schools on a per student basis and how  
8 that compares with the traditional public  
9 school per student funding allocation.

10 And the reviewer guidance on this  
11 one is high points are earned if per pupil  
12 funding to charter students is at least 90  
13 percent of what is provided to traditional  
14 public school students, medium points for 80-  
15 89 percent, and low points if the passthrough  
16 is less than 79 percent.

17 I know I'm racing through this.  
18 It is -- this part gets more black and white  
19 so I think when you go back and read the  
20 criteria this part is a little easier to  
21 deconstruct than the caps.

22 (F) (2) (iv) is about facilities.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The state provides charter schools with  
2 funding for facilities, assistance for  
3 facilities acquisition, access to facilities  
4 -- it just basically lists all the different  
5 ways which might provide facilities to charter  
6 schools.

7 This one is going to ask you to do  
8 descriptions of how you provide this and it --  
9 the guidance to the peer reviewers is much  
10 more of judgment call. We don't have hard and  
11 fast numbers on this one.

12 And (F) (2) (v) is a new one that we  
13 have added. And that is that there are --  
14 that the state enables LEAs to operate  
15 innovative, autonomous public schools other  
16 than charter schools in the state.

17 So this is an acknowledgment that  
18 beyond charters there are some ways in which  
19 states enable LEAs to innovate and provide  
20 other types of schools. And if your state is  
21 a state that has such a system in place you  
22 can get credit for that here as well.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I do want to note that there's a  
2 definition of innovative, autonomous public  
3 schools in the document. It's not whatever  
4 you want to call it -- it's not the magnet  
5 school down the street. So do look at that  
6 definition when you're answering this  
7 criterion. Yeah.

8 MS. MCGRATH: This is Melissa  
9 McGrath from Idaho. And is the facilities  
10 portion -- is that how the state funds  
11 facilities or supports charter school  
12 facilities in comparison to what is does for  
13 traditional public schools? Or is it just  
14 referring to charter schools?

15 MS. WEISS: Well, I mean, we do  
16 say to the extent the state does not impose  
17 any facility-related requirements on charters  
18 that are stricter than those on traditional  
19 public schools. But, you know, most  
20 traditional public schools have a building and  
21 most charter schools starting up don't. So  
22 it's not an equity question as much as it is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 an access question for the facilities.

2 But there's a lot of different  
3 ways to provide access. You can provide it  
4 with a building, you can provide it with  
5 money, you can provide it with incentives. So  
6 we're saying here, how do you provide it? Do  
7 you take that into account in your laws -- and  
8 tell us how that works.

9 MS. MCGRATH: Okay. All right.  
10 Thanks.

11 MS. WEISS: See, we're wearing you  
12 down. That's why we put it in (F). Okay.  
13 (F) (3) -- the last one -- saving the best for  
14 last.

15 So this one is -- we know that we  
16 have a list of things that we asked -- a list  
17 of laws, regulations, statutes that we asked  
18 you about because we, the Department, thought  
19 that they were important things. We also know  
20 that they by no means constitute the universe  
21 of important legal regulatory things that you  
22 could do in your state to create conditions

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that are conducive to reform and innovation  
2 and education.

3 So this one says, tell us about  
4 other laws we didn't ask you about that you  
5 think have been important contributors to the  
6 successors in your state over time. Tell us  
7 what they are. You can not only get credit  
8 for them, but it's one of the ways that we as  
9 a Department are trying -- are starting to try  
10 to gather from states what are the good ideas  
11 in a little bit more of a codified way than  
12 we've been able to in the past so that we can  
13 -- oh, who knows -- in Race to the Top 3 have  
14 a new set of things that are ideas that were  
15 generated by you guys. So that's what this  
16 one is about. And here you just provide us  
17 the description of those laws.

18 So that's it. Any questions on  
19 criteria that occur to you right now before we  
20 just move into priorities? (Pause.) Okay.  
21 Let's keep going then.

22 So priorities -- there is an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 absolute priority. One, in the competition --  
2 and we've already talked about it a little bit  
3 -- that basically just says you have to take a  
4 comprehensive approach to education reform.

5           Just a sort of one-minute  
6 commercial for why we did this -- you know,  
7 there could be an argument for taking on too  
8 much and biting off more than you can chew is  
9 a bad thing. I think that we believe in  
10 education. There's a lot of evidence that  
11 shows that the inertial forces that stall  
12 reforms weigh greater than the biting-off-  
13 more-than-you-can-chew problem, and that if we  
14 don't attack this on multiple fronts  
15 simultaneously we might not break through.

16           So that is the sort of theory of  
17 action that we were operating under when we  
18 said this particular competition. We have  
19 lots of other places where individual  
20 solutions are funded in specific programs.  
21 This is the place for the people who are  
22 really willing to take on the breakthrough

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 change across all fronts and the belief we  
2 have that it really takes an all-front attack  
3 on this one in order to break through.

4 The competitive priority on STEM  
5 is one that's worth spending a couple of  
6 minutes talking about because it's an all or  
7 nothing swing, which means that it's  
8 potentially -- you know, it's worth 15 points,  
9 but that could be a lot of points if it's 15  
10 versus zero in this competition.

11 So to meet this priority your  
12 application has to have a high-quality plan  
13 that addresses these three aspects. The first  
14 one is that it offers a rigorous course of  
15 study in STEM areas.

16 The second is that you've  
17 cooperated with external STEM partners --  
18 industries, museums, universities, whatever --  
19 to prepare and assist teachers in integrating  
20 STEM content across grades and disciplines and  
21 in promoting effective and relevant  
22 instruction and learning opportunities for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 students so that you're working with outside  
2 partners to really integrate STEM in  
3 appropriate ways across grade levels and  
4 disciplines into the curriculum.

5 And the third is that you are  
6 preparing more students for advanced study and  
7 careers in STEM, particularly focusing on  
8 traditionally under-represented groups in this  
9 area.

10 So you do not write to this  
11 priority at the end of this application.  
12 Instead you just weave it in throughout your  
13 application. What we have done in your  
14 application, however, is given you a place in  
15 -- after the STEM priority to point the peer  
16 reviewers in case that would be helpful to you  
17 to say, you know, like, here are the places to  
18 look for where we've integrated this into the  
19 application. So you can just kind of pull it  
20 together in one place and point them out  
21 again. But you're not meant to write to it at  
22 the end -- you write to it where it goes in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the rest of the application.

2 And, again, it's optional. You  
3 don't need to write to it and you could just  
4 say in the priority at the back, We have  
5 chosen not to write to this, and that's  
6 certainly fine too.

7 Then there are four invitational  
8 priorities. These also might be integrated in  
9 places throughout your application. We have  
10 also given you a separate place in the  
11 application if you'd like to write to these.  
12 Note though that peer reviewers are not  
13 scoring any of these invitational priorities.

14 Yeah.

15 MS. DOYLE: This is Betsy Doyle  
16 from Massachusetts. Just a quick questions on  
17 the invitational priorities for which there  
18 are no points. Does that mean that you could  
19 still put them in your budget and have funds  
20 allocated to those activities --

21 MS. WEISS: Yes.

22 MS. DOYLE: -- but not use them

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for points?

2 MS. WEISS: Yes. So they would be  
3 eligible for funding.

4 MS. DOYLE: Great.

5 MR. MILLER: Rick Miller,  
6 California. In addition to -- I know they're  
7 not scored, but I'm curious. When it comes to  
8 the interviews -- and is there actually --  
9 one, are they scoring the interviews and, two,  
10 is there a Rubric for how you're scoring the  
11 interviews -- or how you're thinking about  
12 that?

13 MS. WEISS: Oh, so this leads us  
14 to narrative section. So we are going to talk  
15 about how the competition will work in a  
16 second, so let me come to it then.

17 But the reviewers are not scoring  
18 these invitational priorities at all --  
19 interview, application -- they're unscored.  
20 But they are eligible for funding.

21 Okay. Then I'm going to turn it  
22 over to Meredith and let her take us to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 end.

2 MS. FARACE: Can you all hear me  
3 all right? Okay. The last section -- thanks  
4 for sticking with us. Okay. Program  
5 requirements -- you will find these on pages  
6 95 and 96 of your application. Okay.

7 I'm going to talk a little bit  
8 about Evaluation, Make Work Available, and  
9 Technical Assistance, the three that are in  
10 red. We've already talked about participating  
11 LEA scope of work and state summative  
12 assessments, and so I'm not going touch on  
13 those.

14 But just a couple of notes about  
15 evaluation -- the Department's Institute of  
16 Education Sciences will be doing an evaluation  
17 as part of their national evaluation of the  
18 Recovery Act programs. And so Race to the Top  
19 grantees will be part of that evaluation.

20 The goal is to ensure that we  
21 understand the program impacts, but also  
22 provide informed practices for you all so you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have greater information about what's  
2 happening across the nation.

3 The important thing here is to  
4 know that while you can, if you want to, do  
5 state or local evaluations that's not  
6 required. So you need to be part of the  
7 national evaluation, but you don't need to  
8 write about local or state evaluations.

9 Make work available -- I think  
10 Joanne was the one that talked about this  
11 earlier -- one of us did. Unless otherwise  
12 protected by law we do expect that -- no, it  
13 was Josh -- that all of your information that  
14 you create -- any of your tools or other  
15 information that you create from this grant  
16 would be posted or somehow available to  
17 others.

18 We really want to make sure that  
19 all the good things that you're doing are  
20 transparent to others and that we create a  
21 community of very transparent and open  
22 practices. Again, if you have a law that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 protects certain things that you do then, you  
2 know, we're not overstepping that.

3 And then TA -- we're going to have  
4 TA, technical assistance, to the grantees.  
5 Once you receive a grant we'll have mandatory  
6 technical assistant. We do expect that states  
7 will be part of those technical assistant  
8 activities. And we'll be conducting those  
9 activities -- or our designees.

10 MS. WEISS: Can I just say a  
11 couple of things before we move on? This -- I  
12 just want to elaborate for a second of these  
13 three things because I think even though  
14 they're not important necessarily for the  
15 application writing you're doing they're  
16 important conceptually to understand about  
17 what the Department's trying to do differently  
18 here.

19 So the Making Work Available is  
20 that we know that the Race to the Top states  
21 are going to some of the leaders in developing  
22 innovative practices. They'll also have a lot

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of money to help with the transition to the  
2 standards, so maybe they'll be developing  
3 curricular frameworks, unit materials, lesson  
4 plans, formative or interim assessments -- all  
5 kinds of things that might be really valuable  
6 to all the states that share those same  
7 standards, not just the Race to the Top  
8 winners.

9 And we're trying to really create  
10 a system or a market here for getting that  
11 information out to everyone in the country and  
12 letting the Race to the Top winners be the  
13 ones who help develop it and lead the way, but  
14 providing that information to everyone in the  
15 country to whom it might be applicable.

16 So that's the concept behind the  
17 making work available. We have a lot of work  
18 to do at the Department to figure out how to  
19 enable that. And so all we've said in here is  
20 we'll tell you at some point what to do with  
21 that stuff, but be prepared to know that we're  
22 going to ask you to share that broadly.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Similarly     on     the     technical  
2     assistance -- just as we're asking all of you  
3     to think about how you support your LEAs'  
4     success in ways that may be different from  
5     what you've traditionally been doing, we at  
6     the Department are challenging ourselves to  
7     say our job will be to support the success of  
8     the states who win Race to the Top. And that  
9     will mean we hope very different kinds of  
10    technical assistance activities where we're  
11    building communities of practice across the  
12    winners of the Race to the Top, maybe at the  
13    LEA level if you want to, as well as at the  
14    state levels, and different ways of really  
15    sharing practices among people who are trying  
16    to solve common problems or would just be  
17    really good thought partners for each other  
18    even if the problem they're trying to solve  
19    are a little bit different than one another.

20                   So we are looking at all kinds of  
21    ways of doing technical assistance for the  
22    winners that are maybe different than what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we've done before. We also realize that it's  
2 going to be our obligation as well to figure  
3 out how to take all the things we're learning  
4 from you and make all of those learnings  
5 transparent and accessible to all the people  
6 who don't win Race to the Top and, hence, the  
7 evaluation program we're putting in place is  
8 not only an evaluation of impact, it's also  
9 codifying some of the practices -- the most  
10 promising and best practices that come out of  
11 this so they'll be people documenting those  
12 practices behind you and writing them up to  
13 try to share them nationally.

14 So the evaluation program that  
15 you'll see described briefly in the  
16 application is also a more robust and slightly  
17 different kind of evaluation that we hope will  
18 result in more effective sharing of practices  
19 that really are effective and work. Question  
20 about that?

21 MS. LOPEZ: Hi. My question --  
22 I'm sorry. My name is Nina Lopez from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Colorado. I have a question about the  
2 evaluation. So we anticipate incorporating  
3 into our proposal some evaluation of the  
4 efforts that we embark on similar to what  
5 you're suggesting.

6 And my question is, because the  
7 details or the scope of the national  
8 evaluation efforts aren't available will you  
9 simply not fund that portion of ours if it's  
10 duplicative or how do we know, you know, which  
11 things -- how we want to build upon what  
12 you're going to be doing.

13 MS. WEISS: Yeah, I mean, that's a  
14 good question. And we don't really have -- I  
15 mean, we won't have the program in place in  
16 time. So, no, I think we -- I think that if  
17 there is state level or even local evaluations  
18 that you think are important components of  
19 what you're trying to do to just build the  
20 state or local learning organizations out of  
21 all of this, that probably whatever we do at  
22 the national level would likely not be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 duplicative of that kind of level of detail.

2           So it's not that we're trying not  
3 to encourage you to do that. That's a  
4 perfectly allowable use of funds and may well  
5 make your application a good application. But  
6 -- so it's absolutely allowable. We're just  
7 saying it's not required because we have a  
8 required evaluation over here. I really sort  
9 of doubt that it would be totally duplicative.

10           MS. FARACE: Okay? I'm going to  
11 move on to application submission. Now, this  
12 is not the sexiest part of the presentation,  
13 but I submit to you this is one of the most  
14 important parts because we really cannot make  
15 exceptions about the deadline.

16           Some of you may know from previous  
17 experience that when we say 4:30:00 we mean  
18 4:30:00 and 4:30:02 is late. And I'm sorry to  
19 say that that sounds really bureaucratic, but  
20 at some point you have to cut it off, and we  
21 can't make exceptions for one and not others  
22 and so there it is. Late applications will

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not be accepted.

2 Please also note that January 19  
3 is the deadline for Phase I and January 18 is  
4 a holiday. So I wouldn't head to your local  
5 post office on the 18th and expect it to be  
6 open.

7 I also think that you probably  
8 shouldn't rely on the post office because  
9 anything coming through the U.S. mail system  
10 gets irradiated and it's in some other  
11 location -- that's because of the anthrax  
12 scare a long time ago and they still do that,  
13 and sometimes it damages things. So I would  
14 say don't count on that. I would do Fed Ex or  
15 some other priority overnight mail where you  
16 know when it gets there. So I know that seems  
17 really silly, but this is -- there's a lot  
18 riding on this. Don't count on regular mail.

19 As far as format goes, we talked a  
20 little bit about this. We gave you the file  
21 formats that you can use. That's so that we  
22 can know that we can read it. And, like I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 said, I really think that you should think  
2 about sending this in a PDF format because  
3 that way it's basically a picture of what  
4 you're sending and it's not going to get  
5 messed up when we print it or that sort of  
6 thing.

7           Because when the peers -- you're  
8 going send things on a CD or a DVD -- but many  
9 of the peers might say, Look, I really want  
10 this in hard copy -- that's a lot easier for  
11 me to review. So we're going to print it for  
12 them and we're going to hand it to them in  
13 hard copy.

14           Sometimes when you print things,  
15 things come out differently, and if we can't  
16 read your table then that's going to be  
17 difficult. So that's my pitch for PDF if you  
18 can do it.

19           Now, that's all the electronic  
20 parts. You do have to submit a signed,  
21 original copy of Sections 3 and 4 of the  
22 application and one copy of that signed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 original -- and those are the signature  
2 blocks. So we need that in paper because the  
3 electronic part won't work for signatures.

4 You have to indicate the CFDA  
5 number on the mailing envelope. And we have  
6 two different locations for hand delivery and  
7 overnight mail. So hand delivery could be a  
8 courier if you choose to do that. In the  
9 application -- it's on page 98 to 99 -- there  
10 are the two different addresses to use - on e  
11 for each method, hand delivery or mail. So  
12 that's all listed in the application. It's  
13 also in the Notice Inviting Applications.

14 Again, the January 19 deadline --  
15 I think we talked about this earlier. I know  
16 there was some talk about whether we would  
17 extend it. We are staying firm with the 19th,  
18 so I just wanted to let you know that we're  
19 going to stick with that date. Any questions  
20 or thoughts on this very, very important  
21 slide? (Pause.) Okay.

22 Competition process -- so this is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 how it's going to work. We have an initial  
2 tier -- internally we're calling it Tier I and  
3 Tier II. And this is where the reviewers will  
4 read and comment and score on the  
5 applications. And they will use the selection  
6 criteria and scoring Rubric. They will have  
7 their own independent scores.

8 When we decide then where the  
9 cutoff is for those that go on to the next  
10 tier, to that finalist tier -- the states will  
11 come in to D.C. and give a presentation.  
12 These teams can be made up of up to five  
13 people in your state that have a significant  
14 ongoing role and responsibility in executing  
15 the state's plan. And these teams cannot  
16 include consultants. And the reason for that  
17 is we know that a lot of states are getting  
18 some help with their proposal writing from  
19 consultants, which is fine. But we want to  
20 make sure that state have the capacity to  
21 implement what the consultants are writing.

22 So we need to be asking the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 states, do they understand what's in their own  
2 plan and can they really articulate that. And  
3 so that's why we've asked the consultants not  
4 be part of it. Any questions about that?

5 All right. We've said this is  
6 going to be a very high bar. There will be  
7 probably very few states that go onto the  
8 second tier. But everyone else who is in the  
9 first tier that does not get an invitation to  
10 the second tier will get feedback from the  
11 peers. And then you can use that feedback to  
12 apply for Phase II.

13 So you're at no disadvantage for  
14 not making it to the second tier. You  
15 actually have the advantage of having peer  
16 reviewer feedback, and they're going to have  
17 extensive comments for you. And then you can  
18 use that and look at your scores to adjust  
19 your proposal if you want to apply again in  
20 Phase II, which is due later.

21 Okay. So, like I said, you can  
22 apply in Phase I, and Phase I winners receive

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 full-size awards. Some people have been  
2 asking, Well, if we apply in Phase I can we  
3 apply again in Phase II for more money. And  
4 the answer to that is no -- once you apply for  
5 Phase I, if you win, then that's the amount  
6 you get. And then everyone else has an  
7 opportunity for Phase II.

8 Okay. So planning considerations  
9 -- Joanne talked about this a little bit. We  
10 know that you're working -- oh, I'm sorry.  
11 There's a question.

12 MR. KVAAL: You mentioned that  
13 there's -- sorry. Andrew Kvaal from Ohio.  
14 You mentioned that there's a high bar in this  
15 first phase. And given that it's a point  
16 system it suggests that there is a certain  
17 level of points that you expect that Phase I  
18 applications need to achieve. How does that  
19 high bar translate through to a -- the point  
20 system, if it does at all?

21 MS. WEISS: So we actually don't  
22 have a pre-determined cut score. In fact,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 until we see applications we have no idea what  
2 to expect out of 500 points for really strong  
3 applications.

4 So we don't have a pre-determined  
5 cut score for it. But what we do -- and this  
6 is what we do in all competitions -- is we  
7 rank order the proposals that come in and then  
8 use the data that we see coming back from that  
9 to decide where to draw the lines. So it's  
10 pretty consistent with how we always run  
11 competitions.

12 MS. FARACE: I think Joanne has a  
13 good point though that in the past we often  
14 have points out of a hundred, and this is  
15 different as far as 500 being higher than, you  
16 know, some of the applications that we -- the  
17 competitions we have. And so 90 out of a  
18 hundred might be a typical winner for another  
19 competition. That doesn't necessarily mean  
20 490 out of 500. We don't really know how it's  
21 all going to work out.

22 MS. LEBO: Cheryl Lebo, Arizona.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm just curious -- I oversee assessment and  
2 so I'm very familiar with peer review.

3 MS. FARACE: I'm sure you are.

4 MS. LEBO: Yeah, a little more  
5 familiar than perhaps I'd care to be. Just  
6 kidding. Just kidding.

7 MS. WEISS: No, I understand. You  
8 love it.

9 MS. LEBO: My -- I'm just curious  
10 about the training for peer reviewers and who  
11 you might consider will be the peer reviewers.

12 MS. FARACE: Well, we asked for  
13 nominations for peers. People could either  
14 nominate themselves or others could nominate  
15 them. We got -- how many did we get, Jessica?

16 JESSICA: A thousand --

17 MS. FARACE: Right. So we got a  
18 lot of interest in being peer reviewers, and  
19 we're determining who those peers are going to  
20 be right now. They have extensive experience  
21 in all these different areas. We have a very  
22 high bar for peer reviewers. We think it's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 very important that they have good  
2 qualifications to be able to judge these  
3 applications.

4 And then we're going to do  
5 extensive training with them. I mean, first  
6 of all, they're going to have everything you  
7 have and they're going to understand this in  
8 the same way. So I imagine they're going to  
9 have a training much like today so that they  
10 can learn what to look for and what you know.

11 Do you want to add anything to that?

12 MS. WEISS: No, I think that's  
13 right. I think the training for the reviewers  
14 is understanding the criteria -- the same kind  
15 of training that you're getting today. And  
16 then, in addition, they're getting extra  
17 training on how to write comments in a way  
18 that will actually be useful to you. So we  
19 have a whole separate part of their curriculum  
20 that you don't have to go that you hopefully  
21 will be the beneficiaries of.

22 MS. FARACE: Yeah. Part of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process is that we as Department members don't  
2 review the applications in the same way as  
3 peers. But we make sure that they do comments  
4 on each of the pieces and that that's useful  
5 for you.

6 So we'll have a training probably  
7 offsite -- talk to them over the phone. Then  
8 when they come in we'll have more training.  
9 So they're going to have many opportunities to  
10 ask questions of us.

11 VOICE: Like two or three on a  
12 project or don't know how many?

13 MS. WEISS: You're asking how many  
14 reviewers per application? We're still  
15 working out the details of this.

16 MS. FARACE: Probably more than  
17 two or three.

18 MS. WEISS: But it's going to be  
19 at the high end, so it -- I think three  
20 reviewers per application may be typical for  
21 us. In this competition we're more likely to  
22 have more like five. We're still working out

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these details.

2 And we will add to the FAQ  
3 document a bunch of these additional details  
4 on how we're constructing panels and how that  
5 will work as soon as we have it totally nailed  
6 down, which would be in the next couple of  
7 weeks probably. So we'll put out an FAQ and  
8 tell you a little bit more about panel  
9 construction as soon as we know exactly what  
10 that looks like.

11 MS. LEBO: And just one follow up  
12 -- and that is -- I don't know that you could  
13 do this, but is there anything that will be  
14 done on interrelator reliability?

15 MS. FARACE: We're working very  
16 hard on that actually.

17 MS. WEISS: Yes.

18 MS. FARACE: We've been talking  
19 about that for several weeks trying to come up  
20 with the best plan to deal with that  
21 particular issue.

22 MS. WEISS: Yeah. And that's why

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the FAQ hasn't come out yet, because we're  
2 both looking at within a panel and across  
3 panels how do we get the reliability --  
4 something we're comfortable with and is as  
5 small as it is in this kind of setting. So  
6 we're working hard on that and we'll tell you  
7 what our answers to that are in the FAQs that  
8 we come out with.

9 MS. FARACE: And at the end of all  
10 this the proposals will be posted, the final  
11 scores will be posted, and who the peers are  
12 will be posted. So this will be very  
13 transparent. We haven't decided exactly at  
14 what stage because we want to make sure that  
15 the entire process from Phase I to Phase II  
16 isn't corrupt in any way. But, you know, we  
17 will make all that transparent to the public.

18 MS. LEVIN: Will there be kind of  
19 a final check -- since there won't be that  
20 many applications -- to make sure there hasn't  
21 been kind of a technical glitch -- for  
22 example, maybe a section where a reviewer

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 didn't make any negative comments but maybe  
2 forgot to put the points?

3 MS. FARACE: Every single section  
4 has -- no, we're not going to -- yes, like I  
5 said, we have Department of Ed panel monitors,  
6 they're called -- and they're generally  
7 experienced in doing this. And their  
8 responsibility is to review the comments and  
9 make sure that every part that's supposed to  
10 have a score has a score. So there's  
11 definitely checks on this, and people have  
12 done this for years, yeah.

13 And, just so you know, while this  
14 is a big, new, exciting competition we're  
15 using the procedures we've had in place for a  
16 long time. And we've been doing competitive  
17 grants for a very long time with a lot of  
18 experience. And so we're thinking through  
19 issues, but a lot of these things are already  
20 set in stone because we know how to do that  
21 and we've been doing it. Other questions  
22 before I get into planning? Yeah.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MUENKS: Michael Muenks from  
2 Missouri. I have just a follow-up question on  
3 the peer reviewer selection. Also being an  
4 assessment geek, I'm used to the peer review  
5 process in the assessment world. And knowing  
6 that I'm writing to that type of peer helps me  
7 understand what type of language to use.

8 And so I was wondering if you  
9 could expand just a little bit and -- I mean,  
10 just a teeny bit -- to get -- are we thinking  
11 of folks that are university consultants?  
12 What sort of level of peer am I thinking -- am  
13 I envisioning when I'm writing? Because that  
14 does impact the way I write and the way I  
15 describe things possibly or the type of  
16 language I use even.

17 MS. FARACE: It will be a mixture  
18 of individuals. We will have university  
19 folks, policy makers, practitioners, people  
20 who've done this. Joanne, do you want to add  
21 --

22 MS. WEISS: Yeah. I was just

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to try to point you to -- the Secretary  
2 issued an open call for reviewers that said  
3 what the criteria were we were looking for.  
4 That -- we issued that call in August and the  
5 period closed at the end of September. So I  
6 was just asking whether the letter is still on  
7 our website so we could point you to it.  
8 Since it's expired I'm not sure if it is.

9 VOICE: It's there if you type --  
10 if you search it in the search bar.

11 MS. WEISS: Oh, okay. So if you  
12 search probably Race to the Top reviewers --

13 VOICE: Right.

14 MS. WEISS: -- you'll be able to  
15 find the letter where he described the kinds  
16 of both people and the kinds of traits and  
17 qualities that we were looking for. And those  
18 are the same criteria that we're using to pick  
19 people. But it's a pretty diverse group. It  
20 would be hard to write to the group obviously.

21 It's a pretty diverse group of  
22 people that we're pulling from here. It's not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the same as when you're doing peer review in  
2 the assessment world, and it's a pretty  
3 specific kind of expertise that you're looking  
4 for. This is broader than that.

5 MS. FARACE: And we'll obviously  
6 make sure there aren't conflicts of interest  
7 from the reviewers and who they're -- you  
8 know, the applications that they're looking  
9 at.

10 Okay. Planning considerations --  
11 so we know that one of the big considerations  
12 that you're dealing with right now is what  
13 your work plan is for the next few months --  
14 your weekends, your holidays.

15 And we thought it would be helpful  
16 to give you a couple of planning  
17 considerations so that you can think through  
18 what you may want to do early versus later in  
19 the process. Now, obviously, you can do this  
20 any way you want, but we thought it might be  
21 helpful to give you a couple of things to  
22 think about.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So lining up the certification  
2           from the state's attorney general -- so what  
3           we've done here is give you the requirements  
4           and the selection of criteria that would  
5           require the state's attorney general to be  
6           looking at the state laws, statutes, and  
7           regulations.

8           So you may not want to want -- for  
9           instance, (F)(3) -- if you're doing it  
10          sequentially and you don't get to (F)(3) until  
11          towards the end you may not want to wait to  
12          have your attorney general look at that for  
13          the first time right before you send it in.  
14          You may want to think ahead and do some of  
15          these pieces and have them take a look at it  
16          early on in the process.

17          Enlisting participation from your  
18          LEAs and collecting the required data --  
19          obviously we've talked a lot about that today.

20          You all know that signing up the LEAs is a  
21          task that takes some time and that there's  
22          certain data that you might have to request

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from them in order to write your plan.

2 So we've highlighted a couple of  
3 areas here that you might want to look at and  
4 think about. As you're signing up your LEAs  
5 you might want to also potentially create a  
6 data collection tool where you get some  
7 information from them.

8 Completing the budget is something  
9 that's going to be an ongoing process, but  
10 that you would probably want to think about  
11 early.

12 And then lining up these three  
13 signatures -- you certainly -- you don't want  
14 to make, you know, a problem with getting a  
15 signature be something that holds you up.

16 MS. WEISS: And just to remind  
17 you, because we didn't really touch on that --  
18 the three signatures -- I think you all  
19 notice, but three signatures required overall  
20 on your application are the Governor, the  
21 president of the State Board of Education, if  
22 you have such a thing in your state, and the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 chief state school officer.

2 MS. FARACE: Okay. So on this  
3 slide what we've done is we've written up one  
4 potential way that you could approach and  
5 navigate this process. So this isn't by any  
6 means something that you need to do, but we  
7 thought it might be helpful for you.

8 So first you might want to outline  
9 your statewide reform agenda and your specific  
10 plans in collaboration and in consultation  
11 with your LEAs as you think it's appropriate  
12 and keep them aware of your plans as they  
13 develop it. Because obviously they'll be  
14 signing onto your plan -- they'll want to know  
15 what those plans are as you go.

16 You're going to be creating an MOU  
17 or other binding agreement for your LEAs to  
18 sign, so either the one we have in the back in  
19 the appendix or one that you decide to create  
20 -- but to be simpler if you want to use that  
21 model I know you feel free to do that. That's  
22 in Appendix D. You can use it as it or create

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 your MOU as we've discussed.

2 And then each LEA decides that --  
3 whether interested in participating in the  
4 state's Race to the Top plan, and, if so, they  
5 create the MOU and they determine, together  
6 with the state, what portions of the plan they  
7 will participate in. They sign the MOU and  
8 then return to the state. And, as we've  
9 talked about at great length, then the state  
10 determines whether they are going to  
11 countersign that MOU.

12 So then the state reviews the MOU  
13 to ensure that it meets the requirements of  
14 the state. So, like we said before, you set  
15 the bar. You decide whether the LEA actually  
16 met that -- met all or significant portions --  
17 however you've define that -- of the plan.  
18 And then you countersign it if the LEA's  
19 accepted. So that's your part of that.

20 If an LEA isn't accepted you  
21 should probably have a process for providing  
22 feedback to them so that they know that they

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can resubmit and have another opportunity.

2 But any application will not be  
3 considered in the reviewers' evaluations if  
4 they sign up after the fact. So we've talked  
5 about that a little bit. They can sign up  
6 after your deadline, but that wouldn't be part  
7 of what the reviewers see and so they can't  
8 give you additional points for the scope of  
9 your participating LEAs.

10 Then the state completes the  
11 tables that summarize the LEAs participation.

12 We spent a lot of time on that this morning.

13 And if you're awarded a grant your  
14 participating LEAs, including those that  
15 submitted too late, have up to 90 days to  
16 complete the final scope of work. And at the  
17 conclusion you notify the LEAs with their sub-  
18 grants -- in their final Section 1406(c) sub-  
19 grants. So we've gone through all that. This  
20 is just putting this all together, kind of a  
21 way you might go about planning for your  
22 participating LEAs.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And, with that, we're going to be  
2 -- I'm 20 minutes ahead of time -- look at  
3 that. So questions for the rest of the day.  
4 It's all you, and then we're going to have a  
5 little closing by Joanne.

6           But this is a tremendous amount of  
7 information. I hope putting it in this format  
8 has been a little helpful. I know I've  
9 learned a lot listening to Joanne today talk  
10 about all this.

11           But, once again, please know that  
12 when you write to RacetotheTop@ed.gov or you  
13 call the phone number we're actually going to  
14 write back. I know a lot of people say, I  
15 don't know if I've ever going to hear from you  
16 again, but I'm one of the people who tracks  
17 all that and I'm on that e-mail site all day  
18 long writing back to people, and bringing  
19 together the right people to answer your  
20 questions.

21           So we bring together lawyers and  
22 people from across the Department to make sure

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we have the right answer. And then what we're  
2 trying to do is update our FAQs at least once  
3 a week or every two weeks so that your answer  
4 is appropriate to others -- you know, others  
5 can take advantage of hearing about that.

6 So we really do know this is a lot  
7 to digest. But we are going to try to be as  
8 helpful as we can in this process, and we'll  
9 be working hard up until January 19 as well.  
10 I'll turn it over to you. Or any questions on  
11 this section before I sit down?

12 MS. FOLDESY: I have no  
13 recollection -- this is Judy Foldesy from  
14 Kansas. I have no recollection on what  
15 PowerPoint slide I saw this but it seems like  
16 --

17 MS. FARACE: You have to quote the  
18 exact number or we're --

19 MS. FOLDESY: 200 -- but it wasn't  
20 even on today's. I recall one saying that  
21 there was a letter of intent needed to be  
22 submitted by December.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FARACE: Oh, yeah, that's a  
2 great thing to talk about.

3 MS. FOLDESY: And I never hear it  
4 mentioned.

5 MS. FARACE: So there is a letter  
6 of intent that we encourage you -- it's not  
7 required, but we encourage you to submit to  
8 us. And the deadline for that is Monday the  
9 8th -- so that's this upcoming Monday.

10 If you send in a letter of intent  
11 to apply and you decide not to apply in Phase  
12 I that's fine. There's no problem. If you  
13 choose not to send in the letter of intent and  
14 you do apply that's no problem too.

15 What we're trying to do is just  
16 get a little RSVP so that we have a little  
17 better sense of the numbers who are interest.

18 We're also hearing about things to the media,  
19 but it's obviously better to get it from you  
20 that you're quite interested. We've only  
21 gotten a handful of states. We know there are  
22 more than a handful of state interested.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So, if you would, all you need to  
2 do is take two minutes out of your day, write  
3 the RaceToTheTop@ed.gov, To Whom It May  
4 Concern -- We are interested -- we are from  
5 State X. That's it. So that would be great.

6       You all have your computers right here. You  
7 can just send it all to me right now.

8           MS. WEISS: Yeah. And just as you  
9 can imagine, putting together -- even knowing  
10 how many reviewers we need --

11          MS. FARACE: Yeah.

12          MS. WEISS: -- is hard for us. So  
13 the more insight we can have into how many  
14 applicants we're going to have the more it  
15 will just help us do all the planning we have  
16 to do of running the competition.

17          MS. FARACE: I mean, we have to  
18 assume 52 just in case, but it certainly does  
19 help to know. Others? Nope. Okay. Open Q  
20 and A. Anything you want related to Race to  
21 the Top. Or whatever.

22          MS. WEISS: Yeah. We just wanted

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to leave a little time at the end for any  
2 questions that you thought of earlier, didn't  
3 get a chance to ask.

4 VOICE: I'm going to take a crack  
5 at one that's been kind of burning, which is,  
6 you know, if I look at like the state  
7 summative assessments, it's 10 points and it's  
8 extremely prescriptive about how you get those  
9 10 points. You do this you get 10, you do  
10 this you get 5, et cetera.

11 MS. WEISS: Wait. Which one are  
12 you talking about?

13 VOICE: With the state -- the  
14 summative assessments -- common -- (B) (2).  
15 It's an e.g. The point that I'm getting at is  
16 that you look at the participating LEAs -- and  
17 that is 45 points -- it's a huge part of the  
18 application, and it is a black hole as far as,  
19 you know, how many LEAs, to what extent are  
20 they participating, how many signatures do you  
21 have for each one. The question is was that  
22 intentional that that was left vague, and will

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it be clarified at some point between now and  
2 January 19?

3 MS. WEISS: So it -- well, there's  
4 no further clarification beyond what's in the  
5 notice and what we're telling you today. If  
6 there's specific questions that come through  
7 our process and we answer them in our FAQs I  
8 guess that's possible. But we're not  
9 intending to provide any additional  
10 clarification.

11 And the reason for this again is  
12 we really are trying to provide a different  
13 paradigm of how grant making happens that  
14 says, Here's the problem you're going to  
15 solve. The way that one state solves it might  
16 not be the right way to solve it for another  
17 state. And that's fine. They could both earn  
18 maximum points because in their context it is  
19 a great way to think about how to break  
20 through and solve this problem and really  
21 drive results.

22 So it really is designed to be a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 very flexible mechanism. In the big areas  
2 that count is exactly where we're trying to be  
3 flexible and provide you with the opportunity  
4 to say, In my state here's what I need to do  
5 in order to move the needle forward on  
6 academic achievement. So I don't know what to  
7 tell you other than the black hole was by  
8 design.

9 MS. LEVIN: Sue Levin from Oregon.

10 A quick question and a clarification. The  
11 quick question is, it appears that we can  
12 collect letters of support from stakeholders,  
13 community organizations, et cetera, and  
14 include those in our appendix. Is that  
15 correct?

16 MS. WEISS: Yes.

17 MS. LEVIN: Okay.

18 MS. WEISS: And then would you  
19 summarize them in your narrative --

20 MS. LEVIN: Right.

21 MS. WEISS: -- and refer to them.

22 MS. LEVIN: And clarification:

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Back to low-performing schools, could you just  
2 take one more swing at the difference between  
3 a low-performing school and a district that is  
4 not otherwise identified as a participating  
5 district?

6 I believe I heard you say that  
7 that district does not need to sign the MOU  
8 but can still participate in the application  
9 with respect to the low-performing school in  
10 their district. Is that correct?

11 MS. WEISS: Yes. And you could  
12 then -- if you wanted to, you could say, We're  
13 using SIG money or other money to fund that,  
14 or if you wanted to, you could call them out  
15 and say, We're actually supplementing it with  
16 some additional Race to the Top money out of  
17 the state's 50 percent.

18 MS. LEVIN: Great. Thank you.

19 MS. VAUGHN: Sally Vaughn from  
20 Michigan. Can you either confirm or deny a  
21 rumor?

22 MS. WEISS: That's our favorite

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 activity.

2 MS. VAUGHN: Our assessment people  
3 came back from the discussions about the  
4 common assessment and said that they had heard  
5 that adopting the common assessments means  
6 that you have to be able and willing or ready  
7 sometime to do them all online.

8 MS. WEISS: Okay. I was there.

9 MS. VAUGHN: Oh, good.

10 MS. WEISS: I mean, we haven't  
11 specified one way or another any of that yet.

12 This is an information gathering period that  
13 we're in right now. And so there was  
14 certainly talk about how technology can help  
15 in assessment and -- that is a direction we  
16 could end up deciding to go, and we're not  
17 making any of those decisions for a while.  
18 We're still in the information gather stage.

19 So I will deny the rumor but say  
20 that that could be what happens a few months  
21 from now, but we don't know that yet.

22 Any other questions? People ready

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to head for the airport? So can we ask you  
2 one question before we let you go? We are  
3 going to send around an evaluation form  
4 because we really know that as we go forward  
5 with this and do more technical assistance  
6 events even after the awards are granted that  
7 how we run these events is going to be really  
8 important for the success of the entire  
9 initiative.

10 So we would love your feedback on  
11 anything that you think worked particularly  
12 well and, even more importantly, any areas  
13 that you think we could improve or do this  
14 differently or better next time. Love to hear  
15 from anyone today who wants to say this, and  
16 we'll also send you an evaluation form and  
17 really ask that you give us good, candid  
18 information.

19 MR. REICHARDT: Are the slides  
20 going to be posted?

21 MS. WEISS: Yes. The slides will  
22 be posted next week.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FARACE: And all the slides  
2 from all webinars are on our Race to the Top  
3 website.

4 MS. WOLFE: Quick question for  
5 you. Will you repeat technical assistance  
6 seminars like this for Phase II?

7 MS. FARACE: Yes. We'll have  
8 something for Phase II as well.

9 MS. WEISS: That wasn't feedback.  
10 Those were more questions.

11 MS. FARACE: Was there anything  
12 that could have been more useful? We're doing  
13 this again next week. So for your friends on  
14 the East Coast is there --

15 MS. WEISS: They don't want them  
16 to win.

17 MS. FARACE: Is there anything you  
18 want to make sure we don't do next week?

19 MS. WEISS: Cancel the East Coast  
20 one. I hear you.

21 VOICE: Great job.

22 MS. WEISS: Thank you. Thanks,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but really we really do want the ways to  
2 improve as well. So when you get the  
3 evaluation form feel free to be brutal with  
4 us. We can take it. It will help us do a  
5 better job of meeting your needs. So let us  
6 know how we can do that. Thank you very much.

7 Let me just end by making sure  
8 that this last slide is displayed to just  
9 remind you of the different addresses and  
10 websites that we hope will be helpful to you  
11 over the coming weeks and remind you that a  
12 whole team of us led by Meredith is at the  
13 helm when you send us questions by e-mail.

14 So we really will take them  
15 seriously and get you answers as quickly as we  
16 can knowing that we need the answers to be  
17 right. And it might take us, as you've  
18 noticed today, a while to caucus with the  
19 right folks sometimes to get the answer to  
20 your questions.

21 So thank you so much for taking  
22 your time and for traveling to the frigid

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 state of Colorado for this event. Luckily  
2 we've -- oh, sorry -- the great state of  
3 Colorado for this event. And we hope you have  
4 a safe and good trip back. And we look forward  
5 to hearing from you on January 19. Thanks.

6 (Whereupon, at 4:15 p.m., the  
7 meeting was concluded.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701