

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

RACE TO THE TOP PROGRAM

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLANNING
WORKSHOP FOR STATESTHURSDAY,
DECEMBER 10, 2009

The Workshop convened at 9:00 a.m.
in Salons 3 and 4 of the Sheraton Baltimore
Washington Airport Hotel, located at 1100 Old
Elkridge Landing Road, Linthicum, Maryland,

PANEL MEMBERS:

JOANNE WEISS, Director, Race to the Top
Program; Senior Advisor to the Secretary
JOSHUA BENDOR, Race to the Top Team
MEREDITH FARACE, Office of Elementary and
Secondary Education
JANE HESS, Office of the General Counsel
RACHEL PETERNITH, Office of the General
Counsel

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CONTENTS

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| Call to Order and Welcome | 5 |
| Joanne Weiss | |
| Director | |
| Race to the Top | |
| U.S. Department of Education | |
| | |
| Goals for the Meeting | 5 |
| | |
| Agenda | 7 |
| | |
| Groundrules for the Day | 9 |
| | |
| Introductions | 14 |
| | |
| Overview of the Notice | 15 |
| Joanne Weiss | |
| | |
| Presentation on the Application | 27 |
| Meredith Farace | |
| | |
| Section A, State Success Factors | 48 |
| Section (A) (1) | 51 |
| Section (A) (1) (i) | 106 |
| Section (A) (1) (ii) | 107 |
| Section (A) (1) (iii) | 124 |
| Section (A) (2) | 124 |
| Section (A) (3) | 171 |

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

| | |
|--|-----|
| Section B, Standards and Assessment | 194 |
| Section (B) (1) | 194 |
| Section (B) (1) (i) | 200 |
| Section (B) (1) (ii) | 202 |
| Section (B) (2) | 204 |
| Section (B) (3) | 207 |
| | |
| Section C, Data Systems to Support Instruction | 218 |
| Section (C) (1) | 219 |
| Section (C) (2) | 221 |
| Section (C) (3) | 222 |
| | |
| Section (D), Great Teachers and Leaders | 227 |
| Section (D) (1) | 228 |
| Section (D) (1) (i) | 230 |
| Section (D) (1) (ii) | 231 |
| Section (D) (1) (iii) | 231 |
| Section (D) (2) | 236 |
| Section (D) (3) | 259 |
| Section (D) (4) | 268 |
| Section (D) (5) | 270 |

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

| | |
|---|-----|
| Section (E), Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools | 273 |
| Section (E) (1) | 273 |
| Section (E) (2) | 275 |
| Section (E) (2) (i) | 268 |
| Section (F), General | 293 |
| Section (F) (1) | 293 |
| Section (F) (1) (i) | 293 |
| Section (F) (2) | 300 |
| Section (F) (2) (i) | 300 |
| Section (F) (2) (ii) | 308 |
| Section (F) (2) (iii) | 309 |
| Section (F) (2) (iv) | 317 |
| Section (F) (2) (v) | 318 |
| Section (F) (3) | 319 |
| Priorities | 321 |
| Program Requirements | 325 |
| Application Submission Procedures | 338 |
| The Competition Process | 342 |
| Planning Considerations | 351 |
| General Question-and-Answer Period | 367 |

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

PROCEEDINGS

9:01 a.m.

MS. WEISS: (presiding) Good morning.

Thank you so much for coming. I know that a lot of you traveled long distances across lots of snowy terrain today. So thank you so much for coming.

I am Joanne Weiss. I am the Director of the Race to the Top Program at the Department of Education. In a minute, I am going to introduce my colleagues who are up here today.

But, first, let me just get started by talking a little bit, as soon as I figure out where to point myself. There we go. I think it was moving along, but just not showing here. So hang on. There we go.

Goals for the meeting, a good place to start. So what we wanted to do was just start with a quick overview of what we are trying to accomplish, talk to you a little

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 bit about the agenda, and then we will get
2 going with the content that I know you all
3 came for.

4 So the goals for the meeting are
5 pretty clear to all of us, I think. We want
6 to provide all of you with an overview of the
7 notice and of the application. We want to
8 make sure you know all the information that we
9 have released and that is available, what it
10 is, where to find it. Then we want to really
11 walk you through the application, make sure it
12 is really clear to everybody how the
13 application works, how the parts fit together.

14 We will spend the bulk of the day talking
15 about the selection criteria and the
16 priorities, and making sure that people
17 understand what those are and what they mean,
18 and answering as many of your questions as we
19 possibly can.

20 A couple of caveats on the
21 questions. We are only allowed to answer
22 questions that are technical, clarifying,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 logistical in nature. So, if you ask me a
2 question about how you can make your
3 application more competitive than the person
4 sitting next to you, I am going to tell you to
5 have that conversation over break with each
6 other. But feel free to ask the questions
7 you've got, and we will feel free to let you
8 know if it is something that we can't answer.

9 The agenda for the day. We are
10 going to spend the beginning of the day, just
11 the first hour, making sure everybody is
12 oriented to the notices themselves and to the
13 application. Then the whole rest of the day
14 is spent on the different criteria.

15 Thanks to the lovely way we have
16 designed this State Success Factors A, Section
17 A of the application is by far the most
18 complex part of the whole application. So we
19 are going to get to spend the entire morning
20 talking through that because that has a lot of
21 information in it about how you work with
22 participating LEAs, how you do a Memorandum of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Understanding.

2 We know there were a lot of
3 questions about that initially. So we want to
4 make sure that we spend enough time there to
5 make sure that is all clearly understood and
6 we get your questions answered there.

7 After that, we will have a lunch
8 break. I didn't actually ask, but I assume
9 that there are places out here set up that
10 people can grab lunch. Check at registration
11 at lunchtime if you need help. Okay, great.

12 Then, in the afternoon, we are
13 going to go through the remainder of the
14 sections, B, C, D, E, and F, and the
15 priorities. Then we will talk about a bunch
16 of additional information that we think will
17 be helpful to you around program requirements,
18 application requirements, how to submit your
19 application, a perhaps slightly boring
20 logistical part, but trust us, a really
21 critical part of what you need to know and
22 understand in order to make sure that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 application comes to us in a way that we can
2 actually grab it and include it. Then we are
3 going to talk a little bit about how the
4 competition works as well.

5 So that is what the agenda looks
6 like for the day. Before we jump into the
7 actual content, I want to just talk for a
8 minute about some of the groundrules for the
9 day.

10 Because the content that we are
11 going through is really dense, we are actually
12 going to ask you to ask your questions as we
13 go rather than hold them, because we think it
14 will be more efficient when the slide is up
15 that you have a question about for you to
16 raise your hand and ask your question. So
17 definitely ask your questions as we go.

18 For those of you who were in
19 Denver, the Denver group was smaller than this
20 group, and we let public participants ask
21 questions as well as states. In this forum,
22 we are going to ask that we restrict the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions to states only, so that we really
2 make sure that we are getting your questions
3 answered first.

4 We do, as you saw on the agenda,
5 have a Q&A section at the very end of the day
6 for all of the sort of miscellaneous questions
7 that we weren't able to get to. And if we
8 have time, then we will be happy to take
9 questions from members of the public who are
10 here as well. But let's make sure we get the
11 states' questions answered first.

12 Since there are a lot of you,
13 there may be cases where we need to move on
14 for the sake of time, to make sure we get
15 through the content. So I do ask that you
16 prioritize your questions to make sure that we
17 are getting the most important questions
18 first.

19 Additional questions can be
20 submitted, as you see up here on the slide, to
21 racetothetop@ed.gov. Meredith is actually the
22 person manning that mailbox. So you know it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is not being manned by a robot ED person. It
2 is us at the other end of the line. So we
3 really will answer your questions. If you
4 don't get something answered or asked today
5 that is important, or a new question comes up
6 over the course of the next few weeks, feel
7 free to use that line. We promise to get back
8 to you in a really timely fashion.

9 In addition, we are taking all of
10 the questions that are generic questions and
11 publishing them in our frequently asked
12 questions document. So our plan is to update
13 that document approximately weekly. So keep
14 an eye on the website, and we will be adding
15 addenda to that as we get questions that we
16 think are applicable to everybody.

17 A couple more things. When we are
18 asking questions, we do have people who have
19 hand-held microphones. Guys, why don't you
20 come grab your microphones now and wave, so
21 people know?

22 What we would like you to do, when

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you get a question, is just raise your hand
2 and keep it up, if it hasn't been seen. One
3 of the people with a microphone will come
4 stand behind you and poise us to be ready to
5 answer, to let you ask your question.

6 We are asking that everybody speak
7 into the microphone because we are
8 transcribing everything that happens today, so
9 that we can put the transcription up on the
10 web. The transcribers can only grab it if you
11 speak into a microphone.

12 In addition, I wanted to tell you
13 that the cameras that are here are not
14 Department of Ed cameras. They are news
15 cameras. So we have a special protocol that
16 we have developed, together with the news
17 folks who are here. So this is a group from
18 PBS that is doing a documentary on Race to the
19 Top. Because it is a news production, they
20 don't need consent forms from each of you in
21 order to film this.

22 However, we have a protocol that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we have agreed to with them that is, if you
2 are not comfortable being seen on camera or
3 having your question on tape, then when you
4 just start your question, when you raise your
5 hand and you get the microphone, and you are
6 asking a question, just say into the
7 microphone, "I don't want this on camera", and
8 then go ahead and ask your question. They
9 will promise not to use any of that material.

10 So that is your secret code. Use it as you
11 wish.

12 One other thing is, in addition to
13 the folks in this room, we have about 70 to 80
14 people dialing in on a webinar today. They
15 are also hooked in through our sound system.
16 So another good reason to ask your questions
17 into the microphone, so that the people on the
18 phone can hear. They are seeing the slides
19 and they are hearing us. They also can ask
20 questions by phone.

21 And over at this table, Jessica is
22 going to be the voice of the webinar. So, as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people type in questions, she, too, will be
2 raising her hand, and we will call on her so
3 that she can ask questions on behalf of the
4 people who are on the webinar. So you will
5 see us trying to sort of cover the room and
6 cover the virtual room as well.

7 Let me see if there is anything
8 here I missed. I don't think so, other than
9 just the request to please put your cell
10 phones on vibrate.

11 Cat, did you want to say anything
12 to folks quickly about what you are doing?

13 Cat is the producer from PBS who
14 is filming this. So, if you have questions,
15 feel free to ask her.

16 Okay. With that, let me just do
17 quick introductions of the group of us who are
18 here today to present to you and answer your
19 questions.

20 Rachel?

21 MS. PETERNITH: Hi. I'm Rachel
22 Peternith from the Office of General Counsel

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at the Department.

2 MS. HESS: I'm Jane Hess, also
3 from the Office of General Counsel at the
4 Department of Education.

5 MR. BENDOR: Josh Bendor with the
6 Race to the Top team at the Department.

7 MS. FARACE: Hi. I'm Meredith
8 Farace, Office of Elementary and Secondary
9 Education.

10 MS. WEISS: Great. So that is who
11 we are.

12 We also ask that, as you ask
13 questions, you always begin the question by
14 telling us who you are. So let us know your
15 name and what state you are from. Even if you
16 have asked questions before, and this is your
17 second or third or 15th question, please still
18 start by saying your name because the
19 transcribers need it in order to do the
20 transcription properly.

21 So, with that, I am going to give
22 you a really quick overview of the notice

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because I do think at this point that this is
2 something that most of you know. But we still
3 think that it is good to stay kind of anchored
4 in the big picture before we dive into the
5 weeds. I think it is going to be very easy
6 today to get so lost in the details that we
7 forget the big picture. So we wanted to start
8 by just framing the whole conversation a
9 little bit.

10 So Race to the Top, as you know,
11 is an opportunity for states to really
12 implement comprehensive reforms statewide
13 across four core reform areas: adopting
14 common standards and assessments that really
15 prepare students for success in college and
16 careers; recruiting, rewarding, and retaining
17 effective teachers and principals, and making
18 sure that the most effective teachers and
19 principals are allocated to the schools and to
20 the children that need them the most; building
21 data systems that measure students' success
22 and help inform instructional practice, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 then turning around the nation's persistently
2 lowest-achieving schools -- all with an eye,
3 of course, toward increasing student
4 achievement, decreasing achievement gaps, and
5 increasing college and high school graduation
6 rates.

7 So, with that big picture in mind,
8 we do want to tell you a little bit about the
9 public comment process. The main point that I
10 would like to make to you, since I know that a
11 lot of you have been following this all along
12 and don't need many reminders, but we had a
13 significant level of engagement from the
14 public during the public comment process, way
15 beyond what we typically see in the
16 Department.

17 It is our sincere hope that this
18 level of public engagement really translates
19 in many of your states into a new level of
20 conversation and dialog that you are able to
21 have in the states with members of the public
22 and other people who are interested in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 education coming to the table with you, non-
2 profits, charter school organizations,
3 education reform organizations, community and
4 parent groups.

5 We heard from all of them during
6 this process. I think that is a great way to
7 tee them up for the conversations that I know
8 each of you are having across your states now.

9 So, with that, a quick reminder on
10 the timeline. The notice was published in The
11 Federal Register, as you know, on November
12 18th. December 8th was our requested deadline
13 for people to let us know if they intend to
14 apply.

15 I want to make sure everybody
16 knows that (a) that is not binding. If you
17 sent us an intent to apply and decide not to,
18 that is fine. If you don't send us an intent
19 to apply and then decide to apply, that is
20 totally fine as well.

21 It does, however, help us with our
22 planning because, as you could imagine, we are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the throes right now of trying to design
2 the competition and the number of reviewers we
3 need, how many panels. It helps us to have
4 some sense.

5 So, even if you missed that
6 deadline but do intend to apply, you can still
7 do it. All you need to do is send a quick
8 email to racetothetop@ed.gov and just say, "I
9 intend to apply" and make sure we know what
10 state you are from.

11 I think we have heard from --
12 what? -- 28. I think we have heard from about
13 28 states so far that you are intending to
14 apply. So, if you are not one of those and
15 you do intend to apply, we would appreciate a
16 quick note.

17 Okay. Another thing that is
18 clearly worth talking about is the application
19 deadline. There was a request that we got to
20 extend the application deadline beyond January
21 19th. And after taking it under consideration
22 within the Department, we have decided to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 stick with the originally-published deadline
2 for Phase 1 of January 19th, with a real
3 caveat that we want to say and remind
4 everybody that the bar is going to be high for
5 this competition, and we don't expect that a
6 lot of states will win in Phase 1. Everybody
7 can reapply in Phase 2.

8 And for those of you who want to
9 wait and apply in Phase 2 because you just
10 need more time to do the planning in your
11 state, we promise there will be plenty of
12 money left in Phase 2. I think we saw in
13 Denver that people were worried that we were
14 going to use all the money up in Phase 1.
15 That will not happen. So you can rest assured
16 that, if that is the choice you make, it is
17 fine.

18 The winners for Phase 1 will be
19 announced in April, and Phase 2 is due June
20 1st, and the winners for that will be
21 announced by September.

22 So that is the big picture stuff.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Before I launch into a quick overview of the
2 notice itself, let me just see if there's any
3 brave soul with a question.

4 (No response.)

5 I know you are going to get going.

6 We know the point in this presentation at
7 which all the hands will go up.

8 (Laughter.)

9 Okay. And it's not yet.

10 So let me start by just giving you
11 a quick overview of the notice itself. The
12 application requirements section is the
13 section that has the basic information about
14 what you have to include in your application.

15 One thing that we want to just
16 remind you of, since it is not standard
17 practice in all of these applications, is that
18 there are a number of signatures that you need
19 to have on the notice itself. So you need the
20 signature of the governor, the chief state
21 school officer, and the state board of
22 education president. So we want to make sure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that you are lining up those signatures well
2 in advance.

3 The other thing, and we are going
4 to talk about both of these a little later,
5 when we talk about some planning
6 considerations, the other thing to watch for
7 is that state attorney general certification
8 that what you have said in the notice is
9 accurate. The attorney general does not have
10 to write any kind of opinion.

11 All they have to do is sign, but
12 they do need to read your document in order to
13 sign, and there are certain criteria, in
14 particular, that they need to read. We are
15 going to highlight those for you, so you can
16 make sure that you think about that when you
17 are putting your work plan together and give
18 the attorney general time to take a look at
19 that, and that doesn't become a hitch at the
20 back end of the process.

21 The next thing is the program
22 requirements. Program requirements are the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things that, if you win, you will need to
2 comply with. We will talk more about these
3 later on.

4 Then there are eligibility
5 requirements. I feel like we have gone over
6 these ad nauseam. So the only thing that I
7 want to point out here is a change that we
8 made from the prior notice.

9 In general, I am not going to
10 highlight changes between the proposed notice
11 and the current notice. We are just going to
12 talk about what is, not what used to be.

13 This is maybe one case where I am
14 going to just highlight a change, to make sure
15 that everybody is clear on this. Originally,
16 we had said that you needed to have your state
17 fiscal stabilization fund applications
18 approved before you submitted to Race to the
19 Top. The new requirement is you have to have
20 them approved before you win a grant.

21 So, hopefully, that will just let
22 you -- I mean I know we are still dumping a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lot of stuff on you with very similar
2 deadlines here, for which we apologize. The
3 Recovery Act has done this to all of us, I
4 think. By having hard dates at the back end,
5 it has just made everything sort of back up
6 and stack up on you guys and on us as well.
7 But, hopefully, this will allow you to juggle
8 your time a little bit better.

9 Then there are the priorities.
10 There are three types of priorities. There is
11 one absolute priority, which is that you have
12 to address all of the reform areas in a
13 comprehensive fashion. I should point out
14 that that does not mean that you have to
15 address every single individual criteria.
16 That is totally up to you. But, within each
17 of the big chunks of the application A through
18 F, you do need to have a comprehensive
19 coherent storyline and approach running
20 through your applications.

21 There's one competitive priority
22 on STEM education. We are going to talk a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 little bit more about this toward the end of
2 the day.

3 Then there are four invitational
4 priorities. These are things that are,
5 generally speaking, extensions to the core
6 K-12 work of Race to the Top. They are things
7 the Secretary is interested in and
8 encouraging. They are things that your funds
9 can be used for. So funding, if you put these
10 things in your plan, you are allowed to use
11 funding for them. But they don't earn points.

12 Then we will spend the bulk of the
13 day on the actual selection criteria for the
14 program.

15 Okay a little bit more on a couple
16 of other things that are in the notice itself.
17 We have published in the notice -- it is
18 appendix B in every single notice -- a copy of
19 the scoring rubric and points. This is the
20 document that our peer reviewers will be
21 given. There is no information that they are
22 going to be given that you don't have. So the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 document you've got is exactly what the peer
2 reviewers will get, and we wanted you to be
3 able to see it, as you were filling in your
4 applications.

5 The second thing is budget
6 guidance. We will be talking more about this
7 in the course of the day today. That you will
8 find in the notice inviting applications. It
9 is non-binding guidance, but just general
10 ball-park ranges that are suggested ranges
11 within which you could consider pinning your
12 application.

13 We are also going to tell you a
14 little bit about the competition review and
15 selection process. We have described that
16 process as well in the documents that we
17 released.

18 And finally, we are going to spend
19 a lot of the day today talking about
20 participating LEAs. When we go into Criteria
21 (A) (1), we will talk about appendix D; we will
22 talk about information we have released in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FAQs. We have provided a lot of different
2 guidance in different places, and our job here
3 today is to try to bring that all together for
4 you and answer your questions before you
5 leave. We will also talk quickly about the
6 evaluation program.

7 So, with that, let me turn it over
8 to my colleague Meredith, who will take you
9 through the application.

10 MS. FARACE: Good morning,
11 everybody.

12 Okay, understanding the
13 application. Before I get started, I wanted
14 to let you know that this section of the
15 presentation is exactly like the presentation
16 we gave on a webinar on November 24th. Some
17 of you may have been on that webinar. So I
18 apologize if this is review for a lot of you,
19 but we don't think that everyone was on it.
20 And for those of you that were, that means you
21 are just ahead of the game and we can play
22 "stump the chumps" up here and see if you can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have a question for us that you didn't know
2 back on the 24th.

3 Okay. We are going to start out
4 with how all these pieces fit together. What
5 I am going to do is go through the
6 application, not the content in the
7 application -- we will be doing that
8 throughout the day -- but just the application
9 itself and how it works, so that you get
10 familiar with it. If you have the application
11 with you, and you want to follow along, feel
12 free.

13 I think throughout the day we are
14 going to try to give you page numbers. So, if
15 you want to do that, you can flip right to the
16 application.

17 First, you will remember that
18 there are two types of criteria. There's
19 state reform conditions criteria and reform
20 plan criteria. The reform conditions criteria
21 are used to assess a state's progress and
22 success in creating conditions conducive to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 education reform. So think about this as what
2 you have already done in the past.

3 Then reform plan criteria are used
4 to assess a state's plans in the future. They
5 describe what the state will do with its
6 grant, should it win Race to the Top.

7 So state reform conditions is in
8 the past, what you have done. The reform plan
9 criteria is in the future. What is it, about
10 half and half? Or there is a little bit more
11 for the conditions criteria.

12 Are we not getting me on the
13 microphone? Is that better? Okay, thanks.

14 So it does matter what you have
15 done to date. It is a little bit more heavily
16 weighted towards the state reform conditions
17 criteria.

18 Okay, the parts to respond to.
19 So, when you start writing, there's three
20 pieces to keep in mind. In every case, you
21 are going to write a narrative. We provide
22 space within the actual document for you to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 start typing. It says, "Enter text here."

2 This narrative could include text,
3 tables, charts and graphs. I have already
4 gotten questions about how do you include
5 charts and tables and that sort of thing. Use
6 whatever medium you want to ensure clarity.
7 So, if you want to insert your table right in
8 that text box, feel free to do that. If that
9 doesn't work out, and you would rather attach
10 it as an appendix, please do that. Just make
11 sure to note where the peer reviewer should
12 find that table. So refer to the appendix A,
13 B, whatever you want, and they will be able to
14 find it that way.

15 Next, some criteria require
16 performance measures. Not all criteria do.
17 We will talk a little bit more about that
18 later.

19 Then, finally, some criteria also
20 require evidence. We are going to talk about
21 these in a lot more detail.

22 State reform conditions. So we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are going to go through an example that is
2 actually in your application. It is page 29
3 of the application. This is Criterion (C) (1),
4 fully implementing a statewide longitudinal
5 data system.

6 So I am not going to go into the
7 details. If you have particular questions
8 about (C) (1), if you could hold those until
9 later, when we get to that section, but I am
10 just using this as an example, so you can see
11 what it is like.

12 Okay. At the top box, you will
13 find the criterion itself. See this little
14 area about definition. Keep an eye out for
15 the phrase "as defined in this notice". This
16 is really important. We have a lot of
17 definitions in the notice, as you have seen,
18 explaining what we mean by various terms.
19 Whenever you see that, it means there is a
20 definition in the notice and you can go ahead
21 and look that up to find the meaning. It is a
22 good idea to read these definitions carefully.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Okay. In italics, you are going
2 to find the directions on what to write.
3 Then, if there is evidence requested, which
4 some of them have and some don't, that is
5 listed here in this box.

6 The evidence, if it is brief or a
7 narrative, you can include it in your response
8 to the criterion or you can attach it. This
9 is going to make it easier for reviewers to
10 follow.

11 Like I said, if you do attach it
12 as an appendix, please provide a reference in
13 the narrative, so that the reviewers know
14 where to go.

15 Then, recommended maximum response
16 length. I want to make sure people understand
17 this is a recommended length. I have gotten
18 comments and questions already about, 'well,
19 100 pages, I am not sure we are going to be
20 able to do that. And some of this is taken up
21 by the text box. And what do we do?'

22 This is a recommended page length.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This is what we think it would take. But we
2 say here two pages, you know what? It might
3 be more than two pages. And this is not
4 binding.

5 I know that some grant programs,
6 if you go beyond a certain page length, the
7 peers are instructed not to read what is after
8 that. That is not the case for this.
9 However, we don't want you to write hundreds
10 and hundreds of pages, hoping that will give
11 you more points. The peers do have to read
12 these. So brevity and clarity do matter.

13 Okay. So, where it says, "Enter
14 text here", this is where you start typing. I
15 know that some of you have teams of state
16 folks that are working on this. You might
17 have a lot of different people working on
18 different parts. So you may work on your own,
19 but in the end, this would be your final
20 document. Go ahead and either type or cut and
21 paste what you have into this box.

22 Make sure to look at application

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requirement (d). This is general guidance on
2 writing responses for state reform conditions
3 criteria. So take a look at that, and that
4 will explain what the state must provide for
5 each of the state reform conditions criteria.

6 Again, if you haven't seen it
7 already online Race to the Top on Ed.gov, we
8 have the application in there, and it is a
9 Word file. You can just download that from
10 our website.

11 We will get into later about
12 formats and how to put that together as you
13 submit it, but that is later on, in the boring
14 section, as Joanne put it.

15 Okay. So, finally, it is a good
16 idea, before you start writing, to look at the
17 guidance that is provided to the peer
18 reviewers.

19 Are you having a question back
20 there? Or are you not hearing me?

21 MS. WEISS: You are moving away
22 from the microphone.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FARACE: Okay.

2 MS. WEISS: So just keep it --

3 MS. FARACE: Okay. Great.
4 Thanks. I will keep my eye on you. You can
5 tell me when that happens.

6 Okay. So take a look at what the
7 peers are going to be looking at. That is
8 important. You will find the scoring rubric
9 on page 75 of your application. It is also in
10 the Notice Inviting Applications. It is in
11 the Notice of Final Priorities.

12 So, if you want to look at the
13 scoring rubric that deals with (C)(1), that is
14 on page 82 of the application.

15 In the box section, you are going
16 to find the actual reviewer guidance on how to
17 score the criterion. Then there is general
18 guidance. That matches the application
19 requirement directions. Then there's
20 sometimes specific guidance that is only for
21 some criteria. That offers reviewers more
22 information on how to allocate certain points

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for the criteria. So take a look at that as
2 you are writing, so you know what the peers
3 will be looking for.

4 Then, after the reviewer guidance,
5 the criterion text is included for you and for
6 the peers, and then the total points are
7 shown. This is out of 500 points total. We
8 will go into that a little bit later today.

9 Okay. So, next, we are going to
10 go to a reform plan criterion example. Again,
11 reform plan is what you are talking about,
12 your plans for the future.

13 This is a different example for
14 you. This is (D)(4), improving the
15 effectiveness of teacher and principal
16 preparation programs. Again, if you have
17 questions about (D)(4), we are going to go
18 into all that in detail later. This is on
19 page 41 of your application, if you are
20 following along at home.

21 Okay. We are going to start with
22 the criterion to be addressed, in the shaded

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 box. Then we provide directions.

2 You will notice on this one
3 there's no specific evidence requested, but
4 you are welcome to include evidence if you
5 think that would be helpful to reviewers.

6 Then a recommended page
7 limitation. To be honest, we included this
8 one to show you that you should take these
9 recommendations as loose guidance. A page
10 might not be enough in this case, but this is
11 what we have projected.

12 Okay. So, where it says, "Enter
13 text here", this is where you type in your
14 response. And again, pay attention to the
15 application requirements. For the plans, it
16 is Requirement (e). So we've got that in the
17 box here.

18 Such a plan would include goals,
19 activities, timelines, and responsible
20 individuals. It might include evidence, if
21 you find that that would support the
22 credibility of your plan. It might also

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 include performance measures, which we will
2 turn to next.

3 Any questions before I go on to
4 performance measures?

5 Yes? The first question, wow.
6 Good. We'll get it going.

7 MR. VAISHNAV: Good morning.

8 MS. FARACE: Good morning.

9 MR. VAISHNAV: My name is Anand,
10 with the State of Tennessee.

11 My question is, do the performance
12 measures always have to be numerical goals or
13 can they be other types of goals?

14 MS. WEISS: All of the performance
15 measures that we have requested are numeric.
16 You will see, we will get to in a minute, the
17 "what about optional performance measures?"
18 Those can be anything you would like that you
19 think is appropriate.

20 MS. FARACE: Okay. About
21 performance measures, okay.

22 MS. WEISS: One more question.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FARACE: Sure. Oh, sure. I
2 am sure it is not just one more. There will
3 be plenty more.

4 MS. LYNCH: JoEllen Lynch, New
5 York.

6 Two questions on performance
7 measures. One, even in the optional
8 performance measures, since some of these will
9 be aspirational, and we are really encouraging
10 kind of an aggressive vision, particularly in
11 the area of assessments, and since we don't
12 know that process yet, how will those be
13 tracked in the evaluation component, so that
14 we could be judicious in our performance
15 measures where they are visionary,
16 particularly in the area of the assessments,
17 since we don't know what they will look like
18 yet, if we are joining the common assessments?

19 MS. FARACE: So when you say,
20 "evaluation", you mean as it is being
21 evaluated by the peers?

22 MS. LYNCH: As you are evaluating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the implementation of the Race to the Top
2 proposals.

3 MS. FARACE: Oh, I see.

4 MS. LYNCH: And since we are
5 unclear yet what the assessments will be, we
6 want to do some baseline targeting in some of
7 these areas.

8 MS. WEISS: So let's maybe hold
9 that until we get to the section on the
10 assessments. When we get to (B)(2), which is
11 the criterion on assessments, let's talk about
12 it there, so we are talking about it in the
13 context of the actual criterion. I think it
14 will be easier.

15 So, if we don't touch on that,
16 remind us when we get there.

17 MS. LYNCH: Uh-hum.

18 MS. FARACE: But one thing that
19 might address this a little bit is that, as
20 peer reviewers look at your performance
21 measures, they will look at the extent to
22 which you have set ambitious, yet achievable,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 targets and performance measures. So please
2 do something that it is ambitious, but that
3 you can achieve it, because we will be looking
4 at those targets over time to see how you did
5 against those targets.

6 But, yes, we will talk more
7 specifically about that.

8 So what does ambitious, yet
9 achievable, mean? We would look at, are you
10 being ambitious in what you are attempting to
11 do? Are you being realistic in proposing a
12 plan that you can achieve? And have you
13 balanced ambition and achievement thoughtfully
14 and well? So we will be looking at those
15 things. The peer reviewers will be asking
16 themselves those things, as they look at your
17 plan criteria.

18 And to reinforce the seriousness,
19 we want to let you know that funding can be
20 triggered or delayed or withheld based on your
21 actual performance against your targets set in
22 your application. We will be monitoring those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 over time. So please consider them seriously.

2 Don't go so far out that you know that you
3 are not going to meet them.

4 Okay. Now let's look at an
5 example, the mechanics of completing the
6 application. There are three types of data
7 requests, and (D)(4) has all three, which is
8 why we chose it. This is page 42 and 43 of
9 the application, if you are following along.

10 First, there are general goals,
11 which include the current baseline data and
12 annual targets for the four years of the
13 grant. And the performance measure tables,
14 you are going to fill in all the cells that
15 are blank. Here you fill in the actual
16 baseline data in the first column and the
17 annual targets in the next four columns.

18 The next type of information is
19 general data, and that is used to support
20 other calculations. Again, only fill in the
21 blank cells. So, in this case, you will fill
22 in the first column, which asks for the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 baseline data for the current school year
2 across four areas.

3 The third table is labeled "Data
4 to be requested of grantees in the future".
5 This is really a heads-up for you about data
6 that we will be collecting in the future as
7 part of annual reporting. It is not
8 something, obviously, that you need to put in
9 your application. Those cells are blacked
10 out. But we want to provide it for you as you
11 are developing your plan, so that you can take
12 it into account.

13 A couple of additional notes on
14 performance measures. To minimize burden, we
15 didn't ask for performance measures
16 everywhere. We only asked for them in places
17 where the Department attempts to report
18 nationally on them, and for measures that lend
19 themselves to objective and comparable data-
20 gathering. So feel free to supplement these
21 as you see fit, but we did not include
22 performance measures for everything.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Finally, remember to look at the
2 scoring rubric for Criterion (D) (4) before you
3 start writing. We provide here a little
4 example of the scoring rubric for (D) (4).

5 MS. WEISS: Hey, Meredith?

6 MS. FARACE: Yes.

7 MS. WEISS: On this one, you are
8 going to maybe say it is a typo?

9 MS. FARACE: Oh, actually, yes.
10 Could you point that out?

11 MS. WEISS: Yes. So, in the
12 actual notices, we have a typo. It is only in
13 the scoring rubric. We say, "Application
14 Requirement (d)", but we actually mean
15 "Application Requirement (e)" for the plan
16 criteria. We fixed it on your slides, but it
17 is wrong in the document. So we wanted to
18 just point out to you it is right every place
19 except in the scoring rubric. So it shouldn't
20 really be a problem for you.

21 Great. Thanks.

22 MS. FARACE: The application is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 right; the scoring rubric is not.

2 Okay. In this case, the general
3 guidance points reviewers back to the
4 application requirement, and the specific
5 guidance just reminds the reviewers to watch
6 out for both teachers and principals in their
7 response.

8 Okay, and just to show you that
9 this criterion is worth 14 points. You may
10 wonder, well, what is (D)(4), Romanette i and
11 ii, each worth? Just in case you didn't know
12 the word "Romanette", it is a legal term for
13 the little "i" and the little two "ii". So
14 now you learned something new today.

15 Romanette i and ii are both
16 equally divided. So, according to the
17 Department's general administrative
18 regulations called EDGAR, unless we otherwise
19 state it, points are evenly divided across the
20 criterion sections.

21 So, in this particular case, we
22 have 14 points overall for (D)(4), and then

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Romanette i would be seven points, and
2 Romanette ii would be seven points as well.

3 Okay. We are going to do a little
4 quick overview of the six selection criteria
5 areas, and then more detail to come on the
6 individual selection criteria.

7 We are going to start out, like
8 Joanne said, with state success factors. That
9 is 125 points. That is going to take the rest
10 of the morning. It is probably the biggest,
11 most complicated part.

12 Then we are going to do standards
13 and assessments. That is worth 70 points.

14 Data systems to support
15 instruction, worth 47 points.

16 Great teachers and leaders, worth
17 138 points.

18 Turning around lowest-achieving
19 schools, 50 points.

20 And general selection criteria, 55
21 points.

22 Any questions on just mechanics of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 getting through the application?

2 MR. VAISHNAV: Good morning again.

3 MS. FARACE: Good morning.

4 MR. VAISHNAV: Anand from the
5 State of Tennessee.

6 Do states need to provide evidence
7 of how they derived the performance measures
8 that we put in the application? Is there any
9 specific methodology that you are looking for?

10 MS. WEISS: No. What we are
11 asking is that the plan narrative that you
12 write be connected to the performance
13 measures. So use the narrative to explain how
14 your plan connects to the ways that you want
15 to measure things. There is also a space
16 below each performance measure where you can
17 talk about calculations, if you want to. The
18 goal is just to make it clear to the reviewers
19 what you did, but there is no formula for how
20 to do it.

21 MS. FARACE: Okay. Any other
22 questions? Any webinar questions? Anybody

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 typing in?

2 MS. MCKINNEY: Not yet.

3 MS. FARACE: Not yet? Okay.

4 All right, we are ahead of
5 schedule by 23 minutes.

6 MS. WEISS: It won't last.

7 MS. FARACE: It won't last.

8 MS. WEISS: All right. So now we
9 are going to start on the stuff you need to
10 strap yourself in for.

11 One thing I will say is thank you
12 for turning up the lights. We couldn't see
13 anything up here. Our notes were just
14 shrouded in darkness, and I will admit that,
15 with my eyesight, I couldn't quite see my
16 screen here. So I am in much better shape
17 now.

18 Okay. So the next section,
19 Section A on State Success Factors, is the
20 most complicated section in the notice, as we
21 talked about, mainly because it deals with
22 participating LEAs and the budget and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Memorandum of Understanding. So there are a
2 lot of different pieces here.

3 Our hope over the next couple of
4 hours, between now and lunchtime, is to have
5 all of this murkiness become clear. So that
6 is my goal. So get ready for questions, and I
7 will take you through this and see if we can
8 help make it clear how all of these pieces fit
9 together.

10 The big picture for state success
11 factors, and here I am going to violate my
12 rule where I said we weren't going to talk
13 about what was; we are only going to talk
14 about what is. I am going to violate that by
15 starting this by saying that this whole
16 section didn't exist in the original notice.
17 It actually did in pieces. It was just
18 scattered around the notice, primarily, in the
19 end, the overall criteria section.

20 We noticed from the different
21 public comments we got that people were
22 looking at the criteria that were in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 original notice almost as a sort of checklist
2 that they needed to go through. The big
3 picture framing was missing from it, and it
4 was our fault in how we had written it.

5 So we took a lot of the different
6 sections that had been scattered throughout
7 the document and put them together into this
8 initial section called State Success Factors,
9 which, from our point of view, is designed to
10 try to give you guys the ability to put a big
11 front-end organizer on your application and
12 build the case at the front end to the peer
13 reviewer for what your statewide reform agenda
14 is, and how all the pieces that you are now
15 going to read fit within this framework.

16 So that is the purpose of Section
17 A. Because of that, then, it's got a few
18 different parts.

19 We ask you to describe your
20 statewide reform agenda. We ask you to talk
21 about how much LEAs are committed and what the
22 participation of LEAs looks like statewide.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We are going to talk a lot about that, and
2 also to talk about, particularly at the SEA
3 level, what is the state's capacity to
4 actually oversee, manage, support the LEAs and
5 deliver on the things that you have promised
6 here, and what's the track record of
7 instruction over the last several years that
8 might be evidence that you are on a path that
9 can provide some credibility to the reviewers
10 that you can deliver on what you are
11 promising.

12 So that is kind of the big picture
13 of what is in Section A. With that, let me
14 just go through each of the pieces of the
15 criteria very quick, because we are going to
16 come back to them in more detail after we deal
17 with some of the terms and definitions that
18 are in here.

19 So (A)(1), first of all, has three
20 parts to it. (A)(1)(i) is about defining a
21 comprehensive and coherent reform agenda for
22 the state, articulating your goals and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 articulating a credible path to how you think
2 the actions you are planning on taking will
3 help you achieve those goals.

4 (A) (1) (ii), then, is talking
5 about, well, we know it is great to have goals
6 at the state level, but we also know that the
7 people who actually have to implement the
8 goals on the ground are in the districts all
9 over the state. So, to what extent are the
10 districts in your state strongly committed to
11 implementing your agenda? We are going to
12 talk a lot more about in a minute how this
13 level of commitment is going to be judged by
14 the reviewers.

15 Then, third, the LEAs who are
16 participating, so all the LEAs that you have
17 signed up in your state, that that group of
18 LEAs is the right group to translate into
19 broad statewide impact.

20 So that is the big picture of what
21 this Criterion (A) (1) is trying to ask you
22 for.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So let's start, then, by talking
2 about participating LEAs. I know this is all
3 of your favorite parts of the notice, except
4 we have people from Hawaii here, right? They
5 are the only ones who get to sleep through
6 this part.

7 Okay. So participating LEAs are
8 LEAs that choose to work with the state to
9 implement all or significant portions of the
10 state's Race to the Top plan. We are going to
11 talk more about what that means in a second.

12 They are LEAs who have also
13 entered into some kind of MOU or binding
14 agreement with the state. We are also going
15 to talk more about what those binding
16 agreements need to look like.

17 And they are districts who get a
18 subgrant equal to 50 percent of the total
19 grant that the state received. This is
20 called, handily enough, a 14006(c) subgrant.
21 I am going to talk you through how those
22 calculations work, because we have also gotten

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a lot of questions about that.

2 So let's start with what states
3 can and cannot specify about LEA
4 participation. I will also tell you that this
5 is where the hands are going to start going
6 up, is my guess. So I'm going to take you
7 through this slide, but feel free to linger
8 here, as we help you understand our
9 interpretation of how the statute lets you and
10 does not let you mediate the LEAs that
11 participate in this.

12 So the first thing that you have
13 as a giant degree of freedom is you define
14 your reform plan for the state. So you set
15 the statewide agenda. Obviously, probably
16 best done in collaboration with a number of
17 other people, but that whole process for
18 setting the state agenda is up to you. What
19 the state agenda looks like is up to you.
20 LEAs are going to, then, decide whether they
21 want to opt in to participating in this
22 agenda.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 States also can define what it
2 means to participate in all or significant
3 portions of your agenda. Now, generally, we
4 do expect LEAs to implement the state's entire
5 plan, but there's places where that obviously
6 doesn't make sense. If a district has any
7 schools that are persistently underperforming
8 and are in your turnaround plan, they are
9 probably not going to participate in that part
10 of the state's reform agenda. So that is an
11 obvious case, but there may be a bunch of
12 other cases where you decide it is okay for
13 people not to participate in everything.

14 So how you design that bar is
15 totally up to the states. But, again,
16 remember, it is all or significant portions.
17 It is not one or two things. The language is
18 meaningful.

19 The next thing that you can do is
20 you get to draft the Memorandum of
21 Understanding that the state signs onto. Now
22 we are going to talk more about Memoranda of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Understanding in a minute. And I think you
2 all know that we have provided in the notice a
3 model MOU that is really designed to just help
4 you streamline your process. You are welcome
5 to use it or not, as you see fit, or change it
6 in any way you want to. We just wanted to
7 give you a starting point and provide a
8 document that shows that we are talking about
9 maybe like a three-page document, not a 25-
10 page contract.

11 But you guys get to define that in
12 any way you want. That is yet another lever
13 that you can use to figure out what LEA
14 participation looks like.

15 Then what happens is, so you set
16 these criteria. Then you have to give the
17 option to every LEA in the state, including
18 charter LEAs, the option to opt in to being
19 part of the plan.

20 So that means that you can't
21 select LEAs based on anything like geography.

22 You can't run a competition for LEAs that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 forces them to compete their way in. It's got
2 to be a situation in which you define the
3 terms and conditions, and then LEAs decide for
4 themselves whether they are willing to opt in
5 or not.

6 So let me stop there, since I
7 don't see hands going up, much to my shock,
8 and see if that all just made total sense so
9 far and I should keep going or not.

10 Nothing online, either, Jessica?

11 MS. LOWE: Margie Lowe, the State
12 of Oregon.

13 We have had a superintendent from
14 one of our school districts ask the nature of
15 the MOUs and how they tie into collective
16 bargaining. As he understands it, he may be
17 subject to an unfair labor practice complaint
18 from his local teachers' organizations for
19 some of the things that might be in the plan.

20 How would we address that?

21 MS. WEISS: So let me talk about
22 that in a second, when we talk about the scope

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of work in the Memorandum of Understanding,
2 and talk about how at least we have thought
3 about that. So we will come back to that in a
4 second.

5 Yes?

6 MS. ENGLISH: Lynn English from
7 Rhode Island.

8 Could you talk about the
9 difference between involved LEAs and
10 participating LEAs, as defined on page 10 of
11 the application?

12 MS. WEISS: Yes. And again, I am
13 really good at answering questions, but we
14 have that one coming up in the budget section
15 because that is where it is most obvious what
16 the thing is that you are managing here. But,
17 right now, I am talking only about
18 participating LEAs. Involved LEAs don't have
19 any of these requirements.

20 And just to give you a quick
21 preview of the answer, but we will talk more
22 about it, involved LEAs is a construct that we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 actually put in, in response to public comment
2 because we got questions about, well, if LEAs
3 aren't participating, but I have some things I
4 really need to do statewide in order to make
5 my plan work, like things that have to do, for
6 example, with transitioning to a new set of
7 standards, and I want to do professional
8 development statewide, how do I spend my money
9 on people who aren't participating, but I
10 still need their teachers to come to my TA
11 session?

12 So that involved LEAs is a
13 construct that just lets you say I'm going to
14 spend some of my money on people who said they
15 are not participating, but I need them to
16 participate in this thing.

17 DR. JONAS: Yes, hi from Virginia.

18 You mentioned that we can't make
19 any of the components of the application
20 competitive for LEAs. What if there are fixed
21 costs for some of the components, and imagine
22 they all wanted to participate, and we just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can't fund it? How do we, then, handle that
2 situation without a competition?

3 MS. WEISS: Yes. So what I should
4 have said is, and we will see this more in the
5 budget section as well, what I should have
6 said is that, whether or not you are what we
7 are defining as a participating LEA can't be
8 defined based on a competition. But you can
9 have certain parts of your program that you
10 fund out of the other 50 percent that only
11 certain people participate in, and you are
12 going to get to pick those people, those LEAs,
13 in any way you want to.

14 So we will talk more about pilot
15 programs and other things like that that might
16 just be for a subset of the people in your
17 state and how you can use funding and other
18 mechanisms to select that group.

19 Excuse me. AV folks, that
20 microphone is not working.

21 MR. ROBERTSON: Doug Robertson,
22 Maine.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I was wondering if there's any
2 thought on what is a sufficient number of
3 participating LEAs or what would not meet your
4 expectation for that.

5 MS. WEISS: There is not a
6 predetermined answer to that question. And
7 when we talk about, when we get into (A)(2),
8 Criterion (A)(2), in a second, we are going to
9 talk more about that. We are going to show
10 you the characteristics that the reviewers are
11 looking for.

12 And hopefully, that will help you
13 see the picture of how we see this coming
14 together. There is a lot of judgment in this
15 that is related to the needs and plan in each
16 particular state.

17 So the answer to that might be
18 very different in one state than in another.
19 So we have not set any specific numbers or
20 criteria. When you look at the reviewer
21 guidance for this, you will see that there's a
22 judgment call here because it is really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 related to whether the group of LEAs that are
2 participating, that there's credible reason to
3 believe that that is the right group, a big
4 enough group, whatever, to move the needle
5 forward for the state. The answer to that
6 might be different from state to state. So we
7 left it up to you guys to explain and the
8 reviewers to judge.

9 MR. DELANEY: John Delaney, New
10 York.

11 Would Boards of Cooperative
12 Education Services constitute an LEA for
13 purposes of funding and participation? And
14 part two, would districts and BOCES forming a
15 consortium qualify for participation?

16 MS. WEISS: Oh, legal counsel?

17 MS. HESS: I'll answer your
18 question with a question. How are your BOCES
19 treated for Title I purposes?

20 MR. DELANEY: They are treated as
21 LEAs. No, they do not receive Title I
22 funding, basic, no, they do not.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HESS: Okay.

2 MR. DELANEY: But for other
3 federal funding purposes, they have been
4 determined to be LEAs.

5 MS. HESS: I think the basic
6 answer is, if they are an LEA under Title IX
7 of the ESEA, then they would be an LEA for
8 this purpose.

9 MR. DELANEY: I will take that as
10 a yes then.

11 MS. HESS: Right. But if they
12 don't get Title I, then they aren't going to
13 be a participating LEA under the subgrant
14 part. They will have to be a participating
15 LEA under the state's 50 percent part.

16 MR. DELANEY: Okay.

17 MS. WEISS: Does that make sense?

18 MR. DELANEY: Yes.

19 MS. WEISS: Okay. So let's keep
20 going.

21 Let's talk about how the LEA
22 subgrants are calculated. This gets right at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the second part of the question that Jane was
2 talking about related to the fact that, even
3 though they are LEAs, when you do the
4 calculations, they are going to come up as a
5 zero if they are not getting Title I funding
6 today.

7 So this slide, whatever number we
8 are on, Slide 54 here, is the actual sort of
9 legalese version of how you calculate the
10 subgrant. I am going to skip this and talk
11 about the example because I think it is a lot
12 easier to figure out how the math works by
13 working through an example.

14 So, in this example, we are going
15 to say that a state receives a \$200 million
16 Race to the Top grant, and it is a state not
17 quite as simple as Hawaii, but much less
18 complex than most of your states. It has five
19 LEAs in the whole state, and three of them
20 have decided to be participating LEAs in our
21 example here.

22 So what happens is you look at how

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 much Title I funding the three participating
2 LEAs received in 2009, which means it will
3 include both ESEA and ARRA funding, since 2009
4 had both. And you add that up.

5 So, in this example, LEA 1 got \$20
6 million; LEA 2 got \$10 million, and LEA 3 got
7 \$10 million, so for a total of \$40 million.
8 Now we have just sort of ignored the other two
9 LEAs that aren't participating at all, right?

10 So \$20 million for LEA 1 is half
11 of the total, \$20 million over \$40 million.
12 LEA 1 got half of the total. So their Title I
13 share is 50 percent; LEA 2 and 3, their Title
14 share is 25 percent each.

15 Then you say, okay, we had a \$200
16 million grant. That means \$100 million is
17 passed through to the LEAs. So 50 percent of
18 \$100 million is \$50 million; 25 percent of
19 \$100 million is \$25 million. So that is the
20 way that works.

21 A couple of things that you will
22 notice right away about this. First of all,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you don't actually know how much you are going
2 to pass through until you have your final list
3 of LEAs participating. So LEAs, you can sort
4 of make some guesses about how this will shake
5 down for LEAs, but it is true that they will
6 have to be thinking about their level of
7 participation, about their interest in
8 participating before they know exactly how
9 much funding they will get for it. And that
10 is the ambiguity that they get to live with as
11 they are thinking through these decisions.

12 The other thing you will notice is
13 the LEAs have a little bit of an incentive to
14 be the only LEA that signs up. Yes, we get to
15 thank Congress for that being the way that
16 works.

17 So any questions about the LEA
18 calculations work?

19 (No response.)

20 You'll see that, as a result of
21 this, when we get to the budget, we don't ask
22 you for detailed budgets around the LEA work,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just what the total LEA passthrough is, nor do
2 the MOUs specify in the initial MOUs any of
3 the amounts of money, because, again, we don't
4 know exactly what the funding passthrough will
5 be. So all those calculations kind of happen
6 on the back, all the final calculations for
7 that happens on the back end.

8 Another question that we have
9 gotten is, what if partway through an LEA
10 drops out, for whatever reason? For non-
11 performance, for non-interest, whatever,
12 assuming that there's termination clauses in
13 your MOU with them that allows them to do
14 that. The answer is you would just re-
15 allocate using this formula, and everybody
16 left in the pool would get a little more.

17 I don't know. This is a quiet
18 bunch. We thought it was going to take a lot
19 longer to get through with so many more
20 people.

21 Okay. So the last question is,
22 how do LEAs use the funding that you pass

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 through to them? The big message here is
2 that, even though you are using some Title I-
3 type formulas to calculate how the LEAs
4 receive what share LEAs get, the funding is
5 not used at all in Title I ways. It is used
6 in whatever ways are compliant with your
7 proposal and with the work that the
8 participating LEAs have signed up to do. So
9 they have to use it in ways that match your
10 plan. And you have all the normal degrees of
11 freedom for how you manage, monitor, audit,
12 and require those funds to be used.

13 Hang on. We have a question in
14 the back.

15 DR. WALLINGER: Hello. I'm Linda
16 Wallinger from Virginia.

17 The question relates to the use of
18 the Race to the Top funds for LEAs. If an LEA
19 signs on to participate in several of the
20 initiatives or several of the areas, do they
21 actually have to spread their funds over all
22 of the areas in which they participate? Or,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 if, for example, the state is going to do
2 something with its share of the funds, and
3 fund most of that project through state funds,
4 but the LEA chooses to participate in that
5 area, and maybe check several other areas,
6 they could perhaps focus their funds only on
7 the three other areas and not the area that
8 the state is funding. I hope that makes
9 sense.

10 MS. WEISS: Yes, I think it does.

11 So I am going to answer it, and if I haven't
12 answered it, then ask again.

13 So I think, actually, the answer
14 to that is the same as the answer at the state
15 level. So let me answer at the state level
16 and then the LEA level.

17 Because at the state level, you
18 could do a similar thing. You could say, you
19 know what? I've got a State Longitudinal Data
20 Systems grant or I've got a School Improvement
21 grant that I am going to use to primarily fund
22 the turnaround efforts. So I want to actually

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 use my Race to the Top money over here,
2 instead of for the turnaround stuff. But, in
3 my plan, I am still going to describe the
4 turnarounds; I am still going to get points
5 from the reviewers for doing turnarounds,
6 because I am going to do them, and you can
7 hold me accountable for them. I am just going
8 to use other funds to do them.

9 Because we are trying really hard
10 at the Department to make sure all these
11 programs are really consistent and well-
12 aligned, so that you can make these decisions
13 about where and how to optimize funding for
14 maximum impact.

15 Similarly, at the LEA level, we
16 would expect that you could make the same
17 decisions. So the goal at the LEA level is
18 not necessarily to divide the money equally
19 across every area that they are implementing.

20 Some areas might be, you know, just changes
21 in practice that don't cost anything. Other
22 areas might have a price tag attached, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that might be where all your money goes.

2 So we would expect you with the
3 LEAs to have the budget conversations
4 ultimately and make sure that the budget that
5 they have done, and the way they have
6 allocated the funds, allows them to actually
7 implement what they have signed up to
8 implement, but how they align their different
9 funding to do that is totally between you and
10 the LEAs to make sure you are comfortable
11 with.

12 So that was your question?

13 DR. WALLINGER: Yes.

14 MS. WEISS: Okay, great.

15 DR. KIRBY: Peggy Kirby from
16 Louisiana.

17 We had a question about whether or
18 not all schools within an LEA had to
19 participate and, if not, could some assurances
20 be applied to some schools and others to other
21 schools within the same LEA?

22 MS. WEISS: Hello, Jane and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Rachel.

2 MS. HESS: I'm not sure that we
3 have thought about that. Do you want to talk
4 at the break about it further?

5 MS. WEISS: Perhaps we will be
6 getting back to you on an answer to that
7 question shortly.

8 Over here.

9 MR. PHELPS: Hi. My name is Stacy
10 Phelps from South Dakota.

11 If we have LEAs that don't have
12 low-performing schools, do you still have to
13 extend that invitation?

14 MS. WEISS: [Note: answer is
15 clarified on p. 101 of transcript - "So the
16 answer to that is, yes, you still have to
17 extend an invitation. It is just that that
18 part of the plan they would not put a
19 checkmark in that they are participating in."] No.
20 So that was why I used that as an
21 example, to say, for example, it might make
22 sense that an LEA would not participate in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that part, if they don't have a low-performing
2 school.

3 We do, I think, expect the state
4 to be actively participating in identifying
5 which schools are the schools that you think
6 are in need of turning around, and if an LEA
7 doesn't have an identified school, it would
8 make tons of sense for them not to participate
9 in that part of the plan.

10 All of you out in webinar land,
11 you really can ask questions. We are standing
12 by waiting.

13 And in the meantime, go ahead with
14 yours.

15 MR. REISBERG: Darren Reisberg
16 with the State of Illinois.

17 I wouldn't expect that a
18 Memorandum of Understanding would have a
19 unilateral termination provision which would
20 allow an LEA to be able to terminate at the
21 point where they may realize they would be
22 getting less monies than they otherwise

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thought they might get, just because of the
2 number of LEAs that decided to participate.

3 But, assuming it is the case that
4 a large number of LEAs in a state, after the
5 state has already been approved, decide that
6 they will not accept the money, and a state is
7 going to have a difficult time requiring them
8 to specifically perform, how potentially may
9 that affect the state's award?

10 MS. WEISS: Yes. So, once a state
11 has won a grant, we move into the sort of
12 conversation between the Department and the
13 state. So, if one small LEA drops out and you
14 reallocate their funds, no big deal. If that
15 happens a couple of times, probably no big
16 deal. If big LEAs drop out or a large number
17 of LEAs drop out, I would expect that you
18 would be having a detailed conversation with
19 us, yes.

20 Okay. So are you ready to move on
21 to MOUs? Okay.

22 MS. SMITH: Laura Smith from New

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 York.

2 So we just wanted to clarify, if
3 we have higher-performing districts that sign
4 onto the MOU, the assumption is that, then,
5 obligates us to give them funding. How does
6 that balance, then, with a diversion of
7 resources away from lower-performing
8 districts?

9 MS. WEISS: The funding formula is
10 based on Title I. So it is based on income.
11 That formula, in a way, sort of balances the
12 funding from the other 50 percent going to,
13 presumably, students in the higher-need
14 categories.

15 On the other hand, the 50 percent
16 that the state has total discretion over, you
17 could decide what to do there. And again, I
18 am back to, what's your plan and what's your
19 theory of change? And why are you putting the
20 money where you are putting it?

21 Okay, MOUs. Great.

22 So Memoranda of Understanding.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There are three parts to the Memorandum of
2 Understanding, and each one of them has a
3 specific purpose that you will see tied back
4 to the criteria. So we are going to talk
5 through each of these one at a time.

6 The first is terms and conditions.

7 I want to refer you to appendix D -- it is
8 appendix D in every notice -- for more
9 information on this, and also the frequently
10 asked questions have information about
11 participating LEAs as well. Hopefully, all of
12 these things say the same thing that I am
13 about to say to you right now.

14 The terms and conditions, then,
15 are the contract between you and the LEA
16 around what they are going to do as part of
17 this. One of the things that we thought
18 through long and hard, as a result of the
19 comments that we got mostly from the state
20 folks who sent us in comments during the
21 public comment period, was trying to help
22 think through how in a sort of streamlined way

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you could have the right conversations happen
2 at the LEA level that led to LEA participation
3 being meaningful, as opposed to every LEA
4 feeling like they just get their fair share
5 and now they had more money and didn't have to
6 do anything.

7 So how do you make a conversation
8 that is meaningful, but not so time-consuming
9 that it can't get done in a relatively quick
10 period of time? So I am going to walk you
11 through the ways that we propose to balance
12 this. All of this is up to your own
13 discretion unless I otherwise note it here.

14 So the first "otherwise note" is
15 that the terms and conditions have to have at
16 least these three sections in them: the first
17 is, What are the key roles and
18 responsibilities of the state and of the LEA?
19 The second is, What is the state's recourse
20 for LEA non-performance? And the third is a
21 list of assurances about what the LEA is
22 promising to do as a result of this.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 What the LEA is promising to do
2 is, first, sign up to the fact that they
3 actually have read your plan or are familiar
4 with it, and know what they are signing up to.

5 The second thing they are signing
6 up to is that they are going to implement all
7 or significant portions of your plan, again,
8 as the state has defined it. And they are
9 going to indicate that in their scope of work.

10 We are going to talk about the scope of work
11 in a minute.

12 And the third thing that they are
13 signing up to do is say that, if the state
14 wins a grant, the LEA will put together a
15 final scope of work. Again, we will talk more
16 about this in a second as well, and that final
17 scope of work will be consistent with what
18 they said in their preliminary scope of work.

19 So we are going to talk more about the scope
20 of work in a second.

21 But in the model Memorandum of
22 Understanding that we have put together for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you in appendix D, for the model in appendix
2 D, there is a model Memorandum of
3 Understanding, and it has terms and conditions
4 that meet this requirement that we have just
5 put forward. Again, I want to reiterate, you
6 can use it as is. You can edit, modify it in
7 any way you want to, or you can create a
8 totally new one that has at least these three
9 sections in it. It is totally up to you how
10 you handle that.

11 Yes, question?

12 MS. MCKINNEY: This is a question
13 from New Hampshire who asks, can MOUs contain
14 a reference to collective bargaining similar
15 to the clause under the current ESEA where
16 nothing in the MOU precludes the
17 implementation of certain elements of the plan
18 through the collective bargaining process?

19 MS. WEISS: So, yes, let me
20 actually use that as a way to segue into the
21 scope-of work discussion, and we will show you
22 how we thought through the answer to this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question.

2 So the scope of work is the second
3 part of the agreement. This whole notion of a
4 preliminary versus a final scope of work is
5 one that we put together in order to
6 streamline the process. You are certainly
7 welcome to abandon the preliminary and head
8 straight for the final scope of work.

9 But what we wanted to do in this
10 was give LEAs internally the opportunity to
11 have some of the sort of hard alignment and
12 commitment conversations at the front end and
13 then, if the state wins, they can do all the
14 detailed budgeting and work planning that
15 needs to go along with it, rather than having
16 all of that happen at the front end.

17 So we tried to make, for the
18 preliminary scope of work, a pretty simple
19 form, but in order to put checkmarks into the
20 simple form, some of the hard conversations
21 had to happen. So, for example, you will
22 notice on the preliminary scope-of-work form

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that we put together, Section (D), (D)(2), is
2 the place where probably the bulk of the
3 collective bargaining questions are
4 implicated. So (D)(2) is where we say, are
5 you using, can you do -- you know, what do
6 evaluation systems look like? How frequently
7 do evaluations happen? And then, what is the
8 evaluation data used to inform?

9 So each of those subsections is a
10 separate row on the scope of the work, in the
11 hopes that it would enable districts to have
12 conversations with unions and others, not that
13 all the collective bargaining is done before
14 you submit your application, but that the
15 union leaders, the district leaders, the
16 school board have come together and said, "You
17 know what? In the state's plan, these are
18 things that we are going to be willing to sit
19 down at the table and take on together," or
20 they are not.

21 So that upfront we can have those
22 conversations, and they can put checkmarks in,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 yes, I am going to do this; no, I am not going
2 to participate in this. So that you guys get
3 some clarity on who is really signing up to
4 have the hard conversations and who is not.

5 It is also why we have asked for
6 three signatures. We will get to the
7 signature block in a minute. So that you can
8 also see at the state level who it is that has
9 actually signed up to doing these things. Is
10 the union onboard? Is the school board
11 onboard? So that you have the information you
12 need.

13 Now you can use all these factors
14 also to define all or a significant portion of
15 the work. So you can say, "We require you to
16 sign on fully to this or you can't be a
17 participating LEA," or not. You have all of
18 those degrees of freedom at the state level to
19 use these carrots and levers in any way that
20 you choose to within your state.

21 So, to reiterate, we are not
22 expecting that states have solved all the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 collective bargaining issues at the beginning,
2 nor in any way are we saying that this
3 overrides collective bargaining. I mean that
4 is certainly not the intent or the implication
5 of this. But, rather, that unions and schools
6 come together, districts come together, and
7 say, yes, this is something that we are
8 willing to consider and take on or not.

9 Another thing you will see, when
10 we get into the actual Criterion (D)(4),
11 performance measures in general, as Meredith
12 showed you, roll out over the course of
13 several years. So this is a place, for
14 example, where you might say, you know what,
15 we are going to start with a low number of
16 participating LEAs, but we know sort of how
17 many are interested in doing this work, but we
18 expect it to take a couple of years to come
19 online, so our numbers change over time
20 because of blah, blah, blah. And you just
21 explain in your plan why the numbers look like
22 they do in terms of who is signing on and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 participating over the course of the four
2 years of the grant.

3 DR. WALLINGER: Joanne, I have a
4 couple of questions.

5 MS. WEISS: Yes?

6 DR. WALLINGER: Linda Wallinger
7 from Virginia.

8 Did I understand you to say, then,
9 that we cannot select LEAs to participate or
10 offer the opportunity to participate? We must
11 offer it to all LEAs, but once that offer is
12 made, we can require that LEAs subscribe to a
13 certain component of the MOU in order to be a
14 participating LEA?

15 MS. WEISS: So I would actually
16 flip what you said. You have to set those
17 requirements at the front end of the process,
18 not the back end. So you have to say, "Here
19 is what is required in our state in order to
20 say that you are participating in all or
21 significant portion of this grant." Then LEAs
22 that say, "Okay, I am willing to do that" can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be admitted.

2 Now, in a second when we turn to
3 the signature block, you will see that, in
4 addition to the LEA signatures, we require an
5 SEA countersignature, for obvious reasons. It
6 wouldn't really be a binding agreement without
7 two parties signing it.

8 But, in addition to that, it is
9 because we want you to be able to look at the
10 agreement and make sure that what they really
11 signed up to do meets the requirements that
12 you had set at the front end of the process
13 for what it means to be a participating LEA.
14 So, if somebody brought you back a document
15 that said, "No, we are not participating in
16 any of these parts of your program", and you
17 had said, "You know what? In order to
18 participate as an LEA for us, you must do
19 this," you would say, "I'm not countersigning
20 because you haven't met the obligations that
21 we set or the criteria that we set forth at
22 the beginning of the process."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. COOK: David Cook from
2 Kentucky.

3 In the scoring rubric for state
4 success factors in the 125 points and the LEA
5 participation part of that, we have to build a
6 table that shows the participating LEA and the
7 various signatures that we received. My
8 question is, basically, the weighting -- who
9 is most important? In other words, if I get
10 the superintendent's signature and the Board's
11 signature, but not the union rep's signature,
12 when the reviewer is looking at that, is that
13 different than -- how do you tell if that is
14 just successful or not in terms of them being
15 participating?

16 MS. WEISS: So the answer is the
17 more signatures, the stronger the commitment.

18 We have not set rules or formulas within
19 which the reviewers make those determinations.

20 And it is a place where your plan
21 and what you write in the narrative, we are
22 going to go through all those tables in a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 minute, but where what you write in the
2 narrative needs to connect to those tables, so
3 that you are telling the reviewer how you look
4 at this and why you think that it will be
5 successful.

6 But, certainly, the more
7 signatures, the implication is clear that the
8 more signatures, the stronger the
9 participation level.

10 MS. GAGE: Heather Gage from
11 Arkansas.

12 When we were talking about union
13 representation on the MOUs, can you explain --
14 and I hate it if this sounds like a strange
15 question -- but can you explain how you define
16 a union? Only because, is it just a
17 collective bargaining kind of union? Is it a
18 state unit?

19 MS. WEISS: Yes. Hang onto that
20 question because in a second we are going to
21 get to the signature block, and I will go
22 through that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But let me just spend a second
2 before we switch topics totally to talk about
3 the final scope of work. Because the other
4 big thing that the LEA has to do, of course,
5 is put together the real plans themselves, the
6 detailed plans, that go behind implementation
7 of each of the things that they have signed up
8 to do.

9 And the way we split this baby in
10 terms of trying to get a process that was
11 streamlined enough, so that you could meet the
12 timeframe criteria that we have here, is to
13 say that LEAs would not have to put all of
14 that final detail in place unless the state
15 wins a grant. At that point, presumably, it
16 is now well worth their time to put together
17 all of their detailed work plans.

18 So the detailed work plans in the
19 final scope of work, which in the model MOU we
20 have called Exhibit 2 -- so Exhibit 1 in the
21 model MOU we said is the preliminary scope of
22 work. Exhibit 2 that you would, then, attach

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 later to the MOU, would be a final scope of
2 work.

3 We didn't give you a model for
4 that because we thought that would really vary
5 significantly, depending on what the actual
6 plans were that the LEAs were signing up to,
7 and you could put those together yourselves,
8 but that the final scope of work needed to
9 have basically the same elements of a plan
10 that your plans have, like: what are their
11 goals, their activities, their timelines,
12 their budgets for you to manage against, key
13 personnel, and annual targets? So their
14 detailed plan would be done later, if and when
15 you win a grant.

16 So that is the way we put the MOUs
17 together. Let me go on and talk about the
18 signatures.

19 Yes, I think there is actually one
20 more question back there. I think this will
21 be a little iterative as we are going through
22 this. We will come back to it again, as we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 talk about the performance measures and tables
2 and evidence. So feel free to keep asking
3 questions about this until it feels clear.

4 But, yes?

5 DR. WALLINGER: Thanks. This is
6 Linda Wallinger from Virginia asking a
7 question about the preliminary scope of work
8 and how reporting on that intersects with the
9 evidence requirements as part of (A) (1).

10 Because when we got the idea that
11 it was a model, we were thinking that we would
12 have some degree of flexibility in how it was
13 structured. However, when you look at the
14 data required to be returned as part of
15 (A) (1), it does, indeed, reflect verbatim the
16 components of the sample that you provided.

17 I wondered if that must be
18 consistent or, if a state's MOU changes,
19 whether that data instrument would change
20 also, or do you still require the data to be
21 recorded by (B) (3), (C) (2), and so forth, for
22 every LEA?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: So we are going to
2 talk in a lot of detail about each of these
3 tables and how you put them together, and
4 where you get the data for each thing, and how
5 you put it where, in a minute.

6 So let me just answer that
7 question broadly, and then we can come back to
8 it, if we need to, when we are actually
9 looking at the tables.

10 So these tables just generically
11 match the criteria in the proposal. We felt
12 like that was the generic common thread across
13 all the proposals that would be a good
14 organizer for the reviewers. Because the
15 problem on our end is, how do we allow
16 reviewers to make sense of this in a quick way
17 without reading every MOU and every scope-of-
18 work agreement?

19 So that table is consistent across
20 all applications. You are more than able, if
21 you would like, to supplement it. But we did
22 think that it was a good way to organize the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information in a consistent way for the
2 reviewers. So we do ask that you fill in the
3 table by criterion.

4 Now, if you have clumped criteria
5 together and you haven't disaggregated as much
6 as we have, or something like that, you can
7 certainly indicate that in your table. But we
8 would ask you not to organize that one table
9 in a different way, but you can certainly
10 supplement it with additional tables and ways
11 that you want people to think about it.

12 Is there a question over here?

13 MR. BOUNDS: Yes. Mark Bounds
14 from South Carolina.

15 So can you count an LEA as
16 participating if you only have one signature?

17 MS. WEISS: Yes, as long as it is
18 a binding signature. So, if a superintendent
19 without their school board's permission is a
20 binding signature? Yes. You need at least
21 one binding signature.

22 So, from our point of view, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 answer is yes. You could set criteria in your
2 state that would be different from that. So
3 the minimum bar is at least one binding
4 signature.

5 MR. BOUNDS: Well, it seems that
6 the non-union states would -- not having a
7 union signature would seem like that that
8 would be a disqualifier in my mind compared to
9 a non-union state where a superintendent or a
10 school board would have more authority.

11 MS. WEISS: Okay. So let's talk
12 about the signature block because non-union
13 states or right-to-work states can maybe look
14 a little different in this chart. Let's talk
15 through at least how we were thinking about
16 that.

17 So the signature block section of
18 the MOU, we ask you to include as many as
19 possible of these signatures. And the more
20 signatures, the stronger the application. So
21 the application, the criterion, you may
22 remember, for this part is that you earn, that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the strength of the application is based in
2 part on how many members of the leadership
3 team have signed an application.

4 What we say is that that includes
5 the LEA superintendent or equivalent, the
6 president of the local school board or
7 equivalent, if applicable. So, if there is no
8 school board, then you don't need to get that
9 signature. In the tables, you will see that
10 you don't get penalized for not having that
11 signature if that person doesn't exist.

12 On the other hand, if you have
13 mayoral control, it might be the mayor that
14 you want to get as that signatory.

15 Then, finally, the local teachers'
16 union, again, if applicable. So, if you are
17 in a state where it is not applicable, you
18 don't need to get it, and you will see on the
19 table you just explain to the reviewers in our
20 summary table that that signature wasn't
21 relevant because you don't need it.

22 On the other hand, there's nothing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to stop you from getting a union
2 representative's signature in a right-to-work
3 state, and then in the application narrative
4 saying, "We got some. We didn't get them all,
5 but we are right-to-work." You know, just
6 sort of explain the circumstances, so you can
7 make some of those judgment calls yourselves,
8 but we do recognize that these aren't all
9 applicable in all places. So it is not a
10 magic number.

11 Three they are looking for. They
12 are looking for whether you've got, of the
13 applicable signatures, how many do you have?

14 I can't tell whether I have now
15 really confused everyone or whether that was
16 clear.

17 (No response.)

18 Okay, maybe it is clear.

19 So, just to give you another
20 moment to think, I will put up a slide here
21 that is pretty meaningless. It shows you that
22 there's three signatures in a signature block,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and see if we are ready for a quick break or
2 if there's any last questions before we take
3 our break.

4 We are a little early. We have
5 room for a question or two, if you would like
6 to take one.

7 MR. REISBERG: Again, Darren
8 Reisberg from Illinois.

9 You know, from some of the school
10 management organizations, in states where
11 there are strong unions, I think there is
12 going to be a message that local boards and
13 superintendents should not sign these MOUs
14 without the union's signature, given some of
15 these concerns.

16 Just wondering if there is any
17 effort at the national level to have
18 potentially a discussion with some of those
19 national school board organizations and unions
20 to discuss how these issues can be worked
21 through. I understand we would be doing that,
22 obviously, at the state level, but I am

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 assuming states are wrestling with the same
2 problems.

3 MS. WEISS: So I think that the
4 context, this is so situation-dependent and so
5 context-specific, that our thought has been to
6 leave that totally up to the states to deal
7 with.

8 A couple more hands back there?

9 MR. VAISHNAV: Hi. Anand from
10 Tennessee.

11 Just a question about legislative
12 changes in the state success factors. Do all
13 legislative changes have to be done by the
14 time the application is submitted or, if there
15 are plans underway to change certain laws,
16 will that be looked favorably upon if it
17 happens after the application deadline of
18 January 19th?

19 MS. WEISS: So the way that we
20 have structured this pretty clearly is that
21 those are the accomplishments. So those are
22 things that are done before the application is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 submitted, which means maybe Phase 2 is when
2 it will be done by.

3 I think there was a question over
4 here.

5 MS. GEARING: Charlene Gearing
6 from Wisconsin.

7 My question is, relating to the
8 MOUs, is it possible for the teachers' unions
9 across the state to submit any kind of an
10 attachment to their MOU? And I assume that
11 maybe that would be a state decision to allow
12 that.

13 And the purpose of that being
14 maybe to identify upfront collective
15 bargaining issues that need to be resolved,
16 but aren't going to be resolved before this is
17 due.

18 MS. WEISS: That is certainly
19 something that the state can specify that you
20 would like. We weren't putting any of those
21 sorts of requirements in because, again, I
22 think it is pretty context-specific. And if

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in your state that makes sense, and that is
2 the way you want to manage the situation, it
3 is totally fine to do that.

4 MR. DELANEY: One more question on
5 the participating Title I schools.

6 MS. WEISS: Uh-hum.

7 MR. DELANEY: If we've got two
8 sets of schools, the lowest purporting --

9 MS. WEISS: I'm sorry, just start
10 by -- you're New York.

11 MR. DELANEY: I'm sorry. John
12 Delaney, New York.

13 MS. WEISS: Yes.

14 MR. DELANEY: If you've got one
15 group of the persistently lowest-achieving
16 schools, and say there's 25 schools in that
17 group, then you've got the second set with low
18 graduation rates below 60 percent. Say
19 there's 35 schools there. So you've got a
20 total group of 60. Can we select 25 from
21 Group A and then a subset from Group B?

22 MS. WEISS: So the short answer is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 yes, but let's come back to that when we are
2 in selection Criterion (E), where we are
3 talking about the lowest-performing schools
4 and how they are identified. Let's just come
5 back and make sure that we are answering that
6 because the devil might be in the details.

7 But, basically, yes, the state is
8 identifying within those categories what their
9 schools are that they are going to attack and
10 in what order.

11 MR. DELANEY: Okay.

12 MS. WEISS: Okay. So let's take a
13 15-minute break. Come back to the room at
14 10:45, and we will still be in (A)(1), putting
15 all these pieces together and talking about
16 the evidence tables. So 10:45 back here.

17 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter
18 went off the record at 10:26 a.m. and went
19 back on the record at 10:47 a.m.)

20 MS. WEISS: Hi. I think we wanted
21 to start by asking the folks from South Dakota
22 to re-ask your question, because the consensus

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 up here is we are not sure whether I heard
2 your question right and answered it right or
3 whether you asked a different question than
4 the one I answered about, if there is a low-
5 achieving school in a LEA. Wasn't it you guys
6 who had that question? No? Back right there.

7 Could you just say your question
8 one more time? Because people here think I
9 answered a different question from the one you
10 asked, and that would not be good.

11 MR. PHELPS: Stacy Phelps from
12 South Dakota.

13 If an LEA does not have low-
14 performing schools, do you still have to
15 extend an invitation for participation?

16 MS. WEISS: Ah, you see, they were
17 right. I answered the wrong question.

18 So the answer to that is, yes, you
19 still have to extend an invitation. It is
20 just that that part of the plan they would not
21 put a checkmark in that they are participating
22 in. So every LEA, you extend the invitation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to every LEA in the state, but if there's no
2 low-achieving school in the state, they would
3 not put a checkmark by (E) (2) on the scope of
4 work.

5 Let me go to the webinar.

6 MS. MCKINNEY: Sarah Archibald
7 from Wisconsin has a three-part question. She
8 says: can we condition the money differently
9 for different LEAs based on the amount of
10 money they get through the Title I formula
11 and/or can we set a floor, so that all
12 districts get at least a certain amount of
13 money? With the additional 50 percent, can we
14 select districts to target assistance based on
15 their needs or what is required to make our
16 improvement target? And if the award money
17 isn't sufficient at the district level, can
18 they opt out of some of what we say we will
19 do?

20 MS. WEISS: Okay. That is a great
21 question, and I am going to ask that we hold
22 it until we do the budget section because it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is going to be easier to see the answers when
2 we get to the budget section. So hang onto
3 that, and we will come back to it, if we
4 didn't answer the question.

5 And I hope you are not too
6 snowbound, although earlier, before the break,
7 in Wisconsin, before the break, it felt like
8 we were getting a little snowbound in this
9 room. So we empathize with you. The
10 temperature in here was getting pretty chilly,
11 too.

12 Okay. So another question up
13 here?

14 MS. ANDREWS: Yes. Jessica
15 Andrews from Connecticut.

16 Can you just clarify the
17 participating districts and who you have to
18 invite on to opt in or out of the state's
19 plan? Is it all LEAs in the state or is it
20 LEAs that are funded through the Title I Part
21 A or ARRA?

22 MS. WEISS: It is all LEAs in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 state. But when we get to the budget part in
2 a minute, we will talk about how the funding
3 works and why an LEA that is not a Title I LEA
4 might choose not to opt in.

5 MS. ANDREWS: Okay, but it has to
6 be extended to all?

7 MS. WEISS: But you extend it to
8 everybody, and including, remember, charter
9 LEAs, if such a thing exists in your state.

10 MS. ANDREWS: Thank you.

11 MS. WEISS: Yes.

12 MS. CARPENTIER: I'm Betsy
13 Carpentier from South Carolina.

14 Going back to South Dakota's
15 question, how is the peer reviewer going to
16 know that the reason why somebody didn't check
17 that one off was because they didn't have any
18 turnaround schools? Is that something you
19 stick in the comments or what? How do they
20 know that they really did substantially, are
21 substantially implementing all of the terms?

22 MS. WEISS: So you might, for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 example, in the narrative that accompanies the
2 table, you might explain that you have
3 identified 73 schools as being the schools in
4 need of turnaround and all of them have opted
5 in. Or not. Or this percentage of them have
6 opted in, or whatever. Just give context to
7 help the peer reviewers understand that part.

8 Yes, over here.

9 DR. FORAN: Jim Foran from
10 Maryland.

11 In looking at the state reform
12 conditions criteria and then the reformed plan
13 criteria, I want to make sure of one thing.
14 If a state intends to introduce legislation,
15 let's say during the upcoming legislative
16 session, regarding teacher tenure or teacher
17 evaluation systems, but it is not yet in
18 place, is that an automatic disqualifier for
19 Phase 1 or does it just reduce the points that
20 you would be awarded for Phase 1?

21 MS. WEISS: Oh, no, none of these
22 are -- none of the stuff we are talking about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 -- all the stuff we are talking about now is
2 all just points. You get points. You get
3 some points. You get all points. You don't
4 get points in that thing. But none of this
5 has to do with disqualification.

6 Okay. So let's get started on
7 taking a look back at (A) (1), now that we have
8 got most of the pieces in place, and see how
9 they fit together with the evidence, tables,
10 and so on.

11 So the first one, (A) (1) (i), is
12 the one where you set forth your statewide
13 agenda for reform and give really a short
14 theory of change about what are your goals and
15 what is your path to achieving those goals.

16 One quick disclaimer I will say:
17 the red highlights on all of these slides do
18 not mean that these are the only important
19 words in the criterion. Legally, every word
20 is important in these criteria. This is my
21 official legal talk. We put the red in here
22 because it is just there's so many words on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some of these slides; it just helps focus all
2 of us on the parts that I am going to
3 particularly talk about. But, again, it
4 doesn't really have anything to do with that,
5 other than just a way visually to help keep us
6 all on the same page.

7 Okay. So (A)(1), then, is just
8 narrative. There is no special evidence.
9 That is where you just write your plan, so
10 that the reviewers understand the big picture
11 before they launch into all the subparts.

12 (A)(1)(ii), then, is where you are
13 going to talk about the extent to which the
14 participating LEAs are strongly committed, and
15 that commitment is evidenced by a Memorandum
16 of Understanding or some binding agreement
17 between the state and the LEAs that includes,
18 at a minimum, terms and conditions that
19 reflect strong commitment, scope-of-work
20 descriptions that require participating LEAs
21 to implement all or significant portions of
22 the state's plan, and signatures from as many

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as possible of the signatories, demonstrating
2 the extent of leadership support.

3 So, as you write your narrative,
4 do pay attention to the evidence that has been
5 requested and make sure that what you are
6 doing in your plan is connecting the evidence
7 to the narrative.

8 So let's talk about the evidence
9 that was requested for this plan. So the
10 first bit of evidence that was requested, and
11 in all of these slides you can see at the
12 bottom of the page the application that we
13 took this from. So the evidence for this one
14 is an example of the state's standard MOU. So
15 whatever your standard agreement looks like,
16 include that in the appendix as evidence.

17 And again, Meredith said this, but
18 whenever you refer to anything in the
19 appendix, put yourself in the shoes of a
20 reviewer who is reading a lot of different
21 states with hundreds of pages, and make sure
22 that whatever they need to find in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 appendix is really clearly referenced in your
2 narrative, so they know this is the place to
3 go look there, and in the appendix it is
4 clearly identified and marked, so that they
5 can just find it easily.

6 Yes? Hanging on, waiting for a
7 microphone to get to you.

8 MS. FLEMING: Kim Fleming,
9 District of Columbia.

10 I am wondering, is it helpful for
11 us to include hyperlinks within the narrative
12 to the appendices?

13 MS. WEISS: Meredith has a
14 thought.

15 MS. FARACE: It might be if the
16 peers had this and looked at it
17 electronically. However, some of the peers
18 may be requesting hard paper copies. So just
19 think about the fact that, if they are reading
20 it and then they have to go to their computer
21 to click on something rather than just
22 flipping to the back, that might be difficult

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for them. So I would probably recommend not,
2 but I think you can do what you need to do.

3 MS. FLEMING: Okay, thank you.

4 MS. WEISS: Okay. So the first
5 thing is an example.

6 Oops, sorry. Another question
7 back there?

8 DR. WALLINGER: Yes. Linda
9 Wallinger from Virginia.

10 The question that was just asked
11 was related to hyperlinks within the
12 application itself. What about hyperlinks in
13 the appendix to data or to other things that
14 are on the Virginia Department of Education's
15 web page, school data, and so forth?

16 MS. WEISS: We are going to talk a
17 little bit about data, about school data, in a
18 minute, actually. Well, actually, state data.

19 You can certainly give them
20 references to websites and anything you would
21 like. Just, again, keep putting yourself in
22 their shoes. They have a lot to read. So

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they are going to appreciate efficiency and
2 effectiveness in how you are communicating
3 with them, and sending them all over the place
4 might be something that they don't bother to
5 click through and do. So anything you
6 actually think is critical probably needs to
7 be in the package you submit, not externally
8 referenced.

9 Okay. So you are going to submit
10 one copy of your standard participating LEA
11 MOU, and you are going to describe any LEAs
12 that vary from this, on the assumption that
13 perhaps with individual LEAs you might have
14 negotiated something that is different with
15 one LEA or another. We want you to make that
16 explicit to the reviewers.

17 Then we are going to ask you to
18 complete a summary table that indicates which
19 portions of the state's plan each LEA is
20 committed to implementing; another summary
21 table that shows what LEA leadership
22 signatures you have obtained, and a detailed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 table by LEA that includes all the information
2 in the criterion.

3 So I am going to walk you through
4 this. In every case where we have some
5 specific evidence or performance measures that
6 need to be in a standard format, we have given
7 you the table. If there is no table for it,
8 you can use whatever format you want for
9 providing the evidence to us. But these
10 (A) (1) questions have a bunch of tables that I
11 am going to just walk you through quickly, so
12 that you understand how to think through
13 these.

14 We are going to start with the
15 detailed table because the detailed table is
16 actually the feeder for everything else.

17 So the detailed table, when in
18 doubt, start by taking a look at the
19 directions. There is one row that you are
20 going to fill out for each LEA, and you are
21 going to take information from the Memorandum
22 of Understanding and summarize it here, one

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 row per LEA.

2 I also think that it might not be
3 a bad idea to add a couple of rows to the
4 bottom of your table, one row that is the
5 totals, so the total number of LEAs in each
6 category, and one row that is the percentage.

7 Because you will see that you will need to
8 transfer those two numbers onto summary tables
9 in a minute.

10 So, for some states, this will be
11 a much longer table than for others, we
12 realize. We put it in the body of the
13 document because it is really key to filling
14 out all of your tables. You are welcome to
15 move to an appendix, if you would like to.

16 So start with the detailed table.

17 And the first thing that we want you to do is
18 indicate here if the standard terms and
19 conditions are used or if somebody varied from
20 the standard. So just yes or no. Yes, the
21 standard terms were used; no, it varied. And
22 then that will trigger you to describe some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 place what the variations were.

2 Was there a question back there?

3 DR. JONAS: Hi. Deborah Jonas
4 from Virginia.

5 I just wonder if you have these
6 tables in Excel that you might be able to
7 provide, rather than in Word, where we would
8 be recreating them.

9 MS. WEISS: Yes, we didn't make
10 them in Excel because we didn't know how you
11 would want to do them, but if you just cut
12 this out of Word and paste it into Excel, you
13 will get the table. Then you can just cut and
14 paste it as a picture back into your document
15 at the end.

16 Okay? Was there another question?

17 No.

18 Okay. So the next thing that you
19 will need to do is indicate here which plans
20 the LEA -- so, remember, one row per LEA -- so
21 for LEA X, which plans is that LEA agreeing to
22 participate in? And the total rows here are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to come in handy because you are going
2 to transfer the total participating, the
3 numbers and percentages, to the scope-of-work
4 summary table.

5 So this is the scope-of-work
6 summary table that is in your application.
7 What we are really trying to do here is help
8 the reviewers see a picture of what programs
9 the LEAs are implementing across your Race to
10 the Top plans.

11 So, for each plan criterion that
12 you are responding to, and that you put a plan
13 together for, that you are asking your LEAs to
14 participate in, what is the number of
15 participating LEAs that have signed up to do
16 this, and what percentage is that of the total
17 participating LEAs?

18 Again, there's no judgment calls
19 on any of these numbers. That is for you to
20 make the case in your narrative of why the
21 picture looks the way it does and why it is
22 going to help you meet the state's goals.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Yes?

2 MS. OLANOFF: My name is Beth
3 Olanoff from Pennsylvania.

4 We have 500 LEAs, and they vary,
5 obviously, greatly in size. How do we tell
6 you -- telling you the percentage of LEAs
7 doesn't give you any information on percentage
8 of students represented. How do we tell you
9 that?

10 MS. WEISS: Yes. So that is
11 coming. That is coming shortly in another
12 table that we will talk about in a second.

13 Okay. So back to the detailed
14 table. In fact, if you look at the first
15 rows, of the first columns, LEA demographics,
16 we are going to talk about them in a second,
17 but that is where we are going to answer your
18 question. They are just going to come up in a
19 second.

20 But the next one we are going to
21 talk about is the signature on the MOUs. So
22 here is where you indicate the signatures that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you received for that particular LEA. Then
2 you are going to transfer those signatures,
3 again both numbers and percents, to the
4 summary table.

5 Now here on the summary table,
6 which is in your application, you will note
7 that there are some wrinkles here because now
8 we are saying, so what's the total number of
9 signatures you obtained? What's the number of
10 signatures that are applicable? So this goes
11 back to the question of, what if you don't
12 have a school board or what if you don't have
13 a teachers' union? Then you would subtract
14 those out. So those are no longer applicable
15 signatures. Then what is the percentage of
16 the obtained signatures over the applicable
17 signatures? So we can see the level of
18 support at the accumulated rate.

19 And again, wherever they want to,
20 a reviewer can look back at the detailed
21 table, if they want to, to see what happened
22 in particular districts that you might have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 highlighted in your plan as being key to this,
2 or any of those kinds of things. So they can
3 look at the detailed table, if they want, but
4 they are probably going to start -- I started
5 you with filling out the detailed table and
6 working your way to summary. The reviewers
7 are going to start, just to put yourself in
8 their head for a minute, at the summary tables
9 and probably only look at the detailed tables
10 when they have questions.

11 DR. HYDE: Hi. Sheila Hyde from
12 New Mexico.

13 I think our General Counsel is not
14 wanting to include signatures on the MOUs,
15 but, rather, have attached documents of
16 support from the unions. Should we just
17 indicate that in our narrative? Or what would
18 you recommend, how to handle that?

19 MS. WEISS: Why don't you send
20 that question in to the Race to the Top email
21 box, so that we can think about that a little
22 bit? It might be something that is just going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to be a state decision, and we will have no
2 input on it. But just to make sure that we
3 really understand your question well, write it
4 down and send it in for us, and we will take a
5 look at it.

6 Okay?

7 MS. GEARING: Charlene Gearing,
8 Wisconsin.

9 Is it possible --

10 MS. WEISS: Wait, wait. Where are
11 you? Oh, over there. Okay. Hi.

12 MS. GEARING: Right over here.

13 (Laughter.)

14 Is it possible for the SEA to
15 decide which signatures it will require? For
16 example, if the SEA wants to determine the
17 binding signature is just the superintendent
18 or just the school board president, can they
19 limit the binding signatures in the actual MOU
20 template?

21 MS. WEISS: Yes, sure.

22 MS. CLIFFORD: Ginny Clifford from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 New Hampshire.

2 And that is really, I guess, what
3 I was asking you. If the term "if applicable"
4 meant because the SEA chose not to include it
5 or because such an entity didn't exist where
6 it would logically require a signature?

7 MS. WEISS: So let me clarify what
8 I think I was answering over there. Because
9 it means if it doesn't exist. It doesn't mean
10 that the state chose to ignore it, but it did
11 exist. So it means it doesn't exist.

12 So, when I was saying yes over
13 there, what I hope I was answering was, can
14 you say this is the signature that has to --
15 so, in order for this to be acceptable to the
16 state, I need at least the superintendent's
17 signature in every case or I am not taking
18 this as a participating LEA.

19 So you could specify your required
20 number or required signatures at the state
21 level. We are saying, from our point of view,
22 it needs to be at least a binding signature.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So she was asking, I hope, the question I was
2 trying to answer was, can I specify which
3 signature is the binding signature?

4 Oh, see, I keep answering these
5 questions without understanding them well
6 enough.

7 MS. GEARING: The question was
8 probably not well-framed. Let me say it
9 again.

10 Charlene Gearing, Wisconsin.

11 Can the MOU not require, let's
12 say, a union signature or not require the
13 school board president's signature or not
14 require the district administrator's
15 signature?

16 MS. WEISS: I'm sorry, I thought
17 you were saying, which one is the required
18 signature? You can do whatever you want on
19 your MOU, but the reviewers are going to see a
20 table that says you got zero union signatures
21 or zero school board signatures, and they will
22 view that as a weaker MOU relative to other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MOUs.

2 Sure, go ahead.

3 MR. BENDOR: So, just to clarify,
4 this criterion is about points. So the
5 reviewers would give you fewer points if your
6 demonstrated LEA commitment, based on the
7 signatures, was less. In order for an LEA to
8 qualify as a participating LEA, there has to
9 be a binding signature from whoever is
10 authorized in the LEA?

11 MS. WEISS: Thank you, Josh.

12 MR. BENDOR: So those are two
13 separate issues.

14 MS. WEISS: That was a good
15 answer.

16 Yes?

17 DR. KELLUM: LaNell Kellum from
18 Mississippi.

19 So, in terms of the signatures,
20 not to belabor, but the number of signatures
21 obtained, if you do not have unions in your
22 state, you are going to get the superintendent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the school board? So there are two? The
2 number of signatures applicable would be two
3 because we don't have unions. So there's no
4 one. So it would be 100 percent. Am I
5 correct?

6 MS. WEISS: Yes, and on the union
7 line, you would say zero signatures obtained;
8 zero applicable.

9 MS. CLIFFORD: I'm Ginny Clifford,
10 New Hampshire.

11 So, although I understand the
12 concept of points, should the requirement or
13 should there be a column for union signatures
14 if, in fact, a union exists? So we shouldn't
15 leave it out if, in fact, there is a union?
16 Do we still have a choice around that?

17 MS. WEISS: I mean you would get,
18 if there is a union, then it is applicable and
19 you would get fewer points. I mean the
20 reviewers would judge it as a less strong set
21 of applications, of MOUs, than if you had that
22 signature. So you can't just arbitrarily say

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it doesn't count to me; so it shouldn't count
2 to the reviewers.

3 The reviewers are using the
4 selection criteria in this language, and this
5 language specifically lists those three as the
6 minimum set of signatures that they are
7 looking for information about in your
8 application. So they are judging it whether
9 it is there or not. They are still looking
10 for it.

11 MS. CLIFFORD: So there is no
12 benefit to leaving it out if you can't get any
13 because it is still going to count against
14 you?

15 MS. WEISS: Right.

16 MS. CLIFFORD: Thank you.

17 MS. WEISS: Okay. So now, looking
18 at (A) (1) (iii), this part says that the LEAs
19 that are participating will translate into
20 broad statewide impact and allow the state to
21 achieve the goals that it has set in its
22 application around increasing student

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

6 So what you are doing here is
7 describing in your narrative the answers to
8 these questions and providing the evidence
9 that is attached to this one. So the evidence
10 that we have requested here is, again, another
11 summary table. This is the one where you are
12 talking about schools and students, and
13 students in poverty. So this is where we are
14 looking at the sort of broad representation
15 across your state.

16 Then, in your narrative include
17 any tables, graphs, et cetera, that show the
18 state's goals. I am going to come back and
19 talk about that one in a second, but let's go
20 back to our detailed table and look at the
21 first set of columns, which show for each LEA
22 what its demographics are.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So you are going to put the
2 information in this column for each LEA, how
3 many schools, how many K-12 students, and how
4 many K-12 students in poverty. Then you are
5 going to transfer that information to the
6 summary table here.

7 Again, this is a place where there
8 is no right or wrong answers and there's no
9 magic number that we have given reviewers.
10 They are just looking for the degree to which
11 in your state's context, given your proposed
12 reform agenda, these LEAs will credibly
13 translate into the kind of statewide
14 achievement impact that you are promising in
15 your application.

16 Okay. So we have now seen the
17 three summary tables that we are providing to
18 the reviewers and the detail table that they
19 can turn to if they want more information.

20 Back to the rest of the evidence
21 for this. In addition, in your narrative, it
22 is asked that you put together tables and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 graphs that show the state's goals overall and
2 by subgroup for the period of the grant.

3 So this we don't have specific
4 tables for because we really felt that you
5 would have different ways that you would be
6 telling the story around how you think data
7 will look going forward. So we have just left
8 this open for you to write the story that in
9 the end connects the level of LEA
10 participation you have to how you expect that
11 to translate into the goals that you have set
12 for the state going forward in these big
13 picture areas.

14 Okay? Are we ready to move on to
15 (A) (2) about capacity building?

16 Okay. So let's jump into (A) (2).
17 (A) (2) is about strong statewide capacity.
18 There are two parts to this one.

19 The first one is about just
20 building the capacity at the state level in a
21 variety of ways. So it asks you to talk about
22 how you are going to provide the leadership

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the teams that are necessary at the state
2 level to guide and lead and manage this work,
3 what your plan is for supporting the
4 participating LEAs, so that you are really
5 helping them to succeed by disseminating the
6 effective practices, identifying those
7 practices, disseminating them, and so on.

8 So what's your support
9 infrastructure that you are going to put in
10 place to help the LEAs meet their goals? How
11 you are going to provide efficient and
12 effective operational processes to oversee and
13 administer a grant that is as large as this
14 one. How you are going to use the funds?

15 We are going to talk more about
16 this in a minute, when we get to the budget,
17 and that is when we will get to the question
18 that was asked, I think, by maybe Wisconsin in
19 the webinar. So we will come to this in a
20 second.

21 And then a discussion of how you
22 see this continuing after the period of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 grant is over. So how is this sustainable?
2 How are the reforms going to be able to keep
3 going forward, once the funding is over in
4 four years?

5 Then there is a second part to the
6 Criterion (A) (2) (ii), and this is about broad
7 support from stakeholders. This is where we
8 ask for two types of support. One is specific
9 support from teachers and principals,
10 including, at a minimum, letters of support
11 from the teachers' union or statewide
12 teachers' associations, and other critical
13 stakeholders in your state who you have
14 brought together in putting the plan together.

15 These are just broad letters of support.

16 In the evidence, you will see that
17 we are asking for these letters of support or
18 actions of support to be just documented in
19 the appendix. Of course, in the narrative you
20 will explain them and refer to them.

21 MR. HILL: Hi. I'm Martez Hill
22 with the State Department of Mississippi.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 You referenced dedicated teams and
2 in another slide a group of stakeholders. Can
3 you talk about that some? I am trying to
4 envision what you mean by dedicated teams.
5 Are you saying that as state employees and
6 institutes of higher learning employees? Or
7 could the teams also entail community leaders?
8 But that would suggest that stakeholders are
9 community leaders as well.

10 MS. WEISS: So, I mean, this is a
11 place where it is really up to the state to
12 figure out how you are going to manage the
13 work that you are promising to do under Race
14 to the Top. So this is really specific to
15 this particular grant and knowing that, for
16 potentially hundreds of millions of dollars,
17 this is a lot of work that is going to be done
18 over the course of four years. It is being
19 led at the state level. How is it being led?
20 How are you managing it?

21 And whatever is the answer to that
22 question in your state is fine. It can be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 employees. It can be consultants. Whatever
2 your answer is, you are going to describe it,
3 and we are going to talk about how it is
4 reflected in the budget as well in a second.

5 MS. BRENNAN-GAC: I had a question
6 about the evidence for the other stakeholders.

7 MS. WEISS: Can you start by
8 identifying?

9 MS. BRENNAN-GAC: Hi. I'm Trish
10 Brennan-Gac, and I am on the Michigan team.

11 MS. WEISS: Thanks.

12 MS. BRENNAN-GAC: So a question
13 for the evidence for the other stakeholders.
14 You said there's actions of support, letters
15 of support. You said to document in the
16 appendix.

17 Do you actually mean attach them
18 all or just do a summary that sort of does
19 numbers and types of stakeholders?

20 MS. WEISS: No, I'm sorry. So a
21 summary in your narrative and then attach them
22 in an appendix.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. BRENNAN-GAC: So, even if you
2 have 100, you want them all attached?

3 MS. WEISS: That is why you are
4 putting it in on a DVD instead of sending us
5 paper.

6 MS. SMERDON: Becky Smerdon,
7 Pennsylvania team.

8 My question is about the
9 definition of subgroups. So, when you are
10 providing achievement and goals, do you have
11 specific definitions?

12 MS. WEISS: Yes, we do. I am
13 going to show you a slide with that on it in a
14 minute. I will refer you to the application.

15 It is all spelled out in application
16 requirement (g). We put it in one place
17 because it just made the language easier to
18 plow through, so that we didn't have to repeat
19 it everywhere. So it is in application
20 requirement (g), and we will talk about it in
21 a second.

22 Okay. So the evidence for this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one, to accompany the narrative, is the
2 state's budget. I am going to take you
3 through now the quick budget tutorial.

4 The other piece of evidence, as we
5 pointed out, was the statements or actions of
6 support that you could include in an appendix,
7 but the narrative should describe the level of
8 support you have and just reference the
9 appendix for the reviewers.

10 So, with that, let's turn to the
11 budget portion of our day. I think it was a
12 question from Wisconsin, wasn't it, about
13 budget? So listen up on the webinar, and if I
14 don't answer your questions this time, really
15 come back at me again with them.

16 So the first thing that I just
17 wanted to point out is the budget amounts.
18 This is a program in which states are
19 encouraged to propose the budget amounts that
20 match what is their plan that they have
21 outlined in their application. So this is a
22 place where, for the 50 percent of the money

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that the state has under its control, match it
2 to your plans and figure out what the budget
3 is going to be, and that is what you are going
4 to submit.

5 We did in the application put
6 together non-binding budget ranges for states
7 because the questions that we got from states
8 were, "Well, I could put together a budget for
9 \$2 million or for \$100,000. You tell me what
10 the ball park looks like."

11 So we attempted to put a ball park
12 together here, so that each state could have a
13 sense of approximately what ball park might
14 look like. You are welcome to put in
15 applications above or below these numbers.

16 So, with that, let's talk through
17 the budget. The budget is in your
18 application, I think starting on page 55 of
19 your application. It follows the criteria.

20 So there are four different parts
21 to the budget. There is a budget summary that
22 has a table and a narrative, and there is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 project-level detail that has a table and a
2 narrative. We are going to take them in a
3 funny order, just like we did on the evidence
4 tables. We are going to start with the budget
5 summary narrative, just talk a little bit
6 about the big picture. Then we are going to
7 talk about the project-level detail, the
8 tables and the narrative. Then we are going
9 to see how that feeds back into the overall
10 budget summary table that you are creating.

11 So the budget summary narrative,
12 starting there. First of all, just a couple
13 of general practices to think about.

14 The first is that you want to
15 ensure that the narrative that you provide has
16 enough scope and detail so that the
17 Department, because we will be doing a
18 detailed budget review as well, that the
19 Department can determine if the costs that you
20 have suggested are necessary, reasonable, and
21 allowable. And there's some guidelines. We
22 put up the website here, where you can find

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those, but I trust that most of you are well-
2 familiar with that.

3 The second thing that we are going
4 to ask you to do at the big picture level here
5 is talk a little bit about in your budget
6 summary narrative how other federal, state,
7 and local funds are going to be leveraged and
8 aligned around your state's reform agenda and
9 goals.

10 So this gets back to something
11 that we touched on earlier. If you've got a
12 school improvement grant that you are using to
13 fund a bunch of the work in your turnaround
14 section, this is the place to show us how all
15 the different sources of funding that you
16 have, how you are sort of reconceptualizing
17 them and aligning them around the goals that
18 you are setting here, so that you can have
19 maximum impact with the funds that we are
20 providing, and the funds that you are getting
21 at the state and local level, too, to the
22 extent that you can use those to support this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 kind of work.

2 Then, in the budget narrative at
3 the summary level, the other thing that you
4 are going to do is tell us what's the overall
5 structure of the budget, how you are managing
6 the funding, and thinking about the funding
7 and the organizational structure for the Race
8 to the Top grant.

9 So we have introduced yet another
10 new term here, "project", to indicate that we
11 know that a particular plan in your selection
12 criteria might be handled with a different
13 kind of organizational structure. You might
14 not be budgeting at the plan level. You might
15 be budgeting in bigger buckets.

16 What we would like here is to
17 understand at a high level what the list of
18 projects that you are putting forward are --
19 you will see more about this in a second --
20 and why the project organization that you are
21 proposing is one that makes sense. So how
22 these different projects are going to be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 organized and managed.

2 So, for example, you might design
3 projects as just sort of an organizational
4 construct that you use in whatever way matches
5 your plan. So, for example, a state could
6 choose to have one management project that is
7 where the leadership team is located, from a
8 budget point of view, that is managing
9 everything. Or you might have a human capital
10 project maybe that reports to the management
11 team project, and it handles all of the plans
12 that are in Section (D) of this application,
13 but you are handling them with one team. You
14 are not handling each plan with its own team.

15 Or maybe you are.

16 Maybe in some place you've got a
17 team that is dedicated to a particular plan
18 and in other cases you are organizing across
19 plans. So however you are organizing your
20 organizational teams to manage this work, put
21 a project against each of those teams, and
22 then we are going to ask you to do a budget

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for each project.

2 So I feel as though I was quite
3 inarticulate just now. So let me see if that
4 made sense before I move on and we start
5 talking about the project-level budgets.

6 Yes?

7 MS. LOWE: Margie Lowe, State of
8 Oregon.

9 We have applied for some of the
10 other competitive grants. Some of those would
11 definitely support our Race to the Top
12 application, but we wouldn't want to be
13 presumptuous. So should we do Plan A and Plan
14 B? One if we get the other grant and the
15 other if we don't? Or assume that we don't
16 get the other grant and build it in here?

17 MS. WEISS: I am looking to my
18 colleagues for some guidance on this one.

19 MS. HESS: I have seen that in
20 other competitions, where an applicant will do
21 a Plan A and a Plan B.

22 MS. LOWE: So go ahead and build

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it in, but note that it is in the other
2 competition as well? So then you could back
3 it out, if it is funded in the other --

4 MS. HESS: Or what you would do in
5 the absence of not winning the other
6 competition.

7 MS. LOWE: Okay, thank you.

8 DR. JONAS: Deborah Jonas from
9 Virginia.

10 Just a followup on that same
11 question: would you want to see a contingent
12 budget, so to speak, separated or just sort of
13 asterisked in the whole budget?

14 MS. WEISS: So I think the answer
15 is whatever way is clearest to the reader.

16 I think, do we have one more
17 question here?

18 MS. O'HARA: Hi. Erin O'Hara from
19 Tennessee.

20 I know within other federal
21 grants, when you fill out things like a
22 project-level budget table and personnel

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 percentages, and those types of things, when
2 you go back, if you have any changes, those
3 changes have to be approved through a program
4 officer, and you sort of have to document that
5 relationship, and those things appear on your
6 annual performance report.

7 Will this grant operate in that
8 same way?

9 MS. WEISS: Yes.

10 MS. O'HARA: So we need to be sure
11 that we are being very specific about how
12 these things will work, and that that's
13 exactly what we want going forward?

14 MS. WEISS: Yes.

15 MS. O'HARA: Okay. Thank you.

16 MS. WEISS: Okay. So the project-
17 level -- oh, one more. Sorry.

18 DR. KELLUM: LaNell from
19 Mississippi again.

20 To make sure I am hearing you
21 correct, we can do two, a Plan A and a Plan B.

22 One would have those State Longitudinal Data

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 System grant, or the 1003(g) grants, assumed
2 in them that we have gotten those funded. And
3 Plan B would assume not.

4 So, then, do we submit two total
5 budget sections? Because your total numbers
6 are going to be different. I mean, if we are
7 submitting a Plan A and a Plan B, then the
8 entire budget section is going to have to be
9 submitted under Plan A, and then an entire
10 budget section under Plan B, because the
11 totals are affected.

12 MS. WEISS: I think this is one we
13 are going to caucus about a little bit and get
14 back to you on. It is a good question. Will
15 you guys write it down and let us talk about
16 it, and get back to you on it? [Note: response
17 appears on p. 187 of transcript. "just do one
18 version of your budget. Assume only the
19 things you know are true when you are doing
20 your budget."]

21 Okay. So, then, let's go through
22 the actual tables in the application to fill

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in. So we are going to start with the
2 project-level budget table.

3 This probably looks pretty
4 familiar, pretty standard budget categories.
5 And you are going to provide the budget for
6 the project, for this particular project, in
7 each budget category for each year of the
8 grant. And for each budget category, you are
9 going to include detailed backup information
10 in the budget narrative.

11 This is an example of the budget
12 narrative. It is, again, right out of your
13 application. This is an example of backup for
14 a personnel line, backup for a travel line,
15 where we are just asking you to explain the
16 total that you have moved over into the budget
17 table. I think these are pretty
18 straightforward.

19 But now I want to get back to the
20 involved LEA question and talk a little bit
21 about how there's a couple of lines that are
22 unique to this particular application. Line

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 11 is involved LEAs, and line 12, we will talk
2 about in a minute, is participating LEAs.

3 So now we are still working in the
4 50 percent of the grant that is the state's
5 discretionary portion of the grant. What we
6 have said is there may be cases in which you
7 want LEAs who are not participating LEAs to
8 participate in something that will require
9 some level of funding.

10 So involved LEAs who are not
11 participating in the full grant, but are
12 working with the state to implement specific
13 portions of the state's plan that really
14 require full or nearly full statewide
15 implementation, if there are any such things.

16 You could put zero on this line. But if you
17 have such things in your plan, this is the
18 place to indicate them.

19 Involved LEAs can be signed up at
20 any time by any method. You don't need to do
21 anything at the front end. There is no
22 documentation on this that we require beyond

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 your talking about it in the budget.

2 And again, because involved LEAs
3 are not eligible for the passthrough subgrant,
4 this is part of the 50 percent discretionary
5 funding that we are talking about.

6 So an example that we put in here
7 might be an activity in which you want to pay
8 stipends to teachers to participate in
9 statewide professional development during the
10 summer period because of implementing new
11 standards, and here is the cost of that
12 particular activity.

13 So we would expect this probably
14 to be organized by activity as opposed to by
15 LEA, and then with an explanation of what the
16 activities are. And again, you would expect
17 these activities to be reflected back in your
18 plans.

19 Then there are the participating
20 LEAs. There are two reasons that we could
21 think of, and you may have more, that a state
22 may choose to supplement a participating LEA's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 budget with more than the share that they are
2 getting.

3 So, if a particular LEA needs more
4 than their share, for a variety of reasons --
5 we will talk through some examples in a second
6 -- this is the line of the budget where you
7 are going to document that. This is you
8 taking some of your 50 percent discretionary
9 and saying, "I'm giving it to LEA X for this
10 purpose."

11 There were two general purposes
12 that we could think of why this may be true,
13 and if you have others, feel free to include
14 them. But one was that one or more
15 participating LEAs are implementing a special
16 activity, a pilot activity, of some sort that
17 requires special additional funding pullout.

18 The other is that a participating
19 LEA has a low passthrough share because they
20 have a low Title I allocation, or maybe even
21 no passthrough share and no Title I
22 allocation, and they are a fully participating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 member doing all this work. You really need
2 them to participate, based on how you have
3 organized your plan.

4 Back to the person with the
5 question about a high-performing LEA that
6 maybe in that assumption was not a Title I
7 LEA, maybe you do want them to participate
8 because they have a particular role that you
9 want them to exercise statewide, a leadership
10 role even that you want them to exercise
11 statewide. So you want to include them in
12 your plan in a greater way than their Title I
13 share would enable you to. This is the place
14 where you can sort of true them up so that
15 they get a larger share.

16 So we put into the application two
17 different examples. The first example might
18 be organized by activity.

19 I will come to your question in a
20 sec.

21 The first example might be
22 organized by activity. Maybe there is a pay-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for-performance pilot. This is sort of an
2 obvious one that could require special
3 additional funding, and you are doing it for a
4 pilot group of people in the state. So this
5 is maybe the line where you put that.

6 Example No. 2 is an enhanced share
7 example, where A,B,C District, based on its
8 Title I share, would get this amount, but you
9 want them to participate more fully and you
10 want to true them up to a higher level. So
11 you are going to grant that particular LEA an
12 additional portion out of your 50 percent.

13 Now let me stop and take that
14 question. Yes?

15 MR. HUDSON: Adam Hudson, State of
16 Arkansas.

17 With this supplemental budgeting,
18 are we allowed to just list a contingency line
19 item that is a certain percentage of our
20 overall budget or do we have to be specific to
21 certain activities?

22 MS. WEISS: I think you are asking

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a question -- let me just go to this next
2 slide. So, line 8, other?

3 MR. HUDSON: No, line 12.

4 MS. WEISS: Oh, on line 12? So
5 you are asking whether you could just put a
6 contingency in for additional funding of LEAs?

7 MR. HUDSON: Uh-hum.

8 MS. WEISS: Yes, you can do that,
9 and then you would just have to explain in
10 your narrative how you thought about it and
11 why you were doing it that way.

12 MR. HUDSON: Do you guys have any
13 guidance as to what percentage would be
14 acceptable?

15 MS. WEISS: No. I think it is
16 going to depend on your plan and how you are
17 structuring this.

18 MR. HUDSON: Thank you.

19 DR. GRUENDEL: I will try to state
20 this as clearly as I can. I am trying to
21 understand the relative contribution -- oh,
22 I'm sorry. Janice Gruendel, Connecticut.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Thank you.

2 DR. GRUENDEL: I forgot. I'm
3 sorry.

4 The points associated with this,
5 this is not a point issue, but it is an issue
6 of importance, and the only way I know how to
7 cast it is points.

8 There's a certain amount of points
9 attached to this item under which the budget
10 falls. The budget work is immensely complex,
11 as it should be, building up from what your
12 plan is.

13 Suppose your budget presentation
14 isn't as rich as you would wish it to be. Are
15 there consequences other than you would get a
16 fewer number of points under that, in your
17 mind, as you looked at these things? You said
18 you would do a complete fiscal review. I am
19 trying to understand how this lays out, and it
20 is not about the points.

21 MS. WEISS: So hang onto the
22 microphone, to just make sure that I am really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 answering your question.

2 So this will just earn points, as
3 you said, from the peer reviewers. The
4 Department review in a way is a separate thing
5 that happens. If you win, we will go through
6 and do the sort of detailed Department review
7 that we would always do. But from a peer
8 reviewer's point of view, it is about how many
9 points you will get for connecting your
10 funding and your plans deeply.

11 Does that answer your question?

12 DR. GRUENDEL: I think it does,
13 but could I say it one other way, just to make
14 sure?

15 So, let's say you get "X" number
16 of points, whatever it is -- well, it can't be
17 more than 20 -- in this section, and you get
18 to the next stage. So you are invited back to
19 describe.

20 At that point, there would be
21 extraordinarily more scrutiny on what has
22 actually gone into your budget process and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 your budget forms, and stuff like that? Or is
2 that after you have been awarded and you never
3 look at it until you are awarded?

4 It is important because, you know,
5 that reflects kind of how you are going to
6 implement.

7 MS. WEISS: So I think that I am
8 answering your question. But if you come in
9 to do a presentation, if you are in the
10 finalist group that comes in to do a
11 presentation, the presenter, you are not
12 allowed to present information that you
13 haven't put in your application, and the
14 reviewers will have reviewed your application,
15 will be engaging with you in Q&A around
16 anything that they feel they need to talk to
17 you about.

18 The Department's review of your
19 application is a separate thing from the peer
20 review.

21 Did I answer that right? Yes, go
22 ahead.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HESS: And it is a little bit,
2 it is kind of almost part of the Department's
3 review that would occur kind of right at the
4 time of the award.

5 So, when we have the final list,
6 one of the things that the Department staff
7 would do is go through the budget items and
8 look for, you know, as Joanne was saying
9 earlier, are the costs reasonable? Are they
10 necessary? Are they allowable?

11 And sometimes somebody might put
12 something in that is just not allowable under
13 one of the requirements. Then that would,
14 then, get reflected in the final award.

15 MS. WEISS: Okay. So, then, you
16 are going to take the expenses from each of
17 those project-level budgets and you are going
18 to sum them up to make your budget summary
19 table. So the budget summary table is just
20 the total from each budget category across all
21 of your project-level budgets, and you are
22 going to transfer those into the summary

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 table.

2 Then there's a couple of extra
3 lines at the bottom. This line, line 14, is
4 half the grant, the Section 14006(c) subgrant
5 to the LEAs, because we want the bottom line
6 to actually match the total amount you are
7 asking for, not just 50 percent of the amount
8 you are asking for.

9 So the only place, as you can see,
10 that the passthrough grants to the LEAs comes
11 into the budget is just putting it in that one
12 line item. We do expect that behind that line
13 item you guys, after you get your final plans
14 together with your LEAs, will have much more
15 detailed budgets with your LEAs that you are
16 managing against, and they are auditable, but
17 we are not requesting those budgets at all.
18 That is between you and the LEAs.

19 Okay. Any questions before we
20 move on to (A) (3), the last criterion in
21 Section (A)? (A) (3) is standing between you
22 and lunch.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Yes?

2 MR. DELANEY: John Delaney, New
3 York.

4 The indirect cost, it says if we
5 have an approved indirect cost rate, put it in
6 there.

7 MS. WEISS: Uh-hum.

8 MR. DELANEY: If we have an '08-09
9 approved indirect rate, should we use that in
10 lieu of a pending '09-10? The same thing for
11 fringe benefits? Is that what you would
12 recommend?

13 MS. HESS: Yes. I mean use the
14 most current one you have.

15 MR. DELANEY: That's approved.

16 MS. HESS: And then, depending on
17 when the grant is made, maybe there will be a
18 new one by then or not.

19 MR. DELANEY: Okay. There won't
20 be points deducted because we don't have an
21 approved '09-10?

22 MS. WEISS: No.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DELANEY: Okay. Just
2 checking.

3 MR. CRUCE: Hopefully, this will
4 be a quick one. Dan Cruce from Delaware.

5 I think we know the answer to this
6 question, but we --

7 MS. WEISS: That is always a scary
8 opener you know, but go ahead.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. CRUCE: Right. Right.

11 We wanted to specifically ask, we
12 have four years to spend the money or encumber
13 the money?

14 MS. HESS: Encumber meaning
15 obligate?

16 MR. CRUCE: Encumber meaning
17 obligate, yes.

18 MS. HESS: Yes.

19 MR. CRUCE: Every dollar doesn't
20 have to be spent by the end of the fourth
21 year. To me, it would mean spend. Obligate
22 might mean that it has been budgeted, but not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 yet gone out the door.

2 MS. HESS: I mean the way we talk
3 about --

4 MR. CRUCE: So it is good I asked
5 this question.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MS. HESS: The way we talk about
8 money is we talk about obligating, and the
9 Department's administrative regulations have
10 specific rules about how things are obligated,
11 which I assume most of you are probably
12 familiar with from some of your other grants.

13 And it varies. Like there's a
14 rule for personnel, and then there's a rule
15 for, not that this would be very applicable
16 here, but like for leasing or something like
17 that. So it is different rules as to what
18 counts, as to when it is obligated.

19 We expect that you will spend the
20 money over the four years. We haven't talked
21 about this very much, but I think we mean
22 obligate over the four years, although we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would also expect that probably the
2 expenditures upfront will probably be greater.

3 The project period is going to be
4 four years because we expect it to spend out
5 over the four years, and there's a little bit
6 of cushion in that because the money dies
7 after five years. So you will have a little
8 room to liquidate. So, if you have a signed
9 contract, but then need to kind of spend it
10 out, you will have a little room after the
11 four-year period, but not very much.

12 So you need to be obligating and
13 liquidating as much as possible along the way,
14 and following the regular cash management
15 rules that you do for your other federal
16 grants, and all of those kinds of things.

17 MR. CRUCE: Good. Thank you.

18 MS. WEISS: Thanks.

19 Oh, yes, let me go to Jessica.

20 MS. McKINNEY: We have a question
21 from Jonathan Luknic from Minnesota.

22 He asks, how binding are the cost

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 estimates and how much flexibility can states
2 have in asking for more, if more LEAs than
3 expected sign up for the program?

4 MS. WEISS: So let me answer the
5 second, and let Jane answer the first. Or do
6 you want to just take them both, Jane?

7 The LEAs signing up for the
8 program come out of the state's other 50
9 percent. So more LEAs signing up for the
10 program does not increase the total state's
11 grant. It decreases the share that each of
12 the participating LEAs gets, but it doesn't
13 increase the total amount that the state is
14 requesting.

15 How binding? I don't know, Jane,
16 whether there is another part to that question
17 that you want to answer.

18 MS. HESS: Well, maybe there's two
19 parts because part of it also is what you
20 talked about before in terms of what you
21 propose for your whole grant award amount. We
22 have our recommended levels, and if you feel

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that you need slightly lower or higher, or
2 whatever, you have some discretion to make
3 your whole budget request, if they mean that
4 kind of discretion.

5 As to the discretion within a
6 budget, so if you have kind of your set
7 numbers for half a million dollars, like your
8 typical other fed grants, you have some
9 discretion to move around. There's nothing
10 really written down. Some people kind of use
11 10 percent as a rule of thumb, that if you
12 have something that is a 2 percent difference
13 from what you propose and it is a reasonable
14 and necessary and allowable cost, you
15 probably, without a lot of conversation with
16 the program, can flip it to a different
17 category.

18 MS. WEISS: So who was that from?

19 MS. MCKINNEY: It was from
20 Jonathan Luknic in Minnesota.

21 MS. WEISS: So, Jonathan, it is
22 hard since you are out there, and we don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know if we actually just answered your
2 question. So just let us know if we didn't,
3 and we will go to another question in the
4 meantime, but we are happy to come back to
5 you, if we didn't fully answer your question.

6 Yes?

7 MS. LOWE: Margie Lowe with Oregon
8 again.

9 When I look at line 14 in the
10 budget summary table, it asks us to project
11 what the spending is going to be per project
12 year. But if the districts have not yet
13 developed their spending plans, and they have
14 90 days in which to do that, can we just
15 evenly distribute that across all four years,
16 and then update that once we have better
17 detail?

18 MS. WEISS: Yes, I think that is
19 fine because, when you get the final scope of
20 the work and the final plans from the LEAs,
21 that will include budgets, and that will all
22 happen within 90 days of the grant being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 awarded. So we can adjust the relative years
2 at that point in time, and it wouldn't affect
3 the peer reviewers' judging.

4 Yes, back to Jon maybe.

5 MS. MCKINNEY: No, Jonathan did
6 not respond, but we have a question from Todd
7 Houston in Indiana, who asks, how does the 50
8 percent passthrough to the LEAs work with
9 regard to obligation of monies? For example,
10 if a state wins a \$100 million award, does \$50
11 million immediately get passed through to the
12 LEAs or can that money be held back at the end
13 of the obligation timeline?

14 MS. WEISS: So, much the same way
15 that the grant will work to the states, the
16 money will be obligated, meaning it is in an
17 account with your name on it, but you can't
18 draw it down until you are ready to use it,
19 and it will even be drawn down based on your
20 meeting the different goals and milestones
21 that you have put in your report, and
22 similarly, the state can have those kinds of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requirements on the LEA.

2 We would certainly expect the
3 money to stay in the account until it was
4 used. It wouldn't get dispersed at the front
5 end.

6 MS. SMITH: Hi. Laura Smith from
7 New York again.

8 As we put together our budget
9 projections, how should we think about
10 projecting cost for projects that we know will
11 have outsourced components? Because,
12 obviously, you don't know exactly where your
13 budget will land until you get bids from
14 vendors. So any guidance just on how to go
15 about projecting those costs?

16 MS. WEISS: I do think in the
17 budget section of the application, on the line
18 for contracts, we did talk a little bit about
19 that. So we do have some guidance in the
20 application itself.

21 I don't know, Jane, do you want to
22 provide any --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HESS: Just make your best
2 estimate, I think.

3 MS. WISWELL: Hi. Deb Wiswell
4 from New Hampshire.

5 I just want a clarification
6 because, earlier on, it sounded like if, after
7 the initial MOUs are signed, and we have our
8 participating LEAs, if someone backs out, you
9 said we needed to reallocate that total
10 amount.

11 Just recently, it sounded like you
12 could add in other participating LEAs, in a
13 response to another question. So I would like
14 a clarification on that.

15 MS. WEISS: Yes. So this is
16 something that I probably skimmed over
17 quickly. It was in the slides, and I didn't
18 pay enough attention to it.

19 But if a state wins and you are
20 putting together and you are getting the final
21 scope-of-work agreements from your LEAs, there
22 may be LEAs who just couldn't get it together

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in time to submit their application or in time
2 to sign their MOUs before you submitted your
3 application. So your application will only be
4 judged based on the LEAs that have signed
5 before you submitted and are reflected,
6 therefore, in your proposal.

7 However, if you want to leave the
8 timeframe open, so that LEAs who need more
9 time can keep going, they could keep going in
10 their own states, trying to figure out whether
11 they are willing to participate or not, until
12 90 days after you are awarded a grant. That
13 is the absolute cutoff for us having the
14 detailed budgets together that we will fund.

15 MS. WISWELL: So you would just
16 change the percentages and amounts? Thank
17 you.

18 MS. WEISS: Jessica?

19 MS. MCKINNEY: We have a question
20 from Bette Hartnett in Nevada who asks if the
21 ICR is restricted or unrestricted. And we are
22 assuming that is indirect cost rate.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HESS: I'm not sure. We will
2 have to look that up and get back to them.

3 MS. WEISS: Will you submit that
4 one to our racetothetop@ed.gov email address,
5 so that we can answer that one? We will put
6 the answer to that out publicly, once we get
7 it. But I don't think that is something we
8 are going to be able to answer during a break.
9 So send that in to us, and we will answer it
10 that way.

11 MS. KNOPF: Rae Knopf from
12 Vermont.

13 Two clarifying questions, which
14 you came close to answering, but didn't quite
15 for me. One is, so am I clear that, once the
16 90-day period has passed for the whole four-
17 year period of the project, you could not add
18 additional LEAs?

19 MS. HESS: I think that is going
20 to be the general rule, but I think it will
21 also probably be on a case-by-case basis, that
22 if a state gets a grant, and two years out

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there is some change, that is where you have a
2 discussion with the program.

3 MS. KNOPF: Okay. Thank you.

4 Then the other part of my question
5 was, it appears to me from looking at the
6 budget summary table that the -- my question
7 is, very often in federal grants, the award is
8 made and then allocated in equal increments
9 over the life of the award. It appears in
10 this case that we would define how much we
11 need in year one, year two. It does not have
12 to be in equal increments.

13 MS. HESS: Correct.

14 MS. KNOPF: Okay. Thank you.

15 MS. HESS: Correct.

16 MS. LYNCH: Hi. JoEllen, New
17 York.

18 I am just wondering, back on the
19 topic of LEAs, if there can't be a policy
20 upfront, in response to that question, in
21 regard to charters. I anticipate that will be
22 the biggest growth in LEAs, and no state can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 really anticipate that right now, since each
2 charter would be considered an LEA in the
3 state. And we have a rolling authorization
4 process that will continue. So we don't want
5 to necessarily disadvantage new charters
6 coming in.

7 Could there possibly be a
8 clarification of that, so it is not a
9 procedure states have to go through to modify?

10 MS. HESS: That's a very good
11 question that you should submit to the
12 website.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MS. LYNCH: Okay.

15 MR. STANTON: If I understood your
16 question -- Larry Stanton from Illinois -- if
17 I understood your question, you are saying
18 that LEAs can be added up until 90 days after
19 the grant award?

20 MS. WEISS: Well, you can decide
21 that.

22 MR. STANTON: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: We are not judging
2 anyone past the date that the application is
3 submitted. After that, if you choose to keep
4 the window open, you know, you had LEAs that
5 were in the process, but just couldn't get it
6 done in time, but you would love them to
7 participate, if they can, that would be up to
8 you guys to keep that date open.

9 MS. FARACE: And I've gotten a
10 question in the mailbox. If a state chooses
11 not to, can they shut that down? And that is
12 a state choice.

13 MS. WEISS: Jessica?

14 MS. MCKINNEY: We have a follow-up
15 question from Todd Houston in Indiana.

16 And he asks, if a state had an
17 investment that required a \$100-per-teacher
18 cost, can the state be prescriptive and say
19 that \$100 per teacher has to come from the
20 LEA's 50 percent or does that have to come
21 from the state portion? He says, e.g., line
22 12 in the budget summary table.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HESS: We have received a
2 similar question to that, and that is
3 something that will probably be in a future
4 FAQ.

5 MS. WEISS: So stay tuned, I think
6 is the answer to that one. That is a good
7 question.

8 Any other questions? Yes, one
9 more here, and then I am going to move us on
10 to the last criterion in this section.

11 MR. HUDSON: Adam Hudson,
12 Arkansas.

13 Sustainability being a big concern
14 of ours with a lot of these programs, are we
15 allowed to use funding to set up endowments,
16 so that we have long-term funding options?
17 Because we can't make any changes to the
18 budget at this time.

19 MS. WEISS: So are you asking
20 whether you can put the Race to the Top funds
21 in an endowment?

22 MR. HUDSON: Correct.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Heh, that's a good
2 one.

3 (Laughter.)

4 I think I know the answer, but I
5 will let Jane tell you.

6 Whose name was going to be on the
7 endowment?

8 (Laughter.)

9 MS. HESS: I suspect that that
10 would turn out to not be a reasonable or
11 necessary cost under the cost principle.

12 MS. WEISS: But it is creative,
13 but I think it is not allowed.

14 MR. HUDSON: So that is a
15 definitive answer there?

16 MS. WEISS: Yes.

17 MR. HUDSON: Okay.

18 MS. WEISS: Okay. So let's turn
19 to the last criterion in this section. We
20 have now made it through all the detours. Now
21 we are on a straight line to lunch.

22 (A) (3) is about the track record

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that the state has of demonstrating
2 achievement over the course of the last
3 several years.

4 So this criterion has two parts as
5 well. The first part is the extent to which
6 the state has demonstrated its ability to make
7 progress over the past several years in these
8 four education reform areas, and how it has
9 used its ARRA and other funding to pursue
10 these reforms.

11 And the second, and by far
12 largest, part of this criterion is discussing
13 your track record of student outcomes since at
14 least 2003. We put 2003 in there because some
15 states do not have results on NAEP prior to
16 2003. You are welcome to go back farther than
17 that, if you would like to.

18 And that you explain the
19 connections between the data and the actions
20 you have taken that have contributed to
21 increase in student achievement, decreasing
22 achievement gaps, and increasing high school

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 graduation rates.

2 So here we have asked for this
3 data to be provided for both NAEP and your
4 ESEA tests. What we are asking is that you
5 provide in the appendix the data that has been
6 requested in the criterion. So this is
7 probably a big data dump from your data
8 system.

9 And we are asking that you put
10 that in an appendix. So that, if you are
11 telling a story with your data in the
12 narrative, it is something that the peer
13 reviewers can go back and look up the raw
14 data, if they would like to, but it is fine
15 for you to put this data dump in in just raw
16 data format. You don't need to make it
17 pretty. Just make it indexed and accessible,
18 so somebody can find stuff in it, and stick it
19 in an appendix.

20 But where you are going to spend
21 the bulk of your time, presumably, is on
22 writing the story of how you got to your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 current place and why that is going to be
2 indicative of your ability to move forward
3 with this important work.

4 So the narrative is an analysis of
5 the data, any tables, graphs, anything else
6 that you want to include that best support
7 your narrative.

8 I will come back to you in one
9 second.

10 This is where we talk about the
11 subgroup question. So, again, refer to
12 application requirement (g), but application
13 requirement (g) is where we give you all of
14 the statutory references and subgroup lists,
15 and those things. So, when we are talking
16 about NAEP, here's the list of student
17 subgroups that we are including.

18 In addition, we want to make sure
19 that you are telling us what the exclusion
20 rate was for students with disabilities and
21 for English language learners. Then you
22 document your policies and practices for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 determining whether students with disabilities
2 and English language learners should
3 participate in the NAEP, and whether the
4 student needs accommodation. So all of this
5 can go in your appendix.

6 When we talk about subgroups, this
7 is true anywhere in the whole document, not
8 only in this section. When we talk about
9 subgroups with respect to high school
10 graduation rate, college enrollment, college
11 credit accumulation rates, or your ESEA tests,
12 we are referring to the ESEA subgroups. And
13 we have given you the statutory reference, if
14 you need it.

15 One other thing that we would like
16 you to include, and this, I would suggest, is
17 included in the narrative, is, if there's
18 something significant that changed between one
19 year and another, like you changed your cut
20 scores in a state, and therefore, your data
21 analysis changed because of that, not because
22 of actual changes in student achievement, that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you make that very clear and transparent to
2 the reviewers when they are following your
3 analysis.

4 Yes, question?

5 DR. JONAS: Hi. Deborah Jonas
6 from Virginia.

7 The definition of the graduation
8 rate is defined by CFR 200.19(b)(1). Are you
9 looking for the definition that is in the
10 October 2008 regulations, if it is available,
11 or what is in our currently-approved
12 accountability workbook?

13 MS. WEISS: I'm looking at
14 Meredith.

15 MS. FARACE: Yes, since it is
16 backward-looking, it would have to be what
17 you had. If it is backward-looking, it has to
18 be what you have had in your accountability
19 workbook in the past. We know most states
20 haven't had the cohort rate years back. So,
21 yes, what was approved before.

22 MS. WEISS: Did that answer your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question?

2 DR. JONAS: Yes. So that is all
3 we need to provide?

4 MS. WEISS: So, with this one,
5 this criterion is backwards-looking. The
6 earlier criterion that was your goal question,
7 that was forward-looking, that should
8 certainly be, and what we have asked for is
9 the extended graduation rate.

10 MS. FARACE: It is a four-year
11 cohort graduation rate from the 2008
12 regulations.

13 MS. WEISS: Four-year plus
14 extended.

15 MS. FARACE: If they have it.

16 MS. WEISS: If you have it.

17 So the forward-looking one, which
18 was (A) (1), you can use your new things to
19 project, but this is the backward-looking one.

20 So what you've got in your accountability
21 workbook.

22 DR. JONAS: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WIDNESS: Jennifer Widness
2 from Connecticut. This is just a followup to
3 what you just said.

4 So, if we haven't switched over to
5 the new measure yet, and we are looking
6 forward, there's going to probably be a change
7 in our data, so that it might not make sense
8 in terms of what we have now and what we
9 expect it to be.

10 Do we just put an asterisk and
11 explain?

12 MS. WEISS: remember, there are
13 two totally different criteria. You are
14 asking two different questions. One is in
15 (A) (1), and one is in (A) (3). So just make it
16 really clear again in your narrative. In both
17 cases, you are writing a data analysis story,
18 if you will, to the reviewers. So just make
19 it clear to the reviewers --

20 MS. WIDNESS: But there is
21 baseline.

22 MS. WEISS: -- why there might be.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WIDNESS: Right, but the
2 baseline is still in the first section, and
3 that would be now, which we don't have and
4 which we are not using the new measurement.

5 MS. WEISS: I don't think any of
6 our performance tables ask you for that data.
7 You might choose to put it in your answer,
8 but I don't think we have -- have we asked?
9 Do we have that piece of data that you have to
10 fill in in a particular table coming up?

11 I think there's not a table that
12 asks for that specifically because of this
13 issue. So you put it in, however, and talk
14 about it.

15 Any other questions?

16 Anything else on the webinar?
17 Because this is our last slide before we do a
18 quick break for lunch.

19 (No response.)

20 No other questions?

21 (No response.)

22 Okay, terrific. So we are going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to break for lunch, and we are going to resume
2 at 1:15. We are a couple of minutes ahead of
3 schedule. So we are going to give you a
4 little more than an hour for lunch, and resume
5 back in this room at 1:15.

6 And let me just remind people, at
7 the last break, a bunch of people queued up to
8 ask questions. We just had the question time.

9 We really need questions to be asked publicly
10 because we want everybody to hear the answers.

11 So, please, even if you think it
12 is something very particular to your state,
13 ask publicly. If we tell you that we need you
14 to send it in on the website, I mean through
15 the email, so that we can just answer
16 something specifically for you, that is great.

17 But please do ask it publicly or send it in.

18 Don't come up privately and ask us your
19 questions, for the benefit of all your
20 colleagues.

21 So thank you, and we will see you
22 back in here at 1:15.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1
2
3
4

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
went off the record at 12:02 p.m. for lunch
and went back on the record at 1:16 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 The first question is: Joanne, do
2 LEAs have to include all of their schools?

3 MS. WEISS: So, Josh, the answer
4 to that question is, no, LEAs don't have to
5 include every single school necessarily, but
6 the schools that they do include should add up
7 to the ability to really implement the state's
8 plan and to have the impact that the state is
9 hoping to have on moving the needle statewide.

10 So they need to sign up to goals
11 in sufficient magnitude for the state to feel
12 comfortable that the whole state's plan is
13 moving forward.

14 And that prompted a question.

15 DR. KIRBY: Yes. As a followup to
16 that, Peggy Kirby, Louisiana.

17 If they don't include all schools,
18 do they still have to get the same share of
19 the funding?

20 MS. WEISS: Yes.

21 DR. KIRBY: So, even if an LEA is
22 including only a third of their schools, they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 still get their share of funding based on
2 Title I?

3 MS. WEISS: Yes, they would, but,
4 remember, you can specify now whether you
5 think there is -- yes.

6 DR. KIRBY: Yes.

7 MR. BENDOR: So, in other words,
8 another question, the state could set other
9 rules regarding this? Is that what our panel
10 thinks?

11 MS. HESS: Or maybe it goes back
12 to what you defined in your plan at the outset
13 as to what is all or a significant amount of
14 participation.

15 MR. BENDOR: Thank you.

16 Our second question is regarding,
17 what if a state doesn't want to include
18 signatures from union locals in their MOU, but
19 wants to have an attachment about this? This
20 question goes to Jane Hess, Esquire.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MS. HESS: Thank you, Josh. What

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a thoughtful question.

2 Yes, we can't prevent you from
3 attaching whatever you may or may not want to
4 attach to your application as part of an
5 appendix. But if the concept in asking the
6 question was to attach some sort of
7 description in lieu of the signature, you are
8 still judged on whether you have the signature
9 or not. So take that for what it means.

10 MR. BENDOR: Did you want to say
11 something?

12 MS. WEISS: No, I just wanted to
13 make sure whoever asked that question -- I
14 can't remember which state it was. Yes, that
15 is right, New Mexico. So did that answer it?

16 So a signature on the MOU is a
17 signature on the MOU, not a signature on some
18 other document. Okay.

19 MR. BENDOR: The next question,
20 also for Jane Hess: how prescriptive can
21 states be on the LEA uses of funds? For
22 example, if the state wanted LEAs to use \$100

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for a certain activity, which I don't
2 remember, \$100 per teacher.

3 MS. HESS: If you make that a part
4 of your state plan at the outset, that is
5 something that you can include in your plan.
6 You also have to be reasonable about it, and
7 the whole expense would still be judged on
8 whether it is reasonable, necessary,
9 allowable.

10 To take it kind of to the whole
11 other side of the spectrum, if somebody came
12 up with a plan that they thought LEAs needed
13 to use 90 percent of their formula share for
14 professional development, that is probably not
15 going to shake out as being a reasonable cost,
16 but something that is like \$100, which I think
17 was maybe one of the examples, that probably
18 would be permissible. So you have to use, as
19 usual, your good judgment.

20 MR. BENDOR: And then the last one
21 for this little part of the session, for
22 Joanne: what should states do regarding their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 budgets and grants that they are applying for,
2 don't know if they have gotten yet, that sort
3 of thing?

4 MS. WEISS: So this was a question
5 about what you should assume in terms of SLDS
6 or other grants you may be applying for that
7 you don't know the answer to yet, and do you
8 do version A and version B? And after a nice
9 caucus over lunch -- you did give us really
10 fun things to talk about over lunch, as you
11 can tell -- we decided that the safest
12 guidance to give everybody is just do one
13 version of your budget, not multiple
14 incarnations of your budget, which I am sure
15 you are all happy to hear. And the readers
16 will be happy for that as well.

17 But just do one version of your
18 budget. Assume only the things you know are
19 true when you are doing your budget. So a
20 competitive grant, like SLDS, for Phase 1, you
21 wouldn't know whether you had won or not. So
22 you should assume that it is not included in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 your budget; whereas, a formula kind of grant,
2 like school improvement grants, you might be
3 able to assume that you will be able to tap
4 into.

5 So, anything that is unknown, just
6 don't include in your budget. However, in the
7 budget summary narrative, which is really
8 where we ask you to give us the big picture
9 story of how all these different sources of
10 funds might come together, in the narrative
11 you can certainly say, you know, we have
12 applied for an SLDS grant, and if we win it,
13 here's the ways in which we could supplement
14 what we are proposing in here, not budget
15 numbers, but just talk about the ways in which
16 you would use that to supplement the goals
17 that you have already put forth in your grant,
18 or something like that.

19 So you can certainly talk about
20 what would happen "if", but just do one
21 version of the budget that is based in things
22 that are known at the time that you put your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 budget together.

2 So did that answer that question?

3 MR. BENDOR: I am seeing a
4 perplexed look.

5 MR. CRUCE: Just a quick followup
6 to make sure I am following the answer
7 correctly. So the specific question I had,
8 which was related to the one that was asked on
9 this topic, so if we don't know about SLDS by
10 the time of application, we weren't planning
11 to include it. If we didn't know, we might
12 ask for it in our Race to the Top to make sure
13 that we are putting an "ask" out there in
14 either direction.

15 So I don't know if that changes
16 the question a little bit. At the time of
17 application, we wouldn't know if we received
18 it.

19 MS. FARACE: So you are assuming
20 you don't have it in the sense that you are
21 going to ask for a certain part of the budget
22 to cover that in case you didn't get the SLDS?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CRUCE: Exactly.

2 MS. WEISS: That would be fine.

3 MR. CRUCE: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. BENDOR: And for the
5 transcript, your name and state?

6 MR. CRUCE: Oh, I'm sorry. I
7 apologize.

8 Dan Cruce from Delaware.

9 MR. BENDOR: Okay, anything else?

10 Okay, one more.

11 DR. JONAS: So, just slightly more
12 clarification on, in this model, where we
13 would -- I am sorry. Deborah Jonas with
14 Virginia.

15 If we assume that we don't have,
16 that we are not awarded funds for, say, the
17 SLDS, but there are components of our Race to
18 the Top application that are contingent upon
19 the work that we have proposed in that
20 project, all of that goes in the budget, and
21 then --

22 MS. WEISS: It is really up to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you.

2 DR. JONAS: But I guess I am
3 confused as to what you want in the narrative
4 in that, would we be able to reallocate --
5 let's just say it is \$6 million for one
6 component of the SLDS. I had originally
7 thought of it as we would only need those
8 funds if the SLDS isn't awarded.

9 But if the SLDS is awarded and the
10 Race to the Top is awarded, we only need those
11 funds once. So is that what you want us to
12 explain in the narrative? Or would we
13 reallocate those funds to a different piece of
14 the Race to the Top? Because you said
15 "supplement".

16 MS. HESS: I think it would be the
17 latter. If you think that you need to plan to
18 use your Race to the Top money for that
19 purpose, and then it turns out that you get
20 another grant, then you would talk with the
21 program at that point, assuming you also got a
22 Race to the Top grant, and you would maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 readjust your Race to the Top budget to use it
2 for a different purpose within your allowable
3 uses.

4 I think that was the latter of
5 what you were suggesting.

6 MS. COURTS: Amelia Courts, West
7 Virginia.

8 I understand the logic, but I
9 guess my question is: I was thinking that one
10 of the primary purposes was to show
11 coordination among ARRA funds. How can you
12 show coordination if you are assuming that you
13 are not going to get any of the other funding
14 sources?

15 MS. WEISS: So it is not none of
16 the others. It is the things that are
17 competitive and, therefore, unpredictable, and
18 you don't know if you are going to get them.

19 So that is why we said, for
20 example, the School Improvement grants are
21 coming down to you by formula. So assume,
22 yes, you are getting those. But things that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you are really competing for, you don't know.

2 MS. COURTS: So the only one that
3 we could really show coordination with, then,
4 would be the SIG grants?

5 MS. WEISS: In these new ones.
6 There's also SFSF, and there's anything that
7 you are doing with your Title I funds or other
8 state and local funds that you might be
9 coordinating with as well.

10 MS. COURTS: But, competitive, we
11 wouldn't try to assume coordination?

12 MS. WEISS: Yes, except maybe in
13 Phase 2, in your Phase 2 version of your
14 application, you might know some of those
15 things. So it is at the time that you submit
16 your application, the things that are known
17 take into account.

18 It just seems the safest path and
19 the lowest complexity level. So we are
20 certainly not in any way trying to discourage
21 alignment. We are just trying to keep this
22 something that is manageable. Doing a budget

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is going to be complicated enough without
2 having 10 versions of your budget.

3 MR. DELANEY: John Delaney, New
4 York.

5 Could an LEA use Race to the Top
6 funds for modifications to facilities for
7 turning around maybe a low-performing high
8 school?

9 MR. BENDOR: That is in the FAQs.
10 I am going to turn to that right now.

11 MR. DELANEY: I must have missed
12 it.

13 MR. BENDOR: Let me actually, it
14 is kind of a detailed one. So let's just
15 refer you to FAQ L2. That is in the document
16 published on the website.

17 MS. HESS: And the bottom line of
18 it is that it needs to be consistent with your
19 state plan.

20 MR. BENDOR: All right. So now we
21 are going to move past this question/answer
22 portion to our regularly-scheduled program,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the standards and assessment section. This is
2 selection Criteria (B), standards and
3 assessment.

4 So we know there's a lot of
5 momentum and initiative out there to develop
6 common standards and eventually aligned
7 assessments. We are supportive of that
8 momentum, those initiatives, and not
9 necessarily having 50 goal posts around the
10 country.

11 So this section, just in the big
12 picture, is to support that momentum and,
13 also, have support for related funding and
14 implementation issues. That is in the third
15 criterion here, (B) (3), which I will get to on
16 down the line.

17 So let's start with (B) (1).

18 So (B) (1) has two main parts.
19 Romanette i is the first one. That is the
20 extent to which the state is participating in
21 a consortium that is working toward jointly
22 developing and adopting a common set of K-12

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 standards that are internationally-benchmarked
2 and will prepare students for college and
3 career readiness.

4 And, then, the second part within
5 that is the extent to which that consortium
6 includes a significant number of states.

7 I am going to go forward, and then
8 we will take that question, because I may be
9 about to answer it.

10 So a significant number of states,
11 you may wonder, what a significant number of
12 states means? This is one of those criteria
13 where we really want you to look in the
14 reviewer guidelines, where we have put some
15 important information there.

16 So what we have told reviewers is
17 a state would get high points under the part
18 of this criterion related to a significant
19 number of states if the number of states in
20 its consortium is a majority of states in the
21 country. It would get medium or low points if
22 the number of states is less than a majority.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Now you may ask, what is high
2 points? What is medium and low points? So
3 you will notice on page 77 of the application
4 we have included a chart that basically says,
5 okay, for a criterion that is worth 20 points,
6 if this is a high-quality response to that
7 criterion, here's the point range you should
8 be giving. If it is a medium-quality
9 response, here's the point range you should be
10 giving. For different criteria, different
11 point values.

12 The point of this is just to have
13 consistency between reviewers. So a reviewer
14 that thinks something is high quality and
15 another reviewer that thinks it is high
16 quality, they are giving similar point
17 numbers. That is on page 77 of the
18 application.

19 That is what this high points and
20 medium and low points mean.

21 So did that answer the question
22 that the hand was up there? No? Let's take

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it then.

2 MS. WISWELL: Hi. I'm from New
3 Hampshire.

4 I already belong to a consortium.

5 MR. BENDOR: What's your name?

6 MS. WISWELL: Deb Wiswell.

7 We already have a consortium, a
8 collaboration, the only one. We think it is
9 pretty good. You know, it is not 25 states;
10 we know that. And, yes, there's medium or low
11 points attached to that.

12 But I guess my question is,
13 because it is not defined in here, the common
14 core or the core, it is, are you willing or do
15 you belong to a consortium and have common
16 standards, common assessments?

17 So, from my standpoint, my answer
18 is yes to that, and here is why. Am I --
19 thank you.

20 They were nodding their heads yes.

21 MR. BENDOR: Any other question?

22 DR. SLACK: Jill Slack, Louisiana.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Do you want us to attach full
2 copies of the draft standards or can we
3 reference a website? That is the first part
4 of the question.

5 The second part is, how do you
6 envision demonstrating that all standards are
7 internationally-benchmarked?

8 MR. BENDOR: Thank you for that
9 excellent question, which is a perfect segue
10 to my next slide.

11 (Laughter.)

12 Which is the evidence for this
13 criterion.

14 So I am going to go through and I
15 will answer your question, and raise your hand
16 if I don't, as I go through.

17 So the first thing we ask for as
18 evidence here is a copy of your memorandum of
19 agreement, showing you are part of a standards
20 consortium. We haven't specified a certain
21 format for that. That is just to show you are
22 part of a consortium that you say you are part

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of, straightforward.

2 The second is a copy of the final
3 standards, or if they are not final, then the
4 draft versions of them. We do want you to
5 include a copy of that because, as we
6 discussed earlier, if you really want to make
7 sure reviewers see something, include it in
8 there.

9 Documentation that they will be
10 internationally-benchmarked, we haven't given
11 specific guidance or you must benchmark it in
12 this specific way. And reviewers will be
13 looking at the evidence that you provide and
14 the process, and how rigorous it is that your
15 consortium has gone through or is going to go
16 through, and then the number of states in your
17 consortium and which states they are.

18 Does that answer the question?
19 No?

20 DR. SLACK: Could you repeat the
21 answer to the second part of the question
22 about internationally-benchmarked?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: Say the question
2 again.

3 DR. SLACK: Okay. How do you
4 envision demonstrating that all standards are
5 internationally-benchmarked?

6 MR. BENDOR: And so that is up to
7 you to demonstrate in a way that you think is
8 persuasive that they are or are going to be
9 internationally-benchmarked. We haven't given
10 specific guidance to reviewers that we are not
11 giving to you. Everything that we have given
12 to them is out here for you. So that is up to
13 you to do that in the best way that you think,
14 and to say why you have done what you have
15 done.

16 So the second part of (B)(1),
17 (B)(1)(ii), is regarding the adoption of these
18 common set of standards, and we have done it
19 slightly differently for Phase 1 and Phase 2
20 applicants, just because the applications come
21 in at different times.

22 For Phase 1 applicants, we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 said your state's high-quality claim
2 demonstrating your commitment to and progress
3 toward adopting a common set of standards by
4 August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, at a later
5 date specified by the state.

6 So you may ask, what does this "at
7 a minimum, by a later date" mean? At a
8 minimum denotes that there are fewer points
9 attached to a later date specified by the
10 state. I will get into that in a second.

11 For Phase 2, it is whether you
12 have adopted this set of common standards by
13 August 2, 2010 or, at a minimum, by a later
14 date specified in 2010.

15 And this is another one where the
16 reviewer guidance is particularly important.
17 Once again, the bottom of the slide shows what
18 page of your application this is on.

19 So here we have said, look, you
20 get high points if you are a Phase 1
21 applicant, if you show that you are committed
22 to and you are on track towards adoption by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 August 2nd, 2010, and if you are a Phase 2
2 applicant, you get high points if you adopt by
3 August 2nd, 2010. There aren't medium points
4 available, and you get low points if you are
5 going towards a later specified date in 2010.

6 Questions on this?

7 (No response.)

8 So the evidence here is pretty
9 straightforward. It is, what is the legal
10 process in your state for adopting standards
11 and what's your plan and your progress and
12 your timeframe for adoption? That is for
13 Phase 1 applicants.

14 For Phase 2, it is evidence that
15 you have adopted the standards or, if you
16 haven't, the same thing we are asking if you
17 were a Phase 1 applicant.

18 We have a question over there.

19 MR. SANDROCK: Paul Sandrock,
20 Wisconsin.

21 The question is linking this to
22 the prior Section (i), Romanette i.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Very good.

2 MR. SANDROCK: We are fast
3 learners, believe me, all day.

4 (Laughter.)

5 So there are 48 states in the
6 common core consortium. What evidence are you
7 looking for in the two parts that is going to
8 be different? When you are asking for draft
9 standards, we could all produce the very same
10 draft. We could all produce the very same
11 internationally-benchmarked evidence.

12 Now, in part ii, it is, how are we
13 individually creating this in our state
14 context?

15 MR. BENDOR: Yes.

16 MR. SANDROCK: So you might get,
17 again, similar answers in part i.

18 MR. BENDOR: Yes.

19 MR. SANDROCK: How to
20 differentiate a state around any of that?

21 MS. WEISS: Yes, I think that you
22 are absolutely correct. If you are in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 same consortium, your answer for part i will
2 probably be very similar, and that is probably
3 fine. If you are in a different consortium,
4 we will get different answers from different
5 consortia for part i. And for part ii,
6 everybody's answer is going to be very
7 specific to their state context.

8 So you are correct in how you
9 described it.

10 MR. BENDOR: Anything else on this
11 before we go to (B) (2)?

12 (No response.)

13 All right. (B) (2), so (B) (2) is
14 regarding the development and implementation
15 of common high-quality assessments.

16 Just to step back for a second,
17 probably many of you heard about a separate
18 Race to the Top assessment competition that we
19 are going to be running. Because most of the
20 assessment work is done in that separate
21 competition, this criterion is not worth as
22 many points as some of the other criteria.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That is not because we don't think it is
2 important, but because there is another
3 competition that is specifically about it.

4 And also, for that same reason,
5 this is about the extent to which you are
6 participating in a group that is creating
7 common assessments, and we are not asking you
8 for your specific plan here.

9 So there are two parts to it, the
10 extent to which your consortium that you are
11 working with is jointly developing common
12 high-quality assessments, and then the extent
13 to which that consortium includes a
14 significant number of states.

15 And a significant number of
16 states, once again, we give some color on that
17 in the reviewer guidance, and we give the same
18 description as we did for Criterion (B)(1) in
19 terms of what is a significant number of
20 states.

21 Any questions on this before I go
22 to the evidence?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (No response.)

2 Okay. So the evidence on this is
3 pretty straightforward. It is basically the
4 evidence that you are in the consortium you
5 say you are in, and that it is doing the
6 activities you say it is doing. So a copy of
7 your memorandum of agreement showing you part
8 of your consortium or these other options we
9 give you here. Then which states and the
10 number of states in your consortium.

11 And I just want to note here we
12 have a requirement here, which many of you
13 have noticed. We've got some questions on
14 this, and we should be posting momentarily an
15 FAQ responding to some of the questions on
16 this. This is on statewide summative
17 assessments.

18 Because we have this separate
19 competition again, which is helping states
20 create common statewide summative assessments,
21 we don't want states to be using funds under
22 this competition to create lots and lots of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 different assessments when they are also using
2 a separate pot of money to create a common
3 set.

4 So you can't use funds awarded
5 under this Race to the Top competition to pay
6 for a cost related to statewide summative
7 assessments, such as your state assessments
8 required under the ESEA. That doesn't refer
9 to exams, like interim assessments, unit or
10 lesson tests, that kind of thing. We are
11 intending to fund the creation of common
12 assessments through the separate competition.

13 Now we are on to Criterion (B) (3).

14 So (B) (3) is regarding the transition to
15 enhanced standards and high-quality
16 assessments.

17 We know this is where a lot of the
18 really hard work is going to be for a lot of
19 you all in terms of developing instructional
20 materials, professional development around new
21 standards you are adopting to make sure those
22 actually have an impact down at the classroom

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 level that is affecting teaching and learning.

2 We understand that this is both
3 hard work, but also may be expensive work. So
4 this is your opportunity to explain your plan
5 for how you are going to make this transition,
6 as well as to use this as a hook for your
7 funding that you want to do under that.

8 I want to note that there's a
9 program requirement we have that says,
10 basically, you have to share the work
11 developed under your grant unless it is
12 otherwise protected by a law or legal
13 agreement. The reason is, for those of you
14 who are winners who are going to be in this
15 same set of standards consortium, you are
16 going to be creating similar materials here,
17 and we want you to all benefit from that, and
18 not everyone to be hoarding their materials in
19 their own caves. So we have said you have to
20 share this on a website that we identify or
21 create.

22 And much of this criterion is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 really a "such as" list. These are examples
2 of the kinds of activities you could do here.
3 This is not an exclusive list. You could do
4 other things. It is not a required list. You
5 don't have to do all of these things. These
6 are just to give you examples, so you have a
7 sense of the kinds of things we are talking
8 about.

9 Any questions on this one? Yes?

10 MS. WISWELL: Hi. Deb Wiswell,
11 New Hampshire.

12 Can you define "enhanced" for us,
13 what you mean by enhanced standards and high-
14 quality standards?

15 MS. WEISS: Yes. I think what we
16 were trying to say here, and it is a good
17 question coming from somebody in the NECAP
18 states because what we were trying to say is,
19 if you've got work that you want to do in your
20 state -- so some states that are in the Common
21 Core Initiative might, in fact, be adopting a
22 whole new set of standards.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We didn't want to assume that that
2 was the only case; that there might be other
3 people who are doing work such as the New
4 England states might be doing, if that is the
5 consortium that you are considering yourself
6 part of for this purpose, that you still might
7 have work along these lines that you wanted to
8 do. So we weren't just saying you can use
9 these funds to do that work for whatever
10 consortium you are a part of.

11 MR. BENDOR: Do we have a followup
12 on that? Or did that answer the question?

13 MS. WEISS: Right. We actually
14 used an undefined term so that we weren't
15 specifically saying that it had to be new
16 standards. So, yes.

17 MR. BENDOR: Yes, from the
18 webinar?

19 MS. McKINNEY: Holly Edenfield
20 from Florida says, under standards and
21 assessments, if we change assessments during
22 the RTTT period, how do we recalibrate our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 achievement goals?

2 I think potentially related at
3 least, she asks whether the laws referenced
4 throughout the application potentially related
5 to this or other parts need to be included in
6 the appendix? Or does the AG signature
7 certify that all legislative references are
8 correct?

9 MR. BENDOR: So I think that there
10 are two separate questions here. Folks on the
11 panel, feel free to interrupt me.

12 MS. WEISS: Just ask them one at a
13 time.

14 MS. MCKINNEY: She asks whether
15 changing assessments during the Race to the
16 Top period, if that will affect their
17 achievement goals, how do they recalibrate?

18 MR. BENDOR: So that is, actually,
19 a question not under these criteria, but under
20 Criterion (A) (1) (iii), where you are setting
21 your goals for increasing student achievement,
22 closing achievement gaps, that sort of thing.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think that is the sort of thing
2 that states can discuss in their narrative,
3 what they expect their goals to be.

4 MS. WEISS: But can I add to that,
5 that one of the reasons that we asked for NAEP
6 and the ESEA, and the current tests given
7 under the ESEA, is because we know that during
8 this period states might well be transitioning
9 to a new set of assessments, depending on, for
10 example, if assessments that are funded under
11 the Race to the Top assessment grant start
12 coming into play, either in field testing or
13 in actual use, during the period of this
14 grant.

15 The reason we asked for NAEP as
16 well as ESEA is at least with NAEP we have a
17 common benchmark that we will be able to use
18 and count on, and the others, if they change,
19 could change, and that is a way, as you are
20 talking through your narrative, to have at
21 least one set of benchmarks and standards
22 there under the NAEP that are common and you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can sort of count on, and describe what you
2 think will happen there.

3 MS. MCKINNEY: The second part was
4 asking whether they have to include all laws
5 referenced in their application as an appendix
6 or whether the attorney general's signature is
7 sufficient to verify legislative references.

8 MR. BENDOR: So, where we have
9 specified evidence and said states should
10 include evidence, they should include it.
11 But, otherwise, it is the attorney general's
12 signature.

13 MS. WEISS: And many of the places
14 where we ask for evidence says a description
15 of, not the actual copies of your laws and
16 statutes. So the attorney general's signature
17 is basically saying that the description you
18 have provided was accurate.

19 MR. BENDOR: Thank you, Joanne.

20 MS. STUMBO: Hi. Circe Stumbo
21 with the Iowa team.

22 Am I understanding that, under

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (B) (1) and (2), this is only consortia
2 activity? So, if we want to spend some of our
3 state money to develop some formative
4 assessments at the local level, does that have
5 to be done in a consortium of states or can
6 that be done locally, within only our state?

7 MR. BENDOR: That would be under
8 (B) (3).

9 MS. STUMBO: Under (B) (3)?

10 MR. BENDOR: Because (B) (1) and
11 (B) (2) are about adoption, and (B) (3) is about
12 how do you implement these things.

13 MS. LYNCH: Thank you. I am just
14 trying to figure out some advice on how we
15 would lay this out.

16 So, if a state was going to apply
17 to be part of a common assessment consortium,
18 and what I am hearing is there probably
19 shouldn't be a dollar figure in here for
20 assessments because you may participate in
21 that. But if we want to align those summative
22 assessments to formative assessments two years

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out, say, should we be, can we put a budget
2 line in for that work? Or are you
3 anticipating that work being funded under a
4 common assessment process as well? Because a
5 formative assessment is a pretty significant
6 cost.

7 MS. WEISS: Yes, so we haven't
8 figured out enough of the guidelines to know
9 the extent to which we are going to include
10 anything beyond summative assessments in the
11 other Race to the Top assessment competition.

12 And because formative assessments, depending
13 how you develop them, could be very
14 curriculum-embedded and curriculum-dependent,
15 we wanted to make sure that states could put
16 that together in their state plans.

17 So you can certainly include
18 things like that that have to do with how you
19 are implementing things at the school
20 district/classroom level in these Race to the
21 Top plans. And (B) (3) is the place where that
22 would properly show up.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: One more, and then we
2 are going to have to move on, unfortunately.

3 MS. CARPENTIER: Betsy Carpentier
4 from South Carolina.

5 Can I ask a question about what
6 you mean about adoption of the standards?
7 Because we won't have common assessments in
8 place by June or August. So we won't have the
9 test to assess those standards until some time
10 in the future. So, if you have adoption, can
11 it be for a future date when the assessment is
12 available?

13 MS. WEISS: Yes, so the way we are
14 looking at adoption is as the actual legal
15 process in your state where the state has
16 said, yes, we are going to move to these, but
17 it is not the implementation date. It can be
18 implemented at some time in the future.

19 MR. BENDOR: Right. So I am going
20 to move on here because we have had a lot of
21 great questions.

22 So the last thing on (B) (3) that I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 want to note is, for (B)(3), it is the first
2 criterion you have encountered where
3 performance measures are optional. We have
4 had folks ask, what does this mean?

5 So the reviewers are going to
6 judge your plan. As we say in the
7 application, you know, that should include
8 your goals and related evidence. That is on
9 page 4 of your application, and Meredith was
10 talking about that earlier.

11 And if the way you are putting
12 together your plan lends itself to performance
13 measures, if the performance measures would
14 add clarity or strength, then you could
15 include them, if they are optional, if you
16 think it would make your plan more high-
17 quality.

18 If they didn't fit into your plan,
19 then if they are optional performance
20 measures, you wouldn't need to include them.
21 There's not going to be a box on the reviewer
22 form where they go through and say, "Oh, this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is a criterion with optional performance
2 measures. They didn't have optional
3 performance measures. Minus five points."

4 There are other criteria with
5 optional performance measures. The same
6 general point applies there. I am not going
7 to highlight each one, and Joanne is not, as
8 we go through.

9 Okay. So let's go on to data
10 systems. So we have three criteria under data
11 systems.

12 The first one is the extent to
13 which you have a Statewide Longitudinal Data
14 System that has the COMPETES elements in it
15 already. So that is what you have
16 accomplished. So that is a state reform
17 conditions criteria, per what Meredith was
18 talking about earlier.

19 The second is your plan to make
20 that data accessible and usable to
21 stakeholders and researchers, and the third is
22 about not your State Longitudinal Data

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Systems, but using data at the local level to
2 improve instruction.

3 So let's go to (C)(1). You have
4 seen this before, but we didn't talk about the
5 content.

6 So, as I mentioned, this is a
7 reform conditions criterion. It is about what
8 you have accomplished by the time you apply,
9 and it is, basically, how many of the America
10 COMPETES elements do you have? And as we say
11 -- oh, that is not what I meant to do.

12 As we say here, you get two points
13 per element. So there are 12 elements, and
14 you can get 24 points under this criteria.

15 We have included in the notice a
16 definition of the America COMPETES elements
17 with a cite to the statute, and this slide
18 just shows you an abbreviated version of that.

19 Anything on (C)(1)? Yes?

20 DR. JONAS: Hi. Deborah Jonas
21 from Virginia.

22 What kind of evidence are you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 expecting for that? Or what kind of
2 documentation would suffice for this? So, for
3 example, might a state reference the DQC's
4 rating? Is that sufficient? Do we need to
5 provide visual -- I don't know. I guess it
6 would be very helpful to have some guidance on
7 what constitutes evidence or what kind of
8 documentation you are looking for in this.

9 MR. BENDOR: Right. You know, I
10 don't know if others want to add, but I would
11 say, again, put yourself in the shoes of peer
12 reviewers. If you were an expert who the
13 Department had chosen to evaluate this, what
14 would you find clear documentation that the
15 state had met the criterion in the way it says
16 it meets the criterion?

17 MS. WEISS: That's it. I think
18 you are just making an assertion of what
19 things are in there, and if there's any
20 nuances that you need reviewers to know about,
21 be very clear about what those are. But you
22 are just making assertions.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 If you wanted to put in screen
2 shots or things like that, I mean it can be
3 whatever you think will make it clear to the
4 reviewers that this does exist and this piece
5 doesn't exist. This is meant to be a pretty
6 black-and-white criterion.

7 MR. BENDOR: Anything else on
8 (C) (1)?

9 (No response.)

10 Okay. So (C) (2), about accessing
11 and using state data. So this is about the
12 extent to which the data from that Statewide
13 Longitudinal Data System, and you were telling
14 us about that system in (C) (1), is accessible
15 and used to inform and engage key
16 stakeholders.

17 We have here a "for example" list
18 of key stakeholders. Like our other "for
19 example" lists, this is a "for example" list
20 to give you an illustration. It is not an
21 exhaustive list. It is not a required list.
22 But this is to give you a sense of the kind of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thing we are talking about.

2 And once again, this is a reform
3 plan criterion. So this is not about what
4 your data system, but how accessible your data
5 system is currently or what your plans are for
6 making it accessible in the ways of criterion
7 talks about.

8 Any questions on this one?

9 (No response.)

10 All right. That one was really
11 simple.

12 And that is another one where
13 performance measures are optional.

14 So now we are on to (C) (3).
15 (C) (3) isn't about Statewide Longitudinal Data
16 Systems. So the big picture here is we are a
17 big believer in using data to improve
18 instruction, and that means getting the right
19 data to teachers and principals, and not just
20 to policymakers.

21 And teachers and principals may
22 need different data, and they may need data on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a different timeframe than policymakers. So
2 they may need data systems suited to their
3 needs.

4 So we have called these
5 instructional improvement systems. We have
6 included a definition of this in the notice.
7 All the definitions, I will remind you, are on
8 pages 7 to 11 of your application.

9 But, basically, it means
10 technology-based tools that provide educators
11 with meaningful support and data, so that they
12 can continuously improve instruction.

13 So there are three parts to this
14 criterion. The first one is about increasing,
15 basically, the existence of these systems. So
16 more acquisition, adoption, use of local
17 instructional improvement systems.

18 The second part is about
19 supporting the use of these systems. So
20 supporting LEAs and schools that are using
21 them and providing professional development on
22 how to use them and how to use the data to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 improve instruction.

2 And then third part is about
3 making the data from these systems, in
4 addition to your Statewide Longitudinal Data
5 Systems, available to researchers.

6 And the reasoning here is there
7 may be a lot more data points in these sorts
8 of data systems. There may be more things
9 feeding into them than there are into the
10 Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems. So this
11 can allow researchers to learn a lot more
12 about what works in terms of teaching students
13 and teaching different types of learners.
14 Then that is something that your state can use
15 to inform instruction in the classroom.

16 And we have a question on the
17 webinar.

18 MS. MCKINNEY: There's a question
19 from Michael Neunks of Missouri who asks,
20 under (C) (1), are there more explicit
21 definitions for some of the categories, and
22 are there examples of evidence?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 He is also interested in whether
2 the level of courses must only be credit-
3 bearing.

4 MR. BENDOR: So there is a more
5 explicit definition than the one I showed you
6 on this slide. It is contained in the
7 application and in all the notices. It is in
8 the definition section, which is on pages 7 to
9 11 of the application.

10 And as we discussed earlier, there
11 isn't specific examples of the evidence here.

12 It is what you think would make it clear to
13 peer reviewers that you have what you say.

14 MS. MCKINNEY: The credit-bearing
15 question refers to student-level transcript
16 information.

17 MR. BENDOR: And the question was,
18 does it?

19 MS. MCKINNEY: The question was,
20 for item 9, what level of courses? Credit-
21 bearing only?

22 MS. WEISS: So I would refer him

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 back to the statute. We've got all the
2 references in the materials. And if he still
3 doesn't have his question answered, he should
4 certainly email it into us, and we will take a
5 look at it.

6 MR. BENDOR: Anything else on
7 (C) (3) or other parts of (C)?

8 (No response.)

9 Okay. So I think we are going to
10 take a seventh-inning stretch for five
11 minutes. I would request that, if not
12 necessary, you don't leave the room.
13 Otherwise, you might miss very exciting things
14 once we start on Criterion (D).

15 Back in five minutes. Yes, see
16 you in your seats in five.

17 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter
18 went off the record at 1:57 p.m. and went back
19 on the record at 2:02 p.m.)

20 MR. BENDOR: All right. Thank
21 you, everybody. Everyone is here. It is so
22 great. It makes me very happy.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Okay. So now we are going to turn
2 to Section (D), the selection criteria on
3 great teachers and leaders. We are going to
4 spend a significant amount of time on this.
5 This section is worth a lot of points, and it
6 is pretty central to a lot of state reform
7 plans.

8 So the big picture here is the
9 fundamental belief that great teachers and
10 principals matter tremendously and they make a
11 huge difference in the achievement and
12 learning of their students. For that reason
13 partly, this has the most points of any
14 section. So increasing the effectiveness of
15 teachers and principals is really critical.

16 So, for the details, sort of
17 getting to the purposes of this section, there
18 are five criteria here. The first one is a
19 state reform conditions criteria. Again, that
20 is what your accomplishments have been to
21 date.

22 Then there are four criteria that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are reform plan criteria. They are, what are
2 your plans? The big picture stuff here is,
3 one, building high-quality evaluation systems
4 that are meaningful and useful, then using
5 that evaluation information to inform key
6 personnel decisions, and then assessing and
7 understanding the quality of teacher and
8 principal preparation programs and expanding
9 the effect.

10 So, starting with (D)(1), (D)(1)
11 has three parts. Again, it is a reform
12 conditions criteria. So it is what you have
13 accomplished, not what your plan is. I just
14 want to remind that it is about teachers and
15 principals, not just one or the other.

16 The first part of this is about
17 the legal, statutory, regulatory provisions
18 you have regarding alternative certification
19 routes for teachers and principals. So what
20 does that mean?

21 This is a criterion where the
22 definition plays a really important role, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you should make sure to take a look at it and
2 be familiar with it, as you are answering the
3 criterion.

4 This is a slightly abridged
5 version of the definition. Basically, what we
6 have done is we have defined five key parts of
7 an alternative route to certification. This
8 definition is on page 7 of your application,
9 the unfilled version.

10 So these are five key parts from
11 our alternative route to certification. The
12 first one is especially noteworthy because in
13 the criterion -- sorry for the back-and-forth
14 -- we say, "particularly routes that allow for
15 providers, in addition to institutions of
16 higher education". So we are calling out that
17 first element in the definition. So I note
18 that.

19 Then the way reviewers will score
20 this is -- and this is another place where
21 reviewer guidance is particularly important,
22 and we have given more specific guidance than

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in some places. So we have said the structure
2 is similar for high, medium, and low points.
3 High points is based on whether you have that
4 first part of the definition, that first
5 element about being able to be provided by
6 providers other than institutions of higher
7 education. So do you have that element?

8 Then the second part of whether
9 you get high points is whether you have at
10 least four of the five elements we have
11 included in the definition. So that would
12 mean, do you have that first one and then at
13 least three others? Then medium and low
14 points follow a similar structure.

15 The evidence for (D)(1)(i) is
16 pretty straight forward. It is just, okay,
17 what's the description of your state's legal
18 situation, including information on the
19 elements of the state's alternative
20 certification routes? And when we say,
21 "elements", we are talking about the five
22 elements in the definition we have provided.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So I am going to go on to
2 Romanette (ii), unless I have any questions on
3 Romanette (i).

4 (No response.)

5 Okay. So Romanette (i) was about
6 your legal structure regarding routes.
7 Romanette (ii) is about the extent to which
8 those routes are actually in use.

9 And the evidence here is a list of
10 your alternative certification programs in a
11 state, the elements of the program. Again,
12 elements refers to the definition elements,
13 the number of teachers and principals that
14 successfully complete each program, and then
15 the total number of teachers and principals
16 certified statewide, so we have some number to
17 compare that to, see how significant is this
18 in terms of your total certification annually.

19 I didn't really highlight
20 Romanette (iii). Sorry about that.

21 So Romanette (iii) is not about
22 alternative certification routes. It is --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 oh, I will come to that in a sec -- it is
2 about the extent to which you have a process
3 regarding determining where your teacher and
4 principal shortages are, and then preparing
5 teachers and principals to fill those areas of
6 shortage.

7 There isn't specific evidence on
8 this. It is just write a narrative in
9 response to that part of the criteria.

10 DR. KELLUM: From Mississippi.

11 Backing up to, "Can providers, by
12 various types, include institutions of higher
13 education and other providers operating
14 independently from institutions of higher
15 education?" Are you talking about providers
16 operating independently from your traditional
17 education routes in the colleges?

18 For instance, an alternate route
19 program may be through a community and junior
20 college system. Is that an institution of
21 higher education? It is not the traditional
22 education route that individuals would go

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 through with a bachelor of science degree in
2 elementary education, or what have you. But
3 it might be a community college system's
4 alternative route.

5 So what is the definition of
6 institutions of higher education you are
7 referring to there?

8 MR. BENDOR: I am going to turn to
9 our panel here.

10 MS. WEISS: I mean institutions of
11 higher education, it does include community
12 colleges and four-year colleges and
13 universities. I think it is sort of your
14 standard definition of institutes of higher
15 education. We are not trying to redefine the
16 term and say we mean a narrower thing and it
17 is traditional versus non-traditional. It is
18 IHES.

19 MS. GEARING: Charlene Gearing,
20 Wisconsin.

21 If we have a Teach for America
22 program that is working collaboratively with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the university in the sense of support and
2 graduate credits, is that still considered
3 outside of an IHE?

4 MS. WEISS: So, if the IHE is the
5 credentialer -- and, remember, this is about,
6 if we are talking about (D)(1)(i), this is
7 about your laws. It is not about TFA. It is
8 about your laws. So, if your laws allow for
9 institutions other than IHEs to grant
10 certification or credentials, that is the
11 question we are asking.

12 So, in the case that you brought
13 up, my guess is that the credential is being
14 granted by the IHE, not by TFA, whereas, in
15 some states TFA could be the credentialer in
16 that example that you gave, as opposed to the
17 IHE. So it is about who is giving the
18 credential, who is allowed under state law to
19 give a credential.

20 DR. JONAS: Hi. Deborah Jonas
21 from Virginia.

22 In Virginia --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: Can you speak into
2 the microphone?

3 DR. JONAS: In Virginia, the
4 Department of Education issues licenses and
5 endorsements for teachers. It is not the
6 IHEs.

7 So is it the route to that license
8 that you are looking for, not the
9 credentialing agency?

10 MS. WEISS: I don't know that I
11 have more guidance to give than what we have
12 given. So, if you have a specific question
13 about how your state works, why don't you
14 submit that to the Race to the Top email
15 address and let us take a look at the specific
16 state context that you have a question about,
17 rather than hypothesize about it up here?

18 MR. BENDOR: Is there anything
19 else? Oh, the webinar?

20 MS. McKINNEY: Jonathan Luknic
21 from Minnesota asks, does the definition of a
22 hard-to-staff school apply to specific

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 programmatic skills that a district is
2 seeking, but struggles to realize? For
3 example, Spanish speakers for a Spanish
4 immersion school.

5 MR. BENDOR: So we are not on
6 anything about hard-to-staff yet, unless he is
7 talking about Romanette (iii), in which case
8 we haven't given any more definition than what
9 is there. States should use their discretion
10 for determining what their shortages are.

11 There is something on hard-to-
12 staff later, which we will talk about in a
13 bit. So, Jonathan, if you still have a
14 question at that point, please go ahead and
15 ask it.

16 Okay. So let's go on to (D) (2)
17 then.

18 We did this. We did this. We did
19 all of this.

20 (D) (2). So (D) (2) is a biggie.
21 The big picture here is about building good
22 and useful evaluation systems and using them,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in fact.

2 There are four parts, four
3 Romanettes, under (D)(2). So part of what I
4 want to do is walk you through them and how
5 they connect to each other. Just in case it
6 is not obvious on the first read, hopefully,
7 it will be obvious after we talk about it.

8 The first part is, all right --
9 and, remember, it is a planned criterion; this
10 is not what you have already. This is - give
11 us your plan for establishing an approach to
12 measuring student growth, as defined in this
13 notice, and measure it for each individual
14 student.

15 So how do we define it in this
16 notice? Student growth is defined in a pretty
17 straightforward way. This is a slightly
18 abridged version. Again, it is on pages 7 to
19 11 of the application.

20 But, basically, it says changing
21 student achievement between two or more points
22 in time. So, then, you may ask, student

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 achievement, what's that all about?

2 So student achievement, a few
3 things worth highlighting here. One is it is
4 something that, the way we define it here, it
5 is something you need to figure out both for
6 tested grades and subjects and non-tested
7 grades and subjects.

8 We say, for tested grades and
9 subjects, you should use the test. You can
10 use other things also, but you should use the
11 test.

12 And in all cases, it has to be
13 rigorous and comparable across classrooms in a
14 district.

15 This is, again, the abbreviated
16 version of student achievement. The full
17 definition is in your application.

18 In terms of student growth, as you
19 can see here, we have given a lot of
20 flexibility in how. In addition to just
21 defining it in terms of the changes in student
22 achievement over time, there is a lot of local

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 flexibility to figure out how you want to
2 measure it.

3 So Romanette (i) was about
4 establishing an approach to measuring student
5 growth. Romanette (ii) is, okay, you have
6 this approach for student growth. Now what is
7 your plan for designing and implementing
8 really good evaluation systems. So what is
9 really good? Rigorous, transparent, and fair
10 that differentiates effectiveness using
11 multiple rating categories, using student
12 growth as a significant factor, and then
13 designing and developing that with teacher and
14 principal involvement.

15 So multiple rating categories,
16 what do we mean there? Well, if you just have
17 you could evaluate a teacher as satisfactory
18 or unsatisfactory in your system, just those
19 two options, that is not multiple. That is
20 just two. It is not satisfactory.

21 And we have a question from
22 Arkansas.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. HUDSON: You state student
2 growth as a significant factor. Does that
3 mean you guys are looking for it to be 51
4 percent of the rating system? Or, I mean,
5 what does "significant factor" mean?

6 MR. BENDOR: Got to tell you, when
7 we say, "significant factor", we mean
8 significant factor. I don't know if you have
9 noticed we don't really like magic numbers
10 here. So we haven't given you a magic number.

11 MR. HUDSON: Okay.

12 MR. BENDOR: Okay. So that is
13 Romanettes (i) and (ii).

14 So, then, we also have relevant
15 definitions here of what is an effective
16 teacher, an effective principal, and a highly-
17 effective teacher, and a highly-effective
18 principal. They all follow the same structure
19 in terms of definition. So, once you get one,
20 the others are pretty straightforward. But I
21 just want to walk you through them.

22 So an effective teacher is a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 teacher whose students achieve acceptable
2 rates of growth, and then we give an "e.g".
3 We say, "e.g., at least one grade level in an
4 academic year". So what do we mean by that?

5 We've got a hand up, but I am
6 going to answer. So let's hold to see if I
7 answer it.

8 So we got a lot of questions in
9 the public comment period, what does this
10 mean? It doesn't mean that for all students
11 they have to achieve this rate of growth in
12 one year. We understand that different
13 students may have different rates of growth
14 that makes sense for that student population,
15 whether it is students with disabilities or
16 English language learners. However, it seems
17 like a generally-useful principle that a
18 student with an effective teacher wouldn't
19 fall behind in a year.

20 But the point here is that it is
21 an "e.g." It is an example. We really do
22 mean it as an example, but it should give you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a sense of the kind of thing we are talking
2 about.

3 Do we still have that question
4 there?

5 DR. WALLINGER: Thank you. Linda
6 Wallinger from Virginia.

7 Later in Section (D), I see that
8 we are collecting some data on the
9 effectiveness of math and reading teachers or
10 English teachers. This section that we are
11 talking about now is related to all teachers
12 in a state, of all subject areas and all grade
13 levels?

14 MR. BENDOR: This is a definition
15 that, where it is used, applies broadly.

16 So there's another question.

17 MR. LERUM: Hi. Eric Lerum from
18 the District of Columbia.

19 Is it anticipated that the
20 definition of effective teacher would be
21 defined at the state level or could that be
22 left up to the LEA level?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: That's up to you.

2 MR. LERUM: However the state
3 wants to do it?

4 MR. BENDOR: So the rest of that
5 definition is you have to include multiple
6 measures, provided that teacher effectiveness
7 is evaluated in significant part by student
8 growth.

9 Then what we do for the definition
10 of effective teacher is we give an example of
11 what might be another measure. For effective
12 principal, we also give examples. Once again,
13 these examples truly are examples.

14 The definition of highly-effective
15 teacher, the difference is in the rate of
16 growth. We say it must achieve, the student
17 should achieve high rates of growth because it
18 is highly effective, and the "e.g." we give is
19 1.5 years. Once again, this is an "e.g."

20 Then, for both highly-effective
21 teacher and highly-effective principal, we
22 give examples of other measures that could be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 used in determining that.

2 So, just to give a sense for how
3 these definitions fit together, and we will
4 weave them back into the criteria, student
5 achievement is sort of your foundation.
6 Student growth is your change in student
7 achievement over time.

8 Then we have these effectiveness
9 definitions which use student growth. Then
10 Criterion (D)(2) also uses student growth as
11 well as the effectiveness definition.

12 So let's turn back to that
13 criterion. So parts (iii) and (iv) of that
14 criterion. So in part (i), you put your plan
15 for establishing a clear way to measure
16 student growth. In part (ii), you talked
17 about your plan for evaluation systems.

18 And part (iii) is about actually
19 conducting annual evaluations of teachers and
20 principals with timely constructive feedback,
21 including providing relevant data on student
22 growth.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Then part (iv) is about using
2 those evaluations that you have now conducted
3 to inform key decisions. Then we say,
4 regarding four things here: developing
5 teachers and principals; compensating,
6 promoting, and retaining them; determining
7 whether to grant tenure and/or full
8 certification, and removing ineffective
9 teachers and principals.

10 So I just want to remind folks
11 that this connects back to the participating
12 LEA section that Joanne was talking about.
13 You will remember in that section, in the
14 scope-of-work table, that we actually got very
15 detailed for Criterion (D) (2). In the example
16 we gave, an LEA could sign up to (D) (2) (iv) (a)
17 separately from (D) (2) (iv) (b).

18 We understand these are important
19 issues. They require conversations that may
20 have implications down the line regarding
21 collective bargaining agreements. So that is
22 why you can sign up for some of these and not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 all of them, unless a state decides otherwise.

2 So I am about to move to the
3 performance measures on this criterion, but I
4 am guessing there are questions before I do
5 that.

6 Yes?

7 MS. KNOPF: Rae Knopf from
8 Vermont.

9 We have a question regarding the
10 teacher tenure. I think it comes up here and
11 somewhere else in this category as well. We
12 don't grant teacher tenure in our State. So
13 one of the questions that we have is, if we
14 don't have programs like, as an example, if we
15 can't address (C) directly or if we don't have
16 programs that prevent tenure being granted in
17 less than three years, and things like that,
18 are we going to be penalized in points for
19 that? Or can we just explain in our
20 application that we wouldn't need those things
21 because we don't grant teacher tenure?

22 MR. BENDOR: So, we say, "where

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 applicable" here because we know that some of
2 these things are not done everywhere. We are
3 not saying, if you don't do them, you should
4 do them and then do them in this way.

5 MS. KNOFF: Okay.

6 MR. BENDOR: So, if all of it is
7 not applicable, you should explain why some of
8 it isn't. You should explain why.

9 MS. KNOFF: And then, we shouldn't
10 be penalized for that if it is not applicable,
11 is what you are saying? Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. HESS: And because the other
13 part of it is your attorney general would be
14 signing the certification that everything you
15 have said is accurate.

16 MR. BENDOR: Any other questions
17 on this section?

18 (No response.)

19 Really? They are just being shy.

20 MR. VAISHNAV: Thanks. Hi. Anand
21 from Tennessee.

22 My question had to do with the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 requirement that there be annual evaluations.

2 I was wondering if it would be possible to
3 use maybe a short-form evaluation in certain
4 years, given that student growth can swing
5 wildly for schools of a certain size, small
6 schools, and in certain large schools, annual
7 evaluations can be challenging.

8 So I guess this sounds silly, but
9 what's the definition of "annual"?

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. BENDOR: We have been asked
12 this one before.

13 MS. WEISS: Yes.

14 MR. VAISHNAV: Oh, good.

15 MS. WEISS: So annual does, in
16 fact, mean once a year. I think what this
17 whole criterion is challenging everybody to do
18 is to really think hard about the whole HR
19 system we have created in education, and see
20 if we can't use this as an opportunity to
21 create the HR system that we wish we had,
22 instead of maybe the one we do have.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So you are welcome to describe in
2 your plan whatever you think is the right
3 answer. We are not requiring this. Again,
4 this is how you earn points or not. So it is
5 putting the plan you think is the right plan
6 forward with justification and rationale for
7 why it is the right plan in your state that
8 will really lead to seriously connecting
9 adults to doing what their kids need them to
10 do, in order for their kids to significantly
11 learn throughout the year.

12 DR. GRUENDEL: Janice Gruendel
13 from Connecticut.

14 If, as is likely to be the case,
15 there are states where their systems around
16 teachers are more in line with the advanced
17 thinking that is being done here than their
18 systems for principals might be, it all gets
19 mooshed up together in here. Because there
20 are a lot of these that describe teachers and
21 principals, I assume we would deal with that
22 separately in a narrative?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Yes, and in fact, the
2 guidance to the peer reviewers does say: look
3 at teachers and look at principals and see
4 what is there for both.

5 So we would hope that you wouldn't
6 necessarily moosh them together in your
7 answer, but you are right, for brevity, we
8 mooshed them together in the criterion.

9 MR. HILL: Martez Hill from
10 Mississippi.

11 Could you define tenure? Just
12 like Vermont, Mississippi has a law that
13 specifically says the legislature shall not
14 establish a system of tenure, but some people
15 then define tenure as granting some type of
16 hearing or due process hearing to a staff
17 member, but that doesn't necessarily apply to
18 Mississippi.

19 MS. WEISS: Yes, so you would just
20 have to indicate what does and doesn't apply
21 in your state context and give an answer for
22 the parts that do apply.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BOUNDS: This is Mark Bounds
2 from South Carolina.

3 I want to press the question about
4 tenure because it is having an impact on lots
5 of states. We, like several other states, are
6 a right-to-work state and do not have tenure.

7 But there are people that are viewing a
8 contract level as equal to tenure.

9 So we really do need more of a
10 strict definition from the Department of
11 Education to define what tenure is. And if
12 you can't give it now, we would appreciate it
13 later, because there's lots of confusion about
14 what that equals. Depending on who is reading
15 grants, they could view it differently. So I
16 would really appreciate your taking that into
17 consultation.

18 MS. WEISS: Yes. So send it to us
19 on the ed.gov email address, if you will, and
20 we will take that back and think about it
21 more, and see if we can get more guidance out.

22 Thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. STANTON: Larry Stanton from
2 Illinois.

3 The definition of student
4 achievement says that, for tested grades and
5 subjects, a student's score on the state's
6 assessment under the ESEA should be used.

7 But that implies that the state
8 tests provide an accurate measure of student
9 growth. And for states that don't necessarily
10 believe that that is the case, it presents
11 kind of a cart before the horse, because you
12 also talked about new assessments that do
13 measure that.

14 So we are proposing something,
15 proposing the use of measures that we don't
16 necessarily think measure what you are looking
17 for. So how do we think about the balance
18 between that and using other measures?

19 MS. WEISS: Yes, that is one
20 reason why we said it may be supplemented by
21 other things, so that states have the freedom
22 to look at what data they had from a variety

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of sources and try to put it together in a way
2 that made sense in that state.

3 I guess the big idea here is that
4 we are hoping to start moving -- so, even
5 though we don't have perfect measurements and
6 perfect assessments yet, we don't want the
7 perfect to be the enemy of the good, and have
8 us just wait and wait and wait for the perfect
9 assessment instrument to be out there before
10 we even start walking down this path.

11 So I think the goal is to start
12 heading down the path because it seems like it
13 is the right path for kids. And as we get
14 better measurements that we can swap in, so
15 much the better, but to start taking on these
16 questions and wrestling with them seriously,
17 even now before we have the perfect data in
18 place.

19 MS. COURTS: This is a follow-up
20 question.

21 Amelia Courts, West Virginia.

22 It might be jumping a little bit

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ahead to (D)(3), so I will hold it, if need
2 be.

3 But the same kind of situation
4 there. Basically, if we are transitioning to
5 other measures, is there going to be a point
6 value assigned to earlier targets versus later
7 targets in terms of timeline?

8 MS. WEISS: So the criteria you
9 see here for the reviewers is the criteria the
10 reviewers have, and that is not in there.
11 What is in there is just, are the plans
12 ambitious, yet achievable, and are they
13 connected back to -- or are the targets
14 ambitious, yet achievable, and are they well
15 connected back to well-crafted plans, to high-
16 quality plans?

17 MS. COURTS: And a follow-up
18 question: would you be able to include, if
19 you were piloting that system, would you be
20 able to include those percentage targets in
21 your goals?

22 MS. WEISS: Sure. You can also, I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mean we are going to get to the performance
2 measures in a second, but you can certainly
3 even supplement the performance -- even when
4 we give you performance measures, you can add
5 another row, and say, you know what, I'm doing
6 a special pilot, and here's a row that only
7 applies to the pilot.

8 MR. BENDOR: So thank you for that
9 excellent segue.

10 So, now, these are the performance
11 measures for (D) (2). This is the first
12 criterion where you really have seen detailed
13 performance measures that aren't just
14 optional. So let me talk a bit about these.

15 Remember, these are like goals you
16 are setting in your plan. They are basically
17 various ways of asking, what percentage of
18 your participating LEAs over time are going to
19 be doing the various activities talked about
20 in the criteria?

21 You should think about, and your
22 plan should connect to this, as Joanne was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 saying, it should have the rationale that
2 makes these measures make sense, and these
3 measures should make your plan make more
4 sense.

5 So, if in your plan you talk about
6 how in many of your LEAs it will take a year
7 to do some of the contract negotiations, you
8 shouldn't have 100 percent in your first year
9 for some of these goals because that wouldn't
10 make sense.

11 So these should be, again,
12 ambitious, yet achievable, is the term we use.

13 That really is this tension, this balancing
14 act between those two things.

15 I just want to note one thing
16 here. We use the phrase "qualifying
17 evaluation" you see up in the instructions
18 there. The term "qualifying evaluation" is
19 just those that we describe in Criterion
20 (D) (2) (ii). That was the rigorous,
21 transparent, and fair evaluation systems, et
22 cetera, et cetera. So we just use that as a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 shorthand, so that we don't have text that
2 goes crazy and you can't read anything here.

3 Any questions about these
4 performance measures?

5 (No response.)

6 Great.

7 So, in addition to the goals that
8 you are setting over time, which is the table
9 I just showed you, we are asking you for some
10 data to provide at the beginning of the
11 application. This is pretty straightforward
12 stuff. This is just so we can do some
13 calculations at various points. So you will
14 see that here. You just need to provide that
15 when you apply, straightforward.

16 In addition, we are going to be
17 asking you for some data down the line, if you
18 are awarded a grant. These aren't performance
19 measures, in that you are not being judged on
20 your targets on these in the application, and
21 you are not necessarily going to be monitored
22 on these going down the line.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But we are going to want this data
2 reported. So we just want to give you a
3 heads-up. You don't have to do anything now.

4 That is why it is all blacked out. We just
5 wanted you to know, so you can plan
6 accordingly. We will be asking for these data
7 if you get a grant.

8 MR. BOUNDS: Mark Bounds again
9 from South Carolina.

10 We have several schools that are
11 participating in value-added student growth
12 models. So it is not the whole LEA. Do we
13 say that LEA is participating if it is just
14 one or two schools in the LEA? Because it
15 talks about number of participating LEAs that
16 have that. I mean that LEA is participating,
17 in my mind, but not all the schools.

18 MR. BENDOR: Yes, I think you
19 should do what seems to make sense in your
20 state's context, and explain what you have
21 done, right. So don't include the LEAs and
22 then just not note anything. Explain to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reviewers what the numbers mean.

2 Okay. So we are going to move on
3 to Criterion (D)(3). Very exciting. (D)(2)
4 was a big one.

5 So Criterion (D)(3) is basically
6 the big picture. It is about getting the best
7 teachers and principals in the places that
8 need them the most, in the schools, in the
9 classrooms that need them the most.

10 There are two parts to (D)(3).
11 The first part is about equitable
12 distribution, and there are a few different
13 components to this.

14 The first is, basically, consider
15 the distribution of teachers between your
16 high-poverty or high-minority schools, on the
17 one hand, and your low-poverty or low-minority
18 schools, on the other hand. We are looking at
19 this both in terms of the highly-effective
20 teachers and the distribution of ineffective
21 teachers.

22 So this is, what is your plan --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 remember, this is a plan criterion -- for
2 ensuring an equitable distribution between
3 those high-poverty or high-minority schools
4 and your low-poverty or low-minority schools
5 in terms of both teachers and principals, both
6 highly-effective and ineffective?

7 You will note here that we use the
8 phrase "informed by reviews of prior actions
9 and data". I am not going to point to it
10 because I did something weird the last time I
11 pointed.

12 What that is referring to is we
13 know that you have had teacher equity plans
14 that you have been working on under NCLB. So
15 this is just a reference that you should take
16 what you learned from those plans and use it
17 to help you craft these plans.

18 The evidence for this is pretty
19 straightforward. Your definition of high-
20 minority and low-minority schools, as you have
21 defined it in your state teacher equity plan.
22 You should just send that to us, so that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reviewers in this context have that definition
2 right in front of them.

3 The performance measures here, it
4 seems like there are a lot of them, but,
5 basically, what they are allowing you to do is
6 what I was talking about earlier, is figure
7 out what that distribution is and the
8 difference in highly-effective teachers
9 between the high-poverty, high-minority
10 schools and highly effective teachers in the
11 low-poverty, low-minority schools; the same
12 for principals, and then the same for
13 ineffective teachers and ineffective
14 principals.

15 So these are setting your goals
16 over time for what those numbers will look
17 like. And, remember, these are, again, based
18 on your plan.

19 We've got, yes, a question in the
20 back.

21 MS. ENGLISH: Lynn English, Rhode
22 Island.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think I know the answer you are
2 going to tell me, but can you define
3 "equitable" or is that up to the state to
4 define?

5 MR. BENDOR: That is something the
6 peer reviewers are going to be judging. So
7 you should make your argument for what your
8 plan is based on, what you think is best, and
9 why you think it is the right thing.

10 The webinar?

11 MS. McKINNEY: Jonathan Luknic in
12 Minnesota asks, the states who cannot yet
13 establish a baseline on the distribution of
14 effective teachers, given the link of student
15 data to teacher has not yet been established,
16 what are the expectations around evaluating
17 that?

18 MR. BENDOR: So this is a good
19 question, and this applies elsewhere. If you
20 don't have data that would be meaningful
21 baseline data, please don't make it up. Tell
22 us you don't have it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Laughter.)

2 If you think it is helpful,
3 explain why.

4 MR. CRUCE: So that was, actually,
5 the crux of the question I was going to have,
6 but let me take it one step further.

7 MR. BENDOR: Name and state?

8 MR. CRUCE: Dan Cruce from
9 Delaware. Sorry.

10 So we wouldn't make up the data,
11 but we, too, in Delaware don't quite have --
12 in January, we have a regulation that will
13 allow us to measure that point forward
14 specifically. We don't have it now.

15 So we would certainly denote that
16 in our application, but is there any use to or
17 is it valid or useful to use any type of
18 proxy, like an HQT metric, or anything of that
19 nature, or just explain why we don't have it,
20 specifically around (D) (3) (i), and it is a
21 similar question for (D) (3) (ii).

22 MS. WEISS: So I think if you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't have the baseline data that is requested
2 here, don't fill it in, but you might use
3 other proxies to help you set your targets and
4 goals. Then you could explain that, even
5 though you didn't have the baseline data,
6 here's the process you went through to think
7 about how you set the forward-looking goals.

8 MR. CRUCE: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. BENDOR: The webinar?

10 MS. McKINNEY: Bette Hartnett from
11 Nevada asks whether the performance measures
12 are intended to be a summary chart for the
13 entire state, combining all the LEAs, or
14 whether they should be broken out by LEA.

15 MR. BENDOR: For the whole state;
16 don't break them out by LEA. You will kill
17 yourselves. We don't want that.

18 MS. WEISS: Well, you might need
19 to break them out for yourself. Don't kill
20 us, is what he really meant.

21 (Laughter.)

22 It is for participating LEAs and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it is the summary for the state. But this
2 does lead to a good point that you will hear
3 us talking more about later.

4 In the section called "Planning
5 Considerations", one of the things that we are
6 going to suggest is that a few of the
7 criteria, and (D) (2) and, to some extent, this
8 one may be good examples of that. They might
9 be places where you actually do want to do
10 some data collection from your participating
11 LEAs. So, when you get your package ready, to
12 say to LEAs: here's the MOUs. Here's what
13 all or significant portions means. Here's the
14 outlines of our plan.

15 You might also have a data
16 collection instrument that is in there that
17 people use to send you back the data that you
18 are going to need to fill out some of the
19 baseline data, and maybe even the goals data
20 in the plan.

21 So we will point out specific
22 places later on in this session. We will

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 point out specific places to watch for that.
2 But that is a good thing to think about at the
3 front end, because I think it will help people
4 put their plans together.

5 MR. BENDOR: Okay. So we saw
6 these. We saw these. Oh, no, we didn't see
7 these. So we saw these.

8 This is the data we are asking
9 from you upfront, just to help do some
10 calculations. It is pretty straightforward.
11 We are just asking for it on the front end.

12 And we have definitions above,
13 high poverty and high minority and low poverty
14 and low minority, in the definitions section,
15 page 7 to 11 of your application.

16 Then, just as a heads-up, this is
17 the data we are going to be asking for you
18 later. You don't have to do anything now.
19 Just so you know, we are going to be asking
20 for it. Plan accordingly.

21 Now the second part of (D)(3) is
22 about, as we got a question earlier, it is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about making sure that you are increasing the
2 number of teachers in hard-to-staff subjects
3 and areas, and we have included certain
4 subjects and areas. We have also said that
5 states or LEAs can identify others that make
6 sense for them, but these are ones that are
7 common across the country.

8 We have also noted what your plans
9 for Romanette (i) and (ii) might include.
10 Again, this is an example list. It is not
11 required. It is not exhaustive, but to give
12 you a sense of the kinds of things we are
13 talking about.

14 Questions on this one before we go
15 to its performance measures?

16 (No response.)

17 MS. WEISS: Did that answer the
18 question that the person -- I can't remember.

19 Was it our friend Jonathan from Minnesota?
20 But somebody on the webinar was asking about
21 the --

22 MS. MCKINNEY: Okay, we will

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 double-check with him.

2 MR. BENDOR: They are going to IM
3 Jonathan.

4 All right. So we have performance
5 measures for this criterion. They are aligned
6 with the criterion. This is the percentage of
7 math teachers, for example, who are effective
8 or better. These are your goals for each
9 year, and then similar for the other subjects
10 that the criterion asks.

11 This is data we are asking we for
12 in the beginning, when you apply, and things
13 we are going to be asking you later, as a
14 heads-up.

15 All right. Criterion (D) (4). So
16 (D) (4), what's it about?

17 This is about figuring out which
18 teacher and principal preparation programs in
19 your state are effective and expanding the
20 effectiveness.

21 The first part, Romanette (i), is
22 about linking student achievement and growth

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 data to teachers and principals, and then
2 linking that data to the credentialing
3 programs of those teachers and principals, and
4 publicly reporting that. That way, there will
5 be information in your state about which
6 programs are being effective.

7 Then the second part of this is
8 about, now that you have more information on
9 which programs are effective in this,
10 expanding those programs that are producing
11 effective teachers and principals.

12 And the performance measures here
13 are pretty straightforward. They are the
14 percentage of preparation programs, separately
15 for teachers and principals, for which the
16 public can get this data.

17 Any questions on this? I went
18 kind of fast.

19 (No response.)

20 People need a break.

21 Okay. This is the data we are
22 going to ask you for in the beginning, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this is a heads-up for data we will ask you
2 for if you are a grantee down the line.

3 Anything on (D) (4) before I go on
4 to (D) (5)?

5 (No response.)

6 No? Okay.

7 So (D) (5) is about professional
8 development. We have touched on professional
9 development in parts of other criteria. This
10 criterion is all about professional
11 development.

12 And there are two parts to it, but
13 the big picture is that in the field of
14 education we haven't been good enough in
15 making sure professional development is
16 actually effective at increasing student
17 learning, and this is about changing that.

18 So the first part is about
19 providing effective and data-informed
20 professional development to teachers and
21 principals. And once again, we include a
22 "such as" list. It is truly a set of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 examples. The stuff before it isn't.

2 Then the second part is about,
3 once again, this is a plan criterion,
4 remember. This is your plan to do these
5 things. The second part is about measuring,
6 evaluating, and continuously improving the
7 effectiveness of these supports. So you are
8 providing them, and then you saying, are they
9 working; how do we improve them over time?

10 Wow, break, before we go to break,
11 any questions on this one? Yes?

12 MS. STUMBO: Circe Stumbo with
13 Iowa.

14 And this may be more general than
15 it is to this section, but knowing that the
16 absolute priority includes decreasing
17 achievement gaps among subgroups, and if, for
18 example, one of those areas of achievement
19 gaps is a racial achievement gap, so we intend
20 to use some of this resource to develop
21 critical cultural competence in schools or
22 systems.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I am trying to find where in the
2 application we actually put that. This, so
3 far, has been the best spot, even though I
4 look at it more systemically and wouldn't have
5 said it is just about professional
6 development.

7 Am I missing another place where
8 that sort of focus on recognizing race as a
9 way to address racial achievement gaps would
10 be appropriate?

11 MS. WEISS: We're nodding up here,
12 thinking that you are probably right, this is
13 probably the place that I would have put it,
14 too.

15 MS. STUMBO: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. BENDOR: Any other questions
17 on this criterion or on this section, since we
18 have a few minutes?

19 (No response.)

20 Okay, great.

21 So next is going to be Criterion
22 Section (E), but before we do that, we are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to have a break. What time do we want
2 to come back? Three o'clock? Five after
3 3:00. A 15-minute break. Cool.

4 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter
5 went off the record at 2:45 p.m. and went back
6 on the record at 3:04 p.m.)

7 MS. WEISS: Great. I'm taking it
8 as a good sign that people are generally
9 coming back from lunch and breaks and all
10 those kinds of things. So, hopefully, we are
11 keeping your attention.

12 I know you also appreciate all the
13 different micro-climates going on inside this
14 room as we speak. I know we at the front do.

15 Okay. So we are going to talk
16 about the last two sections, (E) and (F), and
17 then the priorities. Then we will be coming
18 down the home stretch here.

19 So I am going to start with
20 Section (E), turning around the lowest-
21 achieving schools.

22 This section has just two criteria

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in it. One, reform conditions criteria around
2 the kind of laws you have in your state to
3 enable states to intervene when schools or
4 districts are persistently low-achieving, and
5 then the actual plans for turning those
6 schools around.

7 One thing that I want to mention
8 here, and you will hear me say it maybe even a
9 couple more times in this, is that it was our
10 intent to make sure that the Race to the Top
11 requirements around lowest-achieving schools
12 are completely consistent with the State
13 Fiscal Stabilization Fund and the School
14 Improvement Grants. So the exact same plan
15 can be implemented, the same schools
16 identified. That's our hope and that is our
17 goal.

18 Yes?

19 MS. FARACE: One caveat, though,
20 that for the School Improvement grants, the
21 funds have to be used in accordance with Title
22 I, whereas that is not necessarily the case

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here.

2 MS. WEISS: Yes, so you have a
3 little more flexibility with Race to the Top,
4 should you choose to use it.

5 Okay. So the first criterion,
6 (E)(1), is the reform conditions criterion.
7 That is the extent to which the state has the
8 authority to intervene directly in
9 persistently low-achieving schools or in
10 persistently low-achieving LEAs, so LEAs that
11 are in improvement or corrective action
12 status.

13 The reviewer guidance on this is
14 pretty straightforward. You get full points
15 if the laws enable you to intervene in either
16 situation and five points if you can intervene
17 in one case, but not the other, and zero
18 points if you've got no ability to act when
19 there is persistent underperformance
20 happening.

21 That is about it for that one.
22 We've got to have some that are just pretty

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 straightforward, right?

2 Which takes us to (E) (2), which is
3 the actual turnaround plans for your state.
4 This one has two parts. The first part is
5 identifying the persistently lowest-achieving
6 schools.

7 Perhaps I am going to turn to the
8 next slide for a second and talk about what
9 that means. Persistently lowest-achieving
10 schools, again, this definition is consistent.

11 It is identical, in fact, across all three
12 notices. And let me just walk you through it
13 quickly.

14 So this is the state, together
15 with your LEAs, identifying which schools you
16 want to put on your list from among these
17 schools. Persistently lowest-achieving
18 schools are any Title I schools in
19 improvement, corrective action and
20 restructuring, that either are among the
21 lowest-achieving 5 percent of Title I schools
22 in improvement.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I just want to pause here for a
2 second and say there's been some confusion
3 that this is the lowest 5 percent of schools
4 in the state. That is not right. It is the
5 lowest 5 percent of the poor schools of the
6 state that are already in some form of
7 improvement, corrective action, or
8 restructuring.

9 So it is identifying the lowest-
10 achieving 5 percent of those schools or five
11 schools, whichever is greater, or a high
12 school that has a graduation rate that has
13 been less than 60 percent for some period of
14 time.

15 Okay? It could also be a
16 secondary school that is eligible for, but
17 doesn't receive, Title I funding and meets
18 these same basic criteria.

19 So, to identify what are the
20 lowest-achieving schools in each of these
21 categories, a state can take into or, in fact,
22 has to take into account two things, both the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 academic achievement of the "all students
2 group" in reading, language arts, and math
3 combined and the school's lack of progress on
4 those assessments over a number of years.

5 So, in other words, if the state
6 is low-performing but has been consistently
7 improving, you might not want to target that
8 as one of the schools that you are going to
9 target as the persistently lowest-achieving
10 schools in the state. This is for schools
11 that are really stagnating at poor levels of
12 performance.

13 Okay. That is the definition that
14 is consistent across all the notices. Now
15 let's go back and take a look at the Race to
16 the Top definition. So I am still back on
17 (E) (2) (i).

18 So you are going to identify the
19 persistently lowest-achieving schools and,
20 because Race to the Top isn't constrained to
21 just Title I, we have also said, at your
22 discretion, you can in Race to the Top also

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 take non-Title I-eligible schools, if you
2 would like to, and put them in this category
3 and look at them through these same kinds of
4 lenses, and see whether there is any non-Title
5 I schools that you would also say meet these
6 criteria of being persistently low-performing,
7 and use your funds in Race to the Top to
8 address those schools as well. It is up to
9 you.

10 Then the second part of this
11 criterion is supporting your LEAs and turning
12 around these schools by implementing one of
13 the four school intervention models. Again,
14 these are the same models that are in SIG.

15 The models are a school turnaround
16 model, a restart model, a school closure
17 model, or a transformation model. The only
18 caveat that is on this is that an LEA with
19 more than nine persistently low-achieving
20 schools in the same LEA can't use the
21 transformation model for more than half of the
22 turnarounds.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Okay. So we will skip through the
2 persistently lowest-achieving schools
3 definition, since we talked about that.

4 Oh, we have a question in the
5 back?

6 DR. HYDE: Hi. Sheila Hyde from
7 New Mexico.

8 Does the state have full
9 discretion on picking those schools within
10 those categories? Does it have to be a rank
11 order going to the worst, based on those and
12 serving those, before you go down the list?

13 MS. WEISS: So we are saying, I
14 think what we are asking is that you pick the
15 lowest-achieving 5 percent of those schools,
16 but you have quite a bit of discretion in
17 figuring out which group that is.

18 Yes?

19 MR. DELANEY: I'm sorry. John
20 Delaney from New York, the Empire State.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MS. WEISS: A little commercial

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for New York.

2 MR. DELANEY: Some people call it
3 "the Vampire State".

4 (Laughter.)

5 Back to my question this morning:
6 say there's 25 in the first group, 25
7 schools, and then you've got 35 schools in the
8 second group and it says "or". So can we pick
9 the 25 schools or the 35 schools, or is that
10 meant to be 60 schools? So 35 have low
11 graduation rates below 60 percent. Or can we
12 pick 25 from the first group plus a subset of
13 that second group of schools? Does the "or"
14 mean we have discretion to pick from one group
15 or the other, or does it mean we have to
16 include all 60?

17 And I am sorry if I am repetitive
18 here. I just can't get it through my head.

19 MS. WEISS: I think we know the
20 answer, and I think I have been in many
21 discussions about this exact question and
22 should know the answer. And as I stand up

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here, I have just decided that I had better go
2 check on the answer quickly. We will do that
3 at -- we don't have another break. We will
4 try to do that quickly. Oh, we do have
5 another break. We will do that quickly and
6 try to get you the answer because we know
7 people who know the answer to that.

8 Yes, webinar?

9 MS. CLARK: This is another
10 question from Jonathan Luknic from Minnesota.

11 Is it acceptable to split those
12 schools that are Title I and in stages of AYP
13 into two groups, elementary and secondary
14 schools, to ensure a better representation?

15 He says that, using the definition
16 outlined in RTT guidance, the data skews
17 toward secondary schools, excluding elementary
18 schools.

19 MS. WEISS: So let's also take
20 that one, together with the other one, and
21 just get back with answers to both of them.
22 We might come back and ask you guys to submit

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 them on email, if we don't have time to call
2 and get the answers. But if you guys will
3 just write them down, we will try to make the
4 phone call and see if we can get you the
5 answer.

6 MS. LYNCH: I'm sorry, a followup
7 and clarification. If on our list of schools
8 with below 60 percent graduation rate we have,
9 what we call in the State, "transfer schools"
10 that are specifically for students who are
11 formerly dropouts, and we have used
12 supplementary indicators, the State, at its
13 discretion, would rather remove those schools
14 from that list because there's not appropriate
15 accountability for those schools. They are
16 not in a four-year cohort technically.

17 Do we have to include those
18 schools or what we might call special act for
19 kids who are in prison or foster care or, at
20 its discretion with explanation, can the state
21 hold those schools back, so they are not
22 penalized because they are serving special

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 populations of overage and under-credited
2 kids?

3 MS. FARACE: Are those schools
4 underneath the SEA? I mean, are they --

5 MS. LYNCH: The schools and the
6 accountability system, they are under NCLB.
7 You can use supplementary indicators for those
8 schools because they are just not designed to
9 have a four-year grad rate. Kids drop out,
10 return, when they are 17, but they are ninth-
11 graders when they start. So they are in high
12 school for more than three years already when
13 they are just starting ninth grade.

14 So it makes good sense to not
15 include those as failing schools when they are
16 not, but this definition would trigger us
17 putting those schools on the list. It makes
18 no sense to close them since most of them are
19 highly successful.

20 MS. FARACE: Right.

21 MS. LYNCH: But, you know, we are
22 concerned that you will see that, if you look

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at our high schools, and wonder why. We have
2 about 40 of them.

3 MS. FARACE: Can you send that in
4 as well? One of our lawyers is working on
5 Title I, which I would love to run all these
6 by her, and we can get back to you soon.

7 MS. LYNCH: Okay.

8 MS. FARACE: Turn that in. That
9 is a good question.

10 MS. LYNCH: Very good.

11 MS. FARACE: Thanks.

12 MR. VAISHNAV: Hi. Anand from
13 Tennessee.

14 I just have a question about safe
15 harbor.

16 MS. WEISS: Can you talk a little
17 bit more into the microphone, please?

18 MR. VAISHNAV: Sure. Sorry.

19 MS. WEISS: Thanks.

20 MR. VAISHNAV: I just had a
21 question about the safe harbor, which would
22 show some of our lowest-performing schools

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from being on the improvement, corrective
2 action, or restructuring list. So the result
3 is that 5 percent, the bottom 5 percent or the
4 lowest five schools, as defined by Race to the
5 Top, might not actually be the lowest-
6 achieving schools, as a result of safe harbor.

7 So do you have any guidance for
8 how we should handle that?

9 MS. FARACE: So if they made safe
10 harbor, then they have made AYP. So you are
11 saying they are not in improvement, corrective
12 action, or restructuring because --

13 MR. VAISHNAV: That's right, but
14 they --

15 MS. FARACE: -- they made AYP?

16 MR. VAISHNAV: Right. They still
17 may on other measures be considered very low-
18 achieving.

19 MS. WEISS: So that would be an
20 example of the things that in Race to the Top
21 you could still target those schools, because
22 you don't have to use the Title I rules for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 them. But you couldn't use your SIG money for
2 those schools, for example.

3 MR. VAISHNAV: Okay. Thank you.

4 MS. WEISS: It's all right, go
5 ahead with your question. We are just trying
6 to make sure we get the other questions, that
7 we make phone calls to start getting the other
8 questions answered, because I know we do have
9 the answers to those in the Department, I
10 think, for most of them.

11 Sorry. Go ahead.

12 MS. LAFRENIERE: Hi. Stephanie
13 Lafreniere from New Hampshire.

14 I was wondering, with the mention
15 of secondary, in some places it is called
16 secondary and in parentheses it says, "middle
17 and high schools". Do we go based on our
18 state definition?

19 MS. WEISS: Yes.

20 MS. LAFRENIERE: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. WEISS: Yes.

22 DR. HYDE: Sheila Hyde from New

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mexico.

2 I think a couple of times you have
3 said in a non-Title I-eligible school, but
4 this says non-eligible secondary school.

5 MS. WEISS: Yes, I'm sorry, you're
6 right, it is a secondary school that we are
7 particularly targeting for this. Yes, you're
8 right. Thank you.

9 Okay. So, then, let's just turn
10 to the models. I am just going to talk about
11 these quickly. They are in appendix C of all
12 the notices, and they are also the same
13 models, again, that are in the School
14 Improvement grants that just came out.

15 So there's the turnaround model,
16 restart, school closure, and transformation
17 model. These are really quickly, abridged,
18 sort of bottom-line definitions of each of
19 those. Please do see the full appendix for
20 the full information about them.

21 One thing I just did want to note,
22 because we got asked this question a number of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 times, this is the very end of appendix C,
2 that if an identified school has implemented
3 in whole or in part within the last two years
4 one of these types of intervention models,
5 then the school can just keep going and
6 continue down that path, if that is what you
7 choose to do.

8 So this is only for schools that
9 for over two years have not been dealing with
10 this situation at all or for more than two
11 years have been trying to turn it around, but
12 have been unsuccessful in doing so.

13 Okay. Question here?

14 MS. OLANOFF: Beth Olanoff from
15 Pennsylvania.

16 Is the two-year lookback carved in
17 stone or does the state have discretion to
18 extend that a little bit?

19 MS. WEISS: It says two years.

20 MS. OLANOFF: Yes.

21 MS. WEISS: Okay. So the evidence
22 that we are asking for here is tell us about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 your historic performance on school
2 turnaround. So what is the total number of
3 persistently lowest-achieving schools that you
4 have attempted to turn around in the last five
5 years, the approach that you have used for
6 that, the results, and the lessons that you
7 have learned to date?

8 So we have provided an evidence
9 chart in your form for you to provide this
10 information for us. The performance measures
11 for this that you will see are pretty simple.

12 It is the number of schools for which one of
13 the four intervention models is going to be
14 initiated each year.

15 You don't have to in this plan,
16 unless you know it, provide all the detail
17 about which schools, which models, and how you
18 are going to do it. This is just the sort of
19 high-level plan for how many schools you are
20 going to take on a year over the course of the
21 four years of the grant in your plan for
22 working with your LEAs to implement this over

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time.

2 Yes, question, before we go on to
3 the general?

4 MR. ABBOTT: Steve Abbott from
5 South Carolina.

6 Just a procedural question: if we
7 have one of our lowest-performing identified
8 schools that the district opts out of
9 participating, would we amend our list or we
10 would just note that in the narrative? Or how
11 would that be handled?

12 MS. WEISS: So one of the lowest-
13 achieving schools that you have identified for
14 turnaround or corrective action, the LEA opts
15 out of participating, but that is a school
16 that you are targeting for improvement.

17 You could handle that in any
18 number of ways. You could handle it entirely
19 through your School Improvement grant. You
20 could handle it here, using funds from the
21 other 50 percent that are just targeted at
22 that particular school, rather than the LEA.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Yes, those are probably the two that come to
2 mind most readily.

3 Yes?

4 MR. VAISHNAV: I just had a
5 question about the chart for (E)(2).

6 MS. WEISS: I know you've asked
7 questions before but identify yourself again.

8 MR. VAISHNAV: Sure. Anand from
9 Tennessee.

10 Our State hasn't been defining
11 persistently lowest-achieving schools in the
12 same way that Race to the Top defines them.

13 MS. WEISS: Right.

14 MR. VAISHNAV: So my question is,
15 how do we describe record for the purposes of
16 this chart, if we haven't been defining them
17 in this way? Do we have to apply the
18 definition retroactively or can we use the one
19 that we have been using up until now?

20 MS. WEISS: Yes, that is a good
21 question. So I would sort of put this lens on
22 the historic performance and apply it sort of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 loosely, looking back. The real goal is to
2 figure out what your track record of doing
3 this has been and what you have learned from
4 it.

5 So that is sort of the bigger
6 context that the peer reviewers are looking at
7 this from. They are not looking at it as a
8 way of providing checkmarks for any kind of
9 points related to the past. It is more of a
10 story you are telling about what your
11 experiences have been in this so far.

12 Okay. Let's move on to the
13 general criteria then. These, for the most
14 part, are about general conditions that we
15 think are conducive to education reform, and
16 all of them are state reform conditions
17 criteria. So these are all accomplishments.
18 There's no plans in this section.

19 So (F)(1) is about education
20 funding. (F)(1)(i) is really the maintenance-
21 of-effort question. So the percentage of
22 total revenues that were used to support

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 education in FY09 compared with FY08.

2 Now I have to point you to the
3 number of points that this one is worth. In
4 recognition of the really hard year that we
5 have just come off for most states, we did
6 want to indicate that, as the Secretary has
7 said many times, it is really a priority for
8 the nation that we continue our spending on
9 education, even through these hard times, but
10 in recognition of just how unusually hard
11 these times have been, this is not worth a lot
12 of points. So put the numbers out there, and
13 that is what we are asking for.

14 The second part of this is around
15 equitable funding and how the state's policies
16 handle the issues of equitable funding between
17 high-need LEAs and other LEAs and, within
18 LEAs, between high-poverty schools and other
19 schools. So this is a place where you are
20 explaining to us what your policies are.

21 The evidence for the first one is
22 financial data to show the answer to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 questions about how the two years' worth of
2 data compare to one another. And the evidence
3 for the second one is whatever evidence you
4 think will help reviewers understand what your
5 policies are around equitable funding in your
6 state.

7 Just one more bit of detail, the
8 reviewer guidance for the maintenance-of-
9 effort question looks like this. High points
10 are earned if the percentage of total revenues
11 used to support education increased between
12 '08 and '09. Medium points are earned if it
13 was substantially unchanged, and low points
14 are earned if the level of revenue decreased
15 from year to year. So that is the guidance
16 that the reviewers have been given.

17 And again, this part is worth five
18 points in total. Okay?

19 Yes, a question here from the
20 Empire State?

21 MR. VAISHNAV: Can ARRA funds be
22 included?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Can ARRA funds be
2 included? Yes, they are part of the education
3 funding. Right?

4 Hang on. We are reading the total
5 revenues definition.

6 Josh, if you are reading it, read
7 it into the microphone.

8 MR. BENDOR: I'll read it first.

9 So, on page 11, we define the term
10 "total revenues available for the state" as
11 either "projected or actual total state
12 revenues for education and other purposes for
13 the relevant year or projected or actual total
14 state appropriations for education and other
15 purposes".

16 So it is state revenues.

17 MS. WEISS: So sorry. I answered
18 it wrong.

19 MR. BENDOR: So the denominator
20 would be state revenues.

21 MS. WEISS: Go ahead. Go back and
22 restate the question.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FARACE: So, for the gentleman
2 from the Empire State --

3 MS. WEISS: We are going backwards
4 for a minute.

5 MS. FARACE: -- your question
6 about the 25 schools plus the 35 schools, and
7 do you pick one or the other?

8 Can you hear me now? Okay.

9 So I am looking at some guidance
10 that we put out for the School Improvement
11 grants that have the same definition. It says
12 that, in addition to the lowest-achieving 5
13 percent of schools or lowest-achieving five
14 schools identified in this manner, an SEA must
15 identify as persistently lowest-achieving
16 schools any high schools, any set of schools
17 that are not captured on the basis of academic
18 achievement, but that have had a graduation
19 rate of less than 60 percent over a number of
20 years.

21 So I read this as, in addition to
22 these, a state must also identify the ones

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with the low grad rates. So that's both.

2 MS. WEISS: So each bucket.

3 MS. FARACE: I will go back and I
4 will make sure I am right on that, but just
5 from my first look at this, I think that is
6 the answer. But if you want to send that in
7 again, I will take another look and talk to
8 the folks that wrote that.

9 And I think there was another
10 question.

11 MS. WEISS: Did you have a
12 question?

13 MS. LYNCH: And you know, the
14 timeframe on this is really important because
15 we have to notify the districts of exactly
16 which schools they are. In trying to clarify
17 this in talking to some of the staff, we have
18 gotten a couple of different answers on that
19 question from --

20 MS. WEISS: From the Department of
21 Education?

22 MS. LYNCH: Yes. So, if you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could, clarify it really carefully. Because
2 it is a difference of about 40 schools for us.

3 So, in one bucket, if we go with
4 the one way, it is like 25. The total bucket
5 is 60 schools, which is a significant
6 commitment of funds, if we are going to really
7 turn them all around.

8 And maybe you could put out who
9 exactly would be the expert on that, so we
10 could call and follow up on the answer.

11 MS. FARACE: Well, the way we have
12 been doing this is, if you send it into this
13 Race to the Top, we have a group of people
14 that's representative of all of these
15 different areas. We will coordinate that with
16 the right people, so that you don't have to go
17 and find the right person. We will get the
18 right person and we will get you an answer
19 back. And we recognize the time sensitivity,
20 so we will do that really quickly.

21 MS. LYNCH: Good. Thank you.

22 MS. WEISS: Okay. So now we are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 moving on to (F)(2), which is the charter
2 criterion.

3 There are five parts to this
4 criterion. There is a part on caps. There is
5 a part on authorizers and accountability.
6 There's a part on facilities. There's a part
7 on funding. Then there's a new part that we
8 added, in response to public comment, on other
9 innovative autonomous schools.

10 So I am going to just take you
11 through each part because each part has its
12 own specific set in some cases of evidence and
13 reviewer scoring criteria. Let's just take
14 them one at a time and head through them.

15 The first one is the criterion on
16 caps. This is that the state has a charter
17 law that does not prohibit or effectively
18 inhibit increasing the number of high-
19 performing charters, as measured by the
20 percentage of total schools in the state that
21 are allowed to be charter schools, and it also
22 can't otherwise restrict student enrollment.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So that is what the criterion
2 says.

3 The evidence that we ask you to
4 provide for this is a description of the
5 state's applicable laws, and then the number
6 of charter schools allowed under state law and
7 the percentage that this represents of the
8 total number of schools in the state, and the
9 number and types of charter schools currently
10 operating in the state.

11 Types here refers to the fact
12 that, under law, certain states have different
13 types of charter schools. If you are a state
14 like that, tell us what the types are that you
15 have under law and the number of each type
16 that you have currently operating. If you
17 don't have different types of charter schools,
18 ignore that and just tell us the total
19 numbers.

20 Okay. Now we get to the reviewer
21 guidance from hell. Thanks to the incredible
22 complexity of the laws that each state has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 developed around this issue, we were unable to
2 come up with anywhere near the crispness of
3 guidance that we liked for some of the other
4 criteria we have. This one is long and
5 complicated.

6 In a minute, when I go to the next
7 slide, you will see that what we say to the
8 reviewers is, basically, this is long and
9 complicated.

10 So let me start with, in the high
11 category, high points would be earned -- there
12 is one easy category. There is no cap. That
13 makes it easy. Or if you have a high cap that
14 is defined as a cap that, if it were filled,
15 at least 10 percent of the total schools in
16 the state could be charter schools, and that
17 there aren't a whole lot of other restrictions
18 attached to it.

19 Medium points would be earned if
20 the state has a medium cap such that, if it
21 were filled, between 5 and 10 percent of the
22 total schools in the state would be charter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 schools.

2 And low points are earned if fewer
3 than 5 percent of the schools could be charter
4 schools or if there's whole lot of
5 restrictions on that.

6 Which takes us to the whole lot of
7 restrictions stuff. So this is where I said
8 that, at the end of this guidance, we put a
9 special note to the reviewers that said: this
10 stuff is really complicated. You are about to
11 see people describe to you incredibly complex
12 laws here, and you are going to have to use
13 your judgment, and the rubric is meant to
14 guide you, not bind you, because there really
15 are going to be places where you are going to
16 have to call that judgment into play.

17 We have given a couple of
18 examples. Like there are some states in
19 which, rather than talking about the number of
20 charter schools, you talk about funding for
21 charter schools. So how do you convert
22 funding into numbers in order to use this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rubric and apply it to that situation?

2 We also tell reviewers to think
3 about the different kinds of inhibitions on
4 charter schools, and we give them sort of
5 lists of the most common ones, talk a little
6 bit about the smart caps and how those work.

7 So we have given the reviewers
8 exactly the information that you see in the
9 rubric that we have provided you, and nothing
10 more, and try to tell them, with that plus the
11 responses that you give in your application,
12 to try to make sense of this, and assign
13 points based on it.

14 And I think there is a question up
15 here.

16 MS. COURTS: Amelia Courts, West
17 Virginia.

18 The title of the (F) (2) (i) says,
19 "ensuring successful conditions for high-
20 performing charter schools and other
21 innovative schools".

22 MS. WEISS: This is (F) (2) in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 general.

2 MS. COURTS: Okay.

3 MS. WEISS: So that is the title
4 for all of (F) (2), actually.

5 MS. COURTS: Right.

6 MS. WEISS: But, yes.

7 MS. COURTS: And we have
8 innovation zones in West Virginia. We fund
9 innovation zones. But the reviewer guidance
10 specifically says no points are earned if the
11 state has no charter school law. Could you
12 please --

13 MS. WEISS: Yes, that is just for
14 (F) (2) (i). So the other laws that are not
15 charter laws are going to come in in a minute
16 under (F) (2) (v).

17 MS. COURTS: Okay.

18 MS. WEISS: So in (F) (2) (i), you
19 would not get points if you have no charter
20 laws.

21 (F) (2) (ii) --

22 MS. KNOPF: Rae Knopf from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Vermont.

2 I have a follow-up on that
3 question.

4 MS. WEISS: Okay.

5 MS. KNOPF: So it appears that in
6 (F) (2) (i) through (v), it says they are all
7 worth 40 points. The total is worth 40
8 points.

9 So are you suggesting that in
10 (F) (2) (v), if we can make a case for
11 innovative public autonomous schools, that
12 even if we don't have a charter law, we are
13 still eligible for no points for all of
14 (F) (2)?

15 MS. WEISS: So remember the
16 general rule that says, if something is worth,
17 in this case, 40 points, they are divided
18 equally across the criteria. So, in this
19 case, each one would be worth eight points.
20 So you would be able to earn up to eight
21 points for (F) (2) (v), if you had no charter
22 law. So you would still earn up to eight

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 points in this category, not zero points in
2 this category.

3 MS. KNOPF: Okay.

4 MS. WEISS: But you couldn't earn
5 points for the other sections that are about
6 charters.

7 MS. KNOPF: Okay. Because the
8 guidance that we received from Carmel Martin
9 at CCSO and Deputy Secretary Miller was
10 contrary to that in stating that we could make
11 a case for -- I mean we don't have laws that
12 prohibit charter within our State, and that we
13 could make a case through the innovative
14 public charter autonomous -- or public
15 autonomous schools -- for the whole category.

16 So what you are saying is that is
17 not the case.

18 MS. WEISS: No.

19 MS. KNOPF: We could only get
20 eight points?

21 MS. WEISS: So I am trying to be
22 generic. I don't actually know enough about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the laws in your specific State. So you are
2 welcome to send this in, so that we can look
3 at it specifically for your State context. So
4 let's do that.

5 MS. KNOPF: Okay. So who do I
6 send those in to?

7 MS. WEISS: Racetothetop@ed.gov.

8 MS. KNOPF: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. WEISS: Yes.

10 Okay. So (F)(2)(ii), then, is
11 about authorizers. It is about whether the
12 state has laws, statutes, regulations, or in
13 this case guidelines as well, regarding how
14 charter school authorizers approve, monitor,
15 hold accountable, re-authorize, and close
16 charter schools.

17 So this one is about the strength
18 of the accountability system for charter
19 schools. The evidence that we have asked for
20 here is the state's approach to charter school
21 accountability and authorization, and for each
22 of the last five years, the number of charter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 school applications made in the state, the
2 number of applications approved, the number of
3 applications denied, and the reasons for the
4 denials, and the number of charter schools
5 closed. Just a picture of the history that
6 you have in the state of accountability.

7 There is no special reviewer
8 guidance here, which means the normal guidance
9 applies: how good is your answer and the
10 credibility of your plan for this one?

11 (F) (2) (iii), then, is about
12 equitable funding. So that is about whether
13 charter schools receive equitable funding
14 compared to traditional public schools.

15 The evidence here that we are
16 asking for is a description of the applicable
17 state laws, as well as a description and the
18 state's approach to charter school funding,
19 including the amount of funding that is passed
20 through to charter schools per student in the
21 state, and how those amounts compare with the
22 traditional public school per student funding.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And the reviewer guidance here is
2 simpler. High points are earned if the per-
3 pupil funding for charter school students is
4 at least 90 percent of what is provided to
5 traditional public school students. Medium
6 points for 80 to 89 percent, and low points
7 for 79 percent or less.

8 Did you have a question?

9 I think there is a question up
10 here.

11 Can you raise your hand if you
12 have the question? Yes. Thanks.

13 Just try speaking straight into it
14 again.

15 MR. ANDERSON: Hello. This is
16 Mark Anderson from Hawaii.

17 We don't have a per-pupil funding
18 formula.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MS. WEISS: For charter schools.
21 Oh, you do have one in general? Okay.

22 MR. ANDERSON: It is part of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 State budget. You know, you have sort of a
2 base budget. You come in --

3 MS. WEISS: So why don't, again,
4 if it is a specific state question like that,
5 send it in to us and let us look at it and get
6 back to you?

7 MS. HESS: But the one
8 clarification on your individual questions is
9 we can't really give you individual advice.
10 We can't analyze one state's law or this or
11 that. If you have a general question like
12 maybe the previous one about how do the points
13 work in all of (F)(2) if you don't have any
14 charter school laws, I mean it needs to be a
15 general question that would be of benefit to
16 any number of states that might be in your
17 same category. We can't really advise you on,
18 you know, State X's law and, likewise, on your
19 per pupil.

20 But still do ask the question, but
21 we are not going to write back just to Hawaii.

22 When we get these questions, we will post

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 them for everyone to see. We will try to make
2 them of general applicability or interest as
3 relevant as they are, even though your states,
4 your situations do differ in the various
5 categories.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Mark Anderson,
7 Hawaii.

8 Well, as a practical matter,
9 though, we have to fill out the application at
10 some point, and there's a bunch of stuff in
11 this application that doesn't really -- it
12 applies a lot different.

13 So you have written the
14 application for the other 49 states, which
15 makes sense, but --

16 MS. WEISS: Yes, but I mean,
17 remember, peer reviewers are going to be
18 judging all of these things. So part of the
19 onus is on you to explain to the reviewers how
20 in your context this works and provide the
21 sort of credible evidence that I'm answering
22 it this way because this is how it works in my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 state.

2 I know Hawaii, with just one LEA,
3 is different from other states, but I think
4 every state is going to have some unique
5 things about its laws or its context, and
6 every state in some ways is going to be
7 wrestling with this question.

8 The answer is really what Jane
9 said already, which is you are going to have
10 to put yourself in the shoes of a reviewer.
11 You know everything that they are going to be
12 told, and put your case forward for why what
13 you are doing is really the best thing in the
14 context of your state for the kids in your
15 state.

16 MR. PIONTEK: So just a quick
17 question. Jeff Piontek, Hawaii.

18 Will peer reviewers be selected
19 from each state, so they can have a
20 representation of the laws that may be
21 different in those specific states?

22 MS. WEISS: No, because they are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not judging your laws. Your attorney general
2 is signing to say what you wrote is accurate.

3 So you are writing to a generic audience, not
4 an audience that is deeply knowledgeable about
5 your state, since that might also be an
6 audience that is conflicted out from actually
7 even reviewing your application. So think of
8 a general education expert audience, not a
9 state expert audience.

10 Back there, yes.

11 MS. KNOFF: Rae Knopf, Vermont,
12 again.

13 I appreciate what you are saying
14 about the laws and the reviewers. I guess
15 part of the difficulty in this is that it is
16 that last statement. So, if you are not a
17 state that doesn't need a law to have
18 charters, or if you are not a state that has
19 laws to prevent charters, then you are
20 completely penalized in this category. I
21 think that is the part that some of us are
22 struggling with, is: why wouldn't we be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 eligible to earn points, having similar
2 systems that achieve similar results?

3 MS. WEISS: And we heard during
4 public comment this question. It was made
5 well. We responded to it in our responses in
6 the notice of final priorities that we put
7 out.

8 This was where the Department came
9 down, that the Department is supportive of
10 innovative autonomous schools. Charters are
11 the type of schools under law that are
12 currently widespread and showing, when the
13 accountability structure underlying them is
14 good, showing high results. And therefore, we
15 chose to elevate that in this application to
16 something that was worthy of earning points.

17 MR. MOORE: Thank you very much.
18 Keith Moore, South Dakota.

19 So, when we are adding up our
20 charter schools in our State that are
21 autonomous and innovative and operating on
22 their own, we use our tribally-chartered

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public schools. Then do we use their per-
2 pupil funding formula when we are adding up
3 those schools?

4 MS. WEISS: So this is about
5 tribal schools.

6 MS. HESS: Meaning the ones that
7 are funded by the Bureau of Indian Education?

8 MR. MOORE: They're autonomous and
9 operating in their own tribal-chartered
10 fashion.

11 MS. HESS: But are you providing
12 any State aid to them? Are they an LEA under
13 the ESEA?

14 MR. MOORE: No, they're not. They
15 are tribally-chartered public schools.
16 They're an LEA. Yes, they're an LEA
17 themselves.

18 MS. HESS: Receiving State aid?

19 MR. MOORE: They do not receive
20 State aid.

21 MS. HESS: Then they are not --
22 well, you should submit your question to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 website, because we do have an FAQ that is in
2 process on tribally-controlled schools, and it
3 would be useful to have your question as well
4 to give more context to that question, please.

5 MR. MOORE: I would say that,
6 although there's no State aid to those
7 schools, they are eligible for all State
8 grants, 21st century grants, you know, all the
9 grants that come through the State.

10 MS. WEISS: Yes, your question
11 just in the context of charter schools is the
12 one that we need to go look at.

13 MR. MOORE: Okay.

14 MS. WEISS: Okay. So the last two
15 criteria in this section, one is about
16 facilities for charter schools. So the extent
17 to which the state provides charter schools
18 with funding for facilities in a variety of
19 different ways that are articulated here.

20 And the last one is that the state
21 enables LEAs to operate innovative autonomous
22 public schools other than charter schools.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That term "innovative autonomous public
2 schools" is defined in the notice. So do take
3 a look at it, as you are answering this
4 question, because not all schools -- magnet
5 schools and other things may not meet the
6 definition that is in the notice. So take a
7 look at that definition, as you are answering
8 this question.

9 Here the only required evidence is
10 the state's applicable laws. A description
11 around facilities, a description of the
12 facility supports that are provided statewide,
13 and for (F) (2) (v), how the state enables LEAs
14 to operate these different kinds of schools,
15 the types that you have out there, and how
16 they are operating.

17 Okay? Any other questions on this
18 before we launch into the very last criterion,
19 (F) (3)?

20 (No response.)

21 (F) (3), then, is a new criterion
22 that we added for a variety of reasons.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 One is the criterion is about the
2 extent to which the state has other reform
3 conditions under law in the state that you
4 believe have been conducive to education
5 reform and innovation in your state.

6 What we are trying to do here is
7 not only make sure that you have the
8 opportunity to get points for the things that
9 are on your list of important things that you
10 think have really contributed to making a
11 difference in education for the kids in your
12 state, but also that we at the Department are
13 starting to gather this list and understand
14 what it is from your points of view that are
15 really making a difference and driving reform
16 forward, so that we can think about this in a
17 larger way.

18 And maybe part of your job is to
19 help scale reform statewide. Part of our job
20 is to help scale reforms across states. And
21 things that you are doing in your state that
22 we might not even be aware of might really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 help us understand some powerful leverage
2 points that we might want to use in TA that we
3 are providing to other states.

4 So that is the last criterion, and
5 it is pretty wide open for you to describe and
6 provide whatever evidence under state law that
7 you think will be applicable and helpful for
8 us.

9 Yes?

10 MS. LOWE: Margie Lowe with
11 Oregon.

12 Under (F)(2) facilities, our State
13 does not provide funding for facilities for
14 any of our local districts. So it seems like
15 this question doesn't really ask for
16 information in the context of K-12 support in
17 general, let alone it seems to ask only for
18 charters, not for education in general.

19 Does that mean that --

20 MS. WEISS: That's right, because
21 this is a question about charter facilities,
22 which in many states are a very big issue and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 barrier to charter growth. So it says, how
2 are charters funding their facilities?

3 MS. LOWE: Right, but if they can
4 use state school funds for that, just like any
5 other district can use it --

6 MS. WEISS: Then just explain what
7 the laws in your State are.

8 MS. LOWE: Okay.

9 MS. WEISS: Yes.

10 MS. LOWE: Thank you.

11 MS. WEISS: Okay. So let's dive
12 into the priorities. We are going to do this
13 one quickly. The one I am going to spend a
14 little bit of time on is the STEM priority
15 since that is a competitive priority.

16 The absolute priority in the
17 competition is that you have taken a
18 comprehensive approach across all the
19 different areas of reform. We have talked
20 about this. So this doesn't mean that you
21 have to respond to every single criterion, but
22 in each section you have to have a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comprehensive approach that you are taking to
2 reform.

3 The competitive priority, we will
4 come back to in one moment. Then there are
5 four invitational priorities.

6 Again, in your application you can
7 write to these four invitational priorities in
8 separate sections after the selection
9 criteria. You are welcome to write to them
10 there. They are not going to be judged or
11 scored by the peer reviewers, but you can use
12 funds to support the activities that you list
13 in there. That is an allowable use of funds
14 under the competition, if you so choose.

15 The STEM priority, though, I do
16 want to spend a couple of minutes on. So the
17 STEM priority is worth 15 points, and
18 applicants earn it on an all-or-nothing basis.
19 So that means that, if you choose to write to
20 the STEM competitive priority, you would
21 actually write to it across your whole
22 application wherever it was applicable.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We did give you a space at the end
2 of the application to write specifically about
3 this. And what we asked you to write is, tell
4 the reviewers exactly where you did this
5 throughout your application, so that they are
6 looking in all the right places and they don't
7 by mistake miss something. But it is really
8 just an index into your application.

9 The hope is that, if you are
10 writing to the STEM priority, you are
11 integrating it across all the places where it
12 applies in your application.

13 And there are three things the
14 reviewers will be looking for: that you have
15 offered a rigorous course of study in the STEM
16 areas; that you are cooperating with a variety
17 of external partners to be sure you are really
18 preparing and assisting teachers in
19 integrating STEM content across the
20 curriculum, and preparing more students for
21 advanced study in STEM areas and for careers
22 in STEM.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So those are the three things that
2 the reviewers will be looking for across your
3 application. And, again, at the end of the
4 application when you are writing to this, you
5 can just point them in the directions that you
6 want them to look or point them to the places
7 in the application where you want them to be
8 sure to look.

9 They will do that at the end, and
10 they will go back and just sort of look across
11 the whole application. We will be providing
12 to our peer reviewers specific training in how
13 to go back and make sure that you are really
14 looking carefully across all of this, but you
15 guys will help them a lot by pointing them in
16 your application to the places that they
17 should look.

18 So any other questions about the
19 priorities? Yes?

20 MS. LOWE: So, as we are preparing
21 the budget around the invitational priorities,
22 do we just include those as a separate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 program, even though it is not related to the
2 other criteria that is scored, as we prepare
3 that?

4 MS. WEISS: Yes. So you would
5 integrate it into your project budgets. It
6 could be separate projects. It could be
7 integrated in, whatever is the way that makes
8 most sense for how you are thinking of
9 organizing and managing that work.

10 Okay. I am going to, then, turn
11 it over to Meredith, who is going to take us
12 through some of the program and other
13 application requirements.

14 Do we need a quick stretch break?

15 Yes, let's keep going. We are getting close.

16 MS. FARACE: Okay, program
17 requirements. So we have gone over a few of
18 these already. So I am only going to really
19 touch on the ones in red, since we haven't
20 talked about them as much.

21 On page 95 of the application, it
22 talks about evaluation. The main point I want

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to make here is that states may have
2 evaluations; they may want to fund those, and
3 they might have districts doing evaluations,
4 but those are not required.

5 We are going to be doing a
6 national evaluation of all of our programs.
7 It will be part of that.

8 So what is required is that the
9 state grantees that win become part of that
10 national evaluation. But, beyond that, we are
11 not requiring any particular state
12 evaluations.

13 We have talked a lot about
14 participating LEA scope of work. So I will
15 skip that one, but that is also a program
16 requirement, also on page 95.

17 Then Make Work Available.
18 Actually, I think Joanne already talked about
19 this a bit, or maybe it was Josh. That we do
20 expect that, unless it is protected otherwise
21 in a state law or something like that, then
22 the states and the subgrantees need to make

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 available any work that they have developed as
2 a result of this.

3 So the idea is to share what you
4 are learning and to make that broadly
5 available to others. So we would identify or
6 sponsor a website and we would explain to you
7 what you would need to do. We just wanted to
8 give you a heads-up that this is going to be
9 coming out and is a little bit different than
10 some other grant programs.

11 Technical assistance. We are
12 going to be having a lot of technical
13 assistance to have a cooperative relationship
14 with the grantees that win, and states must
15 participate in anything that is applicable to
16 any state technical assistance activities that
17 are conducted by the Department.

18 So this is a little bit different
19 than just grant monitoring. We are going to
20 try to get together with you, make sure that
21 we are having a collaborative relationship
22 with grantees that win, and making sure that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the grantees have an opportunity to talk to
2 each other.

3 Anything you want to add on that,
4 Joanne?

5 MS. WEISS: Yes, maybe just that I
6 sort of want to do a commercial for the ways
7 in which the Department is trying to think
8 differently about this. So, very similarly to
9 the way that we have asked you to think about
10 what it means to really support the success of
11 your LEAs throughout these applications, we
12 are taking very seriously the responsibility
13 that we have to not only support the success
14 of the states that win Race to the Top, and
15 really designing technical assistance programs
16 that are pretty different from what we may
17 have done in the past, really convening
18 different kinds of communities of practice
19 across these organizations and helping them
20 build collaborative groups, where you can help
21 each other get access to experts, and really
22 push forward the plans and the visions that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you have put forward here.

2 But, similarly, we also want to
3 make sure that we are spreading all of that
4 learning out beyond just the states that win
5 to all of the rest of the states in the
6 country. Hence, the evaluation, which is
7 going to not only have the kind of impact
8 evaluation that you would typically see in
9 evaluation programs like this, but, also, the
10 evaluation is planning to identify best
11 practices and get in there and try to document
12 and codify what is happening, so that we can
13 share the knowledge more broadly.

14 Similarly, when we are asking you
15 to make your work freely available nationwide,
16 it is because we know a lot of the work you
17 are doing is going to be broadly applicable
18 beyond the borders of your state. We want to
19 make sure everybody has access to that. So we
20 are going to try to do much larger knowledge
21 management, knowledge sharing, and
22 collaborative processes that we hope will not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 only benefit the states that win Race to the
2 Top, but really push them out to the other
3 states, too. We view that as one of the roles
4 that we have to play in this, to really take
5 those learnings and move them out as fast as
6 possible.

7 So, hopefully, you will watch for
8 some different things to happen in the future
9 with this.

10 MS. SMERDON: Becky Smerdon from
11 the Pennsylvania team.

12 I am wondering if you can talk a
13 little bit more about evaluation. The verb is
14 used, at least in one place, that states will
15 evaluate PD, teacher PD programs. There's
16 terms like "highly effective", "evidence-
17 based", "research-based".

18 One of my questions is, I mean we
19 know a national evaluation would follow post-
20 design of these interventions. I personally
21 believe that the best evaluations are done in
22 tandem with the design.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Right.

2 MS. SMERDON: Can you talk a
3 little bit more about that?

4 MS. WEISS: Yes. So, first of
5 all, all of the funds are absolutely -- you
6 can absolutely use your funds for evaluation.

7 And you're right, many of these criteria
8 assume that evaluation is just built into it.
9 It is really a continuous improvement model in
10 a lot of these, which depends on having the
11 data and evaluation.

12 So I think what we were talking
13 about is the sort of more national large
14 evaluation. You don't need to worry about
15 that or budget for it. We will take care of
16 it through our IES budget.

17 All of the local evaluations or
18 statewide evaluations that you need to do to
19 make the work more effective and document what
20 you are doing, certainly, they are an
21 allowable use of grants and an encouraged use
22 of grant funds, and you can build them into

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the program.

2 MS. FARACE: Okay. Then the last
3 bullet here, state summative assessments, we
4 just wanted to show you that, on page -- I
5 believe it was 96 -- there's a discussion of
6 use of funds for state summative assessments
7 and some restrictions on that. So Josh has
8 already talked about that. I just wanted to
9 point that out, that it is part of the program
10 requirements, if you are looking for that.

11 MS. WEISS: Meredith, one
12 question.

13 MS. FARACE: Yes.

14 MR. GUERICKE: Dan Guericke from
15 South Dakota.

16 You just referenced the ability to
17 replicate projects and that being of interest
18 to the Department. Is there a scoring for the
19 replicability of projects or is that embedded
20 throughout the entire application? Or how do
21 we talk about that in our application?

22 MS. WEISS: So I would say that it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is embedded in the application throughout
2 many, most of the plan requirement, of the
3 plan criteria. Because a lot of the sort of
4 whole big picture goal of Race to the Top, the
5 sort of theory of change, if you will, that
6 the Department was operating under when we put
7 this grant together, was that there are a lot
8 of really great schools and districts in all
9 of the states that really are beating the odds
10 for their kids and doing great things for the
11 kids. What we are missing is the ability to
12 scale and replicate those statewide.

13 The whole grant is really about
14 what's the state's vision of how you can do
15 that at the state level. So a lot of the
16 plans I would expect to be sort of rooted in
17 the assets that you've got and how you are
18 scaling and replicating those out, and what
19 the state's role is in helping to make that
20 happen.

21 And similarly, at the Department
22 level, we are looking at that across states.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So the same thing we are doing across states,
2 we think is what we are hoping to incent you
3 to do within your state through Race to the
4 Top.

5 So I think a lot of the plan
6 criteria will probably be around those kinds
7 of activities.

8 Does that make sense? From the
9 look on your face, I am sensing no.

10 MR. GUERICKE: The concept of what
11 you are saying makes absolute sense. What I
12 am a little bit confused about is, how is that
13 going to be evaluated and scored?

14 MR. BENDOR: I was going to jump
15 in on something more narrow, and then I think
16 Joanne may expand on that.

17 Specifically Criterion
18 (A) (2) (i) (b) is about supporting--

19 MS. WEISS: Josh talks like this
20 all the time. He doesn't even have to look it
21 up.

22 (Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BENDOR: You are lucky you
2 don't have to work with me.

3 It is about supporting your
4 participating LEAs, and that includes
5 identifying promising practices, disseminating
6 that. So that is a specific portion and that
7 is in the state capacity section where we talk
8 about this.

9 MS. WEISS: Yes, but so there is
10 not specific scoring rubrics around it, but we
11 do say to the reviewers, and again look at
12 application requirement (e), I think it is,
13 that is talking about plans, and it is really
14 talking about what your plan is and what the
15 evidence is that you will be able to succeed
16 at this. And evidence takes the shape of
17 things like we're doing this in this place
18 already, and here's the kind of results it has
19 had. So here is how we are going to put a
20 plan together to scale it more broadly.

21 So it is sort of an underlying
22 assumption throughout much of the application,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but there are no special points assigned to
2 it.

3 MR. BENDOR: Just one more thing,
4 if I can. You know, some of the performance
5 measures, like in (D)(2), they are the percent
6 of your LEAs that are doing something over
7 time. So, because we put that in and you fill
8 that in, we are not assuming that that is
9 going to be 100 percent in year one.

10 So, as Joanne was saying, you may
11 start in some not 100 percent set and expand.

12 Presumably, part of your plan will have to do
13 with, as you expand, you would be learning
14 from the places where you started.

15 MS. SMERDON: I'm Becky Smerdon
16 from Pennsylvania.

17 I am wondering if you could be a
18 little bit more specific about make work
19 available? To give an example, if some of
20 these funds, for example, go to a model
21 developer that is doing a restart who has
22 materials that have in the past been

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proprietary, do you mean that make work
2 available means that their guidelines and all
3 of their curriculum would be made public?

4 MS. WEISS: No. So, if you look
5 at the specific wording in that section, we do
6 say that if something is protected by
7 copyright or other law, that we are not trying
8 to in any way override. But if we are paying,
9 through this grant, for example, for a whole
10 bunch of teachers to come together over the
11 summer to develop a bunch of materials, we
12 would expect those materials to be publicly
13 available to everybody.

14 MS. FARACE: Other questions
15 before we get into applications -- oh, here we
16 go.

17 MS. WELLS: I'm Mary Wells, Rhode
18 Island.

19 On a similar vein, if the grant
20 funds are used to create a new 501(c)(3)
21 organization to either do school turnaround or
22 leadership development, or any number of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things, would those materials be subject to
2 the make available clause, because they are
3 not currently copyrighted?

4 MS. WEISS: So, if the government
5 funds are being used to develop these things,
6 they are part of the public domain under this
7 grant and freely available to all states to
8 learn from.

9 MS. WELLS: Okay.

10 MS. FARACE: Anything else?

11 (No response.)

12 Okay. Big, deep breath. We have
13 one hour to go.

14 Even though Joanne called this the
15 "boring" section, and she's right it's not
16 sexy, but I would say that this is probably
17 one of the most important slides, and I get to
18 talk about it.

19 Application submission procedures.

20 So you all have applied to grants before, and
21 you all know about deadlines. And you
22 probably know we really, really mean

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 deadlines. We have had things come in at
2 4:30:01, and that's late if it is a 4:30
3 deadline. So we mean that here. Applications
4 are due January 19th at 4:30:00 p.m.

5 And I will go through formats and
6 that sort of thing with you, so that you know
7 what to do. First, you are going to be doing
8 this on a Word document that we provide to
9 you. Then you will have all these appendices
10 and, yes, it is going to be very large, but
11 what we are asking for is to be submitted on a
12 CD or DVD only.

13 So we have the different formats
14 you can use, DOC, DOCX, RTF, PDF. We prefer
15 PDF, and here's the reason why:

16 You can certainly use the other
17 ones, but if we take your CD or your DVD and
18 we print out your application for the peers,
19 because some peers will want to read through a
20 paper copy, which is fair, and when we print
21 something and your table misaligns and all the
22 formatting goes to heck, we can't reformat

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 everybody's applications. We just can't do
2 that.

3 So we prefer PDF because that is
4 like a snapshot of what you have. Then you
5 send that along, and when we print it, it
6 looks exactly the way it is when you sent it.

7 So that is what we prefer, but you can send
8 any of these kinds of files.

9 You also have to submit original
10 documentation for Sections (3) and (4) of the
11 applications and one copy of that signed
12 original. So these are the signature pages.
13 All right?

14 Then we give you this CFDA number
15 to put on the mailing envelope. Then, in the
16 application, page 98 to 99, we give two
17 addresses, one for if you are mailing it to us
18 and one if you are doing hand-delivery or a
19 courier service. There are two locations for
20 where we get these things.

21 Applications postmarked on the
22 deadline, but arriving late, will not be read.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm sorry about that.

2 Please also note that, remember,
3 January 18th is a holiday. So that is Monday.

4 These are due Tuesday. Don't go to the post
5 office on Monday thinking it is going to be
6 open, don't try to do that.

7 I probably shouldn't say this
8 because it is a government agency, but I
9 wouldn't recommend going to the post office
10 for this application.

11 (Laughter.)

12 Not because the post office is
13 bad.

14 MS. WEISS: Regular mail? You
15 mean regular mail. You mean snail mail.

16 MS. FARACE: Regular mail. I'm
17 sorry, snail mail. Snail mail.

18 Because of the anthrax scare many,
19 many years ago, all our mail gets irradiated
20 at some location someplace else. And that can
21 sometimes damage things, and it really slows
22 it down. We sometimes take weeks to get snail

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mail.

2 So please do something that is
3 overnight, certified, FedExed, whatever, so
4 that you know that we have it. Yes, that's
5 important. So I can't stress that enough.

6 We will probably get someone
7 saying, "You got it at 4:32." Please, then we
8 can't -- okay, on to more fun things.

9 The competition process. So
10 here's how this is going to work. We are
11 going to have a two-tiered process. The
12 Department is going to use this for the first
13 Tier to have the peer reviewers read, comment
14 on, and score off on their own their assigned
15 applications.

16 Then they are going to use the
17 selection criteria and scoring rubric that we
18 have talked about all day. Then they are
19 going to come into D.C. and they are going to
20 meet and discuss.

21 Then we are going to come up with
22 the finalists that go on to the second Tier.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 If you are called in as a finalist, then you
2 are going to be brought to D.C., and your team
3 may include up to five people who had
4 significant roles preparing your application.

5 We want to make the point that the
6 teams cannot include consultants. We really
7 want to make sure that, even though we
8 understand consultants are helping to write
9 your applications, and there's no problem with
10 that at all, that it is the states that are
11 going to be implementing the application.
12 They need to be able to show that they
13 understand the application and are really very
14 tied and committed to it, and can answer all
15 the questions. So we are asking that the team
16 not be made up of any consultants that helped
17 you write it.

18 Any questions on that?

19 (No response.)

20 We are going to have a few
21 frequently asked questions in our next version
22 that talk a little bit more about this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process.

2 So, like I said, states that apply
3 in Phase 1 may go on to Phase 2 -- I'm sorry
4 -- Tier 2. But if they don't go on to Tier 2,
5 then they can apply to Phase 2. I know it's
6 complicated, phases, tiers, but there's two
7 phases, and each phase has two tiers.

8 So we have already said this.
9 There is going to be a very high bar for who
10 wins in Phase 1. There's going to be plenty
11 of opportunity in Phase 2. So you can either
12 apply in Phase 1, and if you don't make it,
13 try again in Phase 2; you can wait until Phase
14 2. We recommend you try in Phase 1 in order
15 to get some comments, but you certainly don't
16 have to.

17 You will be receiving comments
18 from Phase 1 if you don't get selected as a
19 winner. So you can use those comments to
20 change or adopt your application for Phase 2.

21 Phase 1 winners will receive full-
22 size awards. So they can't apply for more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 funding in Phase 2.

2 A question here?

3 MR. COOK: David Cook from
4 Kentucky.

5 This isn't really necessary, but I
6 will forget it if I don't ask it.

7 MS. FARACE: Okay.

8 MR. COOK: In terms of the
9 reviewers, will reviewers have sections of our
10 proposals that they will review or will one
11 reviewer review our whole proposal?

12 MS. FARACE: Several reviewers
13 will review your whole proposal.

14 MR. COOK: But they will review
15 the whole proposal?

16 MS. FARACE: The whole thing.

17 MR. COOK: Okay.

18 MS. FARACE: Absolutely. Uh-hum.
19 Good question.

20 Anything else on the process?

21 (No response.)

22 At some point, we will be letting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you know who all the peer reviewers, the list
2 of the peer reviewers' names, you know, when
3 this is all over. So you will have access to
4 that as well.

5 We also plan on posting a lot of
6 this information down the road as the phases
7 are completed, so that it is transparent.

8 MS. OLANOFF: Beth Olanoff,
9 Pennsylvania.

10 Did you give a deadline for the
11 first cut, read only, and then the group that
12 goes on to the presentations? When should we
13 expect to hear about that?

14 MS. WEISS: The FAQ that we are
15 about to put out that goes into a little more
16 detail on how the competition will work is
17 going to tell you the approximate date when we
18 will announce who is going to go through to
19 the second tier, and also the date when, if
20 you do go through to the second tier, you
21 would be invited to come to D.C., so that you
22 just have some visibility into that right now.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So within the next week or so, we should have
2 that posted on the website, and you can look
3 up those dates there.

4 DR. GRUENDEL: I think we
5 understood that states who apply and are not
6 accepted will get comments back at about the
7 same time as you announce the entire winning
8 pool, is that right? So it would be around
9 April 1 or something like that?

10 MS. FARACE: We think that is
11 about right. We are still nailing down those
12 details.

13 DR. GRUENDEL: Okay. Because if
14 you find yourself in that situation, then you
15 want to have the maximum amount of time to
16 take advantage of.

17 MS. FARACE: Right.

18 DR. GRUENDEL: Otherwise, we are
19 working, and any state may be working without
20 a full deck, so to speak, in terms of change.

21 And I am wondering, in that
22 regard, I know this is not possible, but I am

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 going to raise it anyway.

2 (Laughter.)

3 Janice Gruendel from Connecticut.

4 So, if you want to throw something, that's
5 okay, too.

6 (Laughter.)

7 States that aren't invited into
8 the finalist pool are probably not going to be
9 a finalist logistically.

10 MS. FARACE: Yes.

11 DR. GRUENDEL: Which means you
12 would have reviewed their applications --

13 MS. FARACE: Yes.

14 DR. GRUENDEL: -- and that
15 information would be available sooner. On the
16 other hand, that keeps you from making one
17 grand announcement.

18 MS. FARACE: Correct, and that is
19 what we are working through.

20 DR. GRUENDEL: Okay. Well, you
21 know, I was sort of hinting that maybe you --

22 MS. FARACE: I understand.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. GRUENDEL: I thank you.

2 MS. WEISS: And I think we have
3 said in the notice inviting applications where
4 we talked about this, we have said that we
5 will get the comments back to the states as
6 fast as we possibly can, given their
7 particular place in the competition.

8 So we will do our best to try to
9 get comments back to people as fast as
10 possible. We just need to get a couple more
11 "i's" dotted and "t's" crossed on our own
12 process, but it is our intent to get you the
13 comments as fast as we can.

14 MS. FARACE: Any others on that?
15 Okay, a comment here.

16 MS. KRAMER: I just have -- Kate
17 Framer from South Dakota -- I just have a
18 question about a comment that you just made.
19 You said that the bar will be very high for
20 the first round of selections, but the
21 criteria is not changing.

22 MS. FARACE: No. Well, I don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 necessarily mean it is higher.

2 MS. KRAMER: Can you elaborate
3 what you mean by that?

4 MS. FARACE: Joanne?

5 (Laughter.)

6 MS. WEISS: I think we mean the
7 bar is high, period, for this competition.

8 MS. KRAMER: Well, do you have a
9 cutoff number of states that you are going to
10 award to? I mean I am wondering why that
11 comment was made, that the bar will be very
12 high for the first round.

13 MS. FARACE: I think states are
14 worried that we will accept so many
15 applications as winners that there won't be a
16 Phase 2. And that is not our intention at
17 all. That is why we made that comment. We
18 don't want people to worry that they can't
19 apply just in Phase 2 and that the money will
20 all be gone.

21 But we don't have a cutoff. We
22 don't have a number. We have to see what the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 applications look like.

2 Okay. Planning considerations.
3 So we have been thinking that, if you all are
4 working very hard, as we know, to create a
5 work plan to make sure all this gets
6 accomplished by January 19th, if you are going
7 to apply for Phase 1, we thought it might be
8 helpful to give you some things to think about
9 in what you might want to do first.
10 Obviously, you can do this in any order you
11 want, but we just thought we would give you a
12 couple of ideas of things to think about.

13 So, first of all, we have talked
14 about this lining up the certification from
15 the state's attorney general. What we have
16 done is we have listed out all of the areas in
17 the notice that the state attorney general
18 will be signing off on and requiring AG
19 review.

20 So, knowing all that, you know,
21 giving your attorney general all those things
22 together at once might be useful. Maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 working on these parts first, so that you are
2 not going to your attorney general right
3 before the deadline might be useful as well.
4 So just something to think about.

5 You all are probably well aware
6 that enlisting LEA participation and
7 collecting the data from the LEAs is one of
8 the more time-consuming parts of this process
9 for you right now. So maybe looking at what
10 those data elements might be and talking to
11 your LEAs upfront early on, and having those
12 conversations with them as you develop your
13 plan, might be a useful thing.

14 You will need to give them the
15 information that they will need in order to
16 make some decisions, maybe thinking through
17 some internal deadlines for them on deciding,
18 you know, when they need to tell you they are
19 participating.

20 Then there might be some cases
21 where you are going to collect data from them.

22 You might want to send that out at the same

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time that you give them some additional
2 information.

3 Criteria (A) (1), (D) (2), and
4 (D) (3) are criteria that are the most likely
5 candidates here and where you might need some
6 information. So we thought we would point
7 those out to you.

8 Third, don't forget about the
9 budgets. This is Section VIII of your
10 application on page 55. Obviously, that is
11 something we have talked a lot about today,
12 and to think through throughout this whole
13 process.

14 And fourth, be sure that you have
15 the governor, state chief, and state board
16 president lined up for the signatures. So
17 that, you know, you need that one last
18 signature, and the state board might be gone
19 for the week, and what are you going to do?
20 So think about that ahead of time.

21 And then we have a slide here
22 about planning for participating LEAs. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just thought we would think through one way --
2 you can do it how you want -- but one
3 potential way you might want to approach and
4 navigate this process.

5 So, first, a state might outline
6 its reform agenda, its specific plans, and do
7 that in collaboration and consultation with
8 LEAs as appropriate, and keep them aware of
9 the plans as they develop, so that they know
10 what they are going to be getting into.

11 The state, then, either creates a
12 binding agreement or an MOU, based on what we
13 have provided or however they would like to do
14 it, and get the LEAs to sign, if they are
15 interested in participating in the plans.
16 Like I said, to make this simpler for you, we
17 have provided the model MOU, and that is in
18 appendix D.

19 Then, if an LEA decides it is
20 interested in participating, then it completes
21 the MOU, determines, together with the state,
22 which portions it is going to participate in,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 signs the MOU, and returns it to the state.
2 Then the state reviews each MOU to ensure that
3 the requirements the state has set forth all
4 or a significant portion -- we talked about
5 this earlier -- of the state's plan, that the
6 state, then, makes sure that the LEA really
7 has signed up for all those things the state
8 determines is all or a significant portion.
9 Then they countersign if they believe the
10 district really is participating in the way
11 that they have laid out.

12 So we have talked about this
13 before, but any LEA that signs up after the
14 state has submitted to the Department on the
15 19th wouldn't be considered as part of the
16 reviewer process, but they could potentially
17 sign up, if the state wants to allow that, up
18 until the 90-day period where they are working
19 on their final scope of work.

20 Then the state completes the table
21 that summarizes all the LEAs' participation.
22 And if the state is awarded a Race to the Top

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 grant, then the participating LEAs, including
2 those that submitted too late for the 19th,
3 but if the state decides to allow them to
4 participate, they have up to 90 days to
5 complete the final scope of work. Then, at
6 the end of that period, the states notify the
7 LEAs of their subgrants.

8 So this is just kind of pulling it
9 all together. We have talked about all those
10 things today, but it is just one way to kind
11 of walk through how you are going to be
12 working with your LEAs, how you are going to
13 get all this accomplished.

14 Any questions? Okay, from the
15 great Empire State. Oh, I'm sorry, we have
16 another one. Sorry.

17 MS. SMERDON: Sure. Becky Smerdon
18 from Pennsylvania.

19 To what extent can states expect
20 technical assistance, research evaluation, and
21 certainly dissemination of making work
22 available, to what extent can we assume some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of that will be done by our regional education
2 labs and our regional comprehensive centers?

3 MS. WEISS: We're still figuring
4 that part out right now. So that is why we
5 have been sort of generic in the proposal and
6 said we will tell you where and how to do
7 this. We are still working that through.

8 MR. DELANEY: John Delaney, New
9 York.

10 And I apologize if this is in the
11 FAQs. The 250-page limitation on the
12 application does that include the budget?

13 MS. FARACE: So, yes, let me talk
14 about page limitations.

15 MR. DELANEY: Thank you.

16 MS. FARACE: What we have said is
17 that this is a recommended limitation of 100
18 pages of text and 250 pages of appendix.
19 Those are recommended only. You can go
20 beyond that.

21 In some grants, if you go past the
22 page limit, you have issues. But, in here, it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 depends on where you put the budget. If you
2 have a budget narrative, that might be part of
3 your 100-page narrative demarcation, but if
4 you have appendices and you want to put tables
5 in, and you would rather have that as an
6 appendix, as a part of the narrative, you can
7 do that, too.

8 So it is really up to you, as long
9 as you show us where to find things in your
10 appendix. Like I said, these are just
11 suggested.

12 We have also gotten questions
13 about -- we have some suggested formatting,
14 you know, spacing, font size, that kind of
15 thing. Again, these are purely suggested for
16 you to make it easy for the peers to read, but
17 we will accept other kinds of formatting.

18 You can certainly format things
19 differently within tables. I know this sounds
20 like minutia, but I have had a question about
21 color. Can we put things in color? Graphics?
22 That is all fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Just note that, when we print
2 these for the peers, if they choose a printed
3 copy, and I am sure many of them will, we
4 cannot print in color. So we will be printing
5 in black and white and making copies. So, if
6 you have something that is important to see in
7 color, you might want to rethink how you do
8 that.

9 Question in the back.

10 MR. HUDSON: Adam Hudson,
11 Arkansas.

12 A quick question just in terms of
13 formatting. Are we allowed to put an
14 executive summary or cover letter on top of
15 our application?

16 MS. FARACE: Yes, I mean I think
17 you certainly can. It is not required. It is
18 not something that we laid out, but I don't
19 see any reason why not.

20 MR. BENDOR: But also note, the
21 very first criterion, (A)(1)(i), it is kind of
22 your overview criterion.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: And that is what is
2 scored. A cover letter will not be scored.

3 MR. BENDOR: So you might just
4 want to think about whether that is where you
5 want to put that kind of information.

6 MR. HUDSON: Thank you.

7 MS. ANDREWS: Hi. Jessica Andrews
8 from Connecticut.

9 I just have a question about, all
10 the questions that have been unanswered, are
11 those going to be posted on the FAQs?

12 MS. FARACE: So I was going to
13 talk about that next. Thank you.

14 I feel like we were able to answer
15 a lot, but certainly not all the questions
16 today. We knew that was going to be the case.

17 That was the case in Denver, when we talked
18 last week.

19 This is really complicated. You
20 are asking some really great, detailed
21 questions, some of which we have thought
22 about, but we just want to go back.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So we have already been answering
2 a lot of questions over the last month. I
3 have probably written back to about 150 people
4 already. Those have generally been pretty
5 easy to answer, pretty straightforward. I can
6 point to an FAQ that already exists. I could
7 point to something in the criterion. We have
8 an answer.

9 Some of you have asked questions
10 within the last few weeks that you haven't
11 gotten answered yet, and that is because we
12 are still working through them. We are really
13 trying hard to get these to you quickly.

14 If it is a question that we think
15 will help other people, that isn't already
16 someplace, we are adding those to our FAQs.
17 So, for instance, the folks that had questions
18 about the tribes, well, we know that there are
19 other states that have tribes and they might
20 have the similar kind of question. So we are
21 going to add that to our FAQs.

22 So we have this FAQ document. It

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is on the web. What we are trying to do is
2 update that every week, two weeks, depending
3 on when we get a small critical mass of
4 questions to add.

5 We have a few that we hope will be
6 coming out soon. Then we are already working
7 on the next iteration.

8 I really do request that, when we
9 said we are going to get back to you, if we
10 haven't gotten back to you today, and you
11 don't feel confident that you have the answer,
12 please do write it in. Because if we wait
13 until the transcript comes back, that could be
14 a week, and that is going to hold us up a
15 week.

16 So go home, do it today, whenever.
17 Write it back. I look at that email mailbox
18 all day long. It is all I do all day long, is
19 try to answer questions and get the right
20 people in the room to make sure that we have
21 the right answer for you.

22 There is also a phone line. I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 probably only check that once a day, a couple
2 of times a day, but I am on the email all day
3 long.

4 So we will get to you, and I am
5 either going to get back to you in the form of
6 an FAQ or I will just answer you individually,
7 but I will tell you, hey, it is now going to
8 be in the FAQs; look at K9, or something. You
9 won't just not hear from me. You'll hear from
10 me.

11 So, if it is not within the next
12 few weeks, that means we are really working on
13 it. If you don't hear from me and you feel
14 like you should, write me again.

15 MR. CRUCE: Dan Cruce, Delaware.

16 So we know around April of '10 we
17 should likely hear about the announcement of
18 the winners.

19 MS. FARACE: Uh-huh.

20 MR. CRUCE: Do we know, or is
21 there a plan, about how shortly after the
22 actual funding will be available for those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 winners, when the money will flow?

2 MS. WEISS: So, then, there is the
3 process of putting your grant together,
4 getting your final scopes of work from your
5 LEAs, and doing the actual paperwork, whatever
6 form that will take. So we expect that that
7 will take a little while to put together. I
8 don't think we have exact estimates, but I
9 think it will take weeks, months, to put
10 together, not days. It is not like the money
11 will flow in days.

12 MR. CRUCE: So weeks or months?

13 MS. WEISS: Because it is three
14 months to even get your LEA plans together, up
15 to; I mean, if you can do it faster, that is
16 great. So I think it will take us a while to
17 put the grants together with you guys.

18 MR. CRUCE: Thank you.

19 DR. WALLINGER: Back to the FAQ,
20 is it possible to put a specific date when you
21 post these, so that we know if we are looking
22 at the most recent publication?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FARACE: That's a great
2 question. So what we are doing is we have the
3 original FAQ, and then we are adding addendum.
4 Is that right?

5 So if we want to clarify -- for
6 instance, I know we are going to be doing some
7 FAQs on this summative assessment restriction
8 funds issue. We are not going to mess with
9 the existing FAQ that is there. So there
10 won't be lots of different versions floating
11 around. That will still exist, and then we
12 will add onto it, and you will have a piece of
13 paper that says: these are the addendums;
14 these are the new FAQs as of "X" date.

15 They will all be in the same
16 location. We might have different files, like
17 the existing files -- oh, go ahead, Josh.

18 MR. BENDOR: Just to piggyback on
19 that, what I am planning to do -- and
20 hopefully, I will get some nods that this is
21 going to be helpful -- is we will put up an
22 addendum, like Meredith said. You know, here

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are three new FAQs, posted on "X" date. There
2 will be the original FAQ document, so you can
3 see it without any additions, and then we will
4 have an updated one that has everything we
5 have had from all of the addenda, and it will
6 mark this is one from addendum 1, posted on
7 blah, blah, blah. So you can also just have
8 one document in your hand. That makes it
9 easy.

10 MS. FARACE: Yes? Oh, one second,
11 and then we've got one in the back here.

12 MS. LAFRENIERE: This is Stephanie
13 from New Hampshire.

14 Do you mind if I go back and ask a
15 question more about one of the models?

16 MS. FARACE: Yes. I think we are
17 now in the open, free-for-all Q&A. No?

18 MS. WEISS: Actually, I wanted to
19 take like a five-minute break because we have
20 been trying to get answers to some of the
21 questions, particularly that we published, and
22 we need a quick break, so that we can see if

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we can get you some of these answers now.

2 MS. FARACE: But we have actually
3 determined, from talking to Wendy, that we
4 probably need to go back tomorrow morning and
5 talk to people.

6 MS. WEISS: Oh, okay.

7 Oh, okay. So I'm sorry. So, on
8 these school improvement, on the school
9 turnaround questions that we were unable to
10 answer, we have written them down, but if you
11 guys who asked them could also just submit
12 them to racetothetop@ed.gov, it will be very
13 helpful, to make sure that we really heard it
14 exactly properly. If you've got your
15 computers open, feel free to do this right
16 now, even as we are speaking.

17 We will get you answers as fast as
18 we can, because we really do have answers to a
19 lot of these questions, and we will get them
20 out quickly. Yes.

21 MS. FARACE: Yes, we had one in
22 the middle.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LAFRENIERE: I just had a
2 question about -- and I think other states
3 have had this question, too. So sorry if you
4 have already answered it.

5 But when it comes to the changing
6 of the principal, I know it was stated that,
7 if the principal has changed within the last
8 two years, in an effort to actually turn
9 around that school, that it is okay.

10 We do have some principals that we
11 think would still be effective leaders. It is
12 more about maybe changing the conditions and
13 allowing them to be more instructional leaders
14 and redeveloping their actual position.

15 Does that person actually have to
16 be removed from leadership or could we submit
17 possible alternatives, such as someone coming
18 in to help kind of with the management and
19 then with the instruction? Are those options,
20 redesigning their actual role?

21 MS. WEISS: Yes, so I don't think
22 we can give you any more guidance than what is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 already in these school improvement models.
2 We don't have a different answer from the one
3 that is written there for how the models are
4 described.

5 MS. LAFRENIERE: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. TAKUMI: Yes, I had a
7 question. Roy Takumi from Hawaii.

8 You are saying that the states
9 that are finalists could send up to a five-
10 person team. Are you paying for that? Or do
11 the states have to pay for that?

12 (Laughter.)

13 If you're from Maryland, it is
14 maybe not a big deal, but if you're from
15 Hawaii, that's a big deal.

16 (Laughter.)

17 Well, when is this going to be,
18 anyway? When are you expecting to have the
19 finalist teams come out?

20 MS. WEISS: So we are going to
21 publish shortly the dates for that, so that
22 you can get a sense of when to expect that to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be. So, within the next couple of weeks, we
2 will have the dates out to you, and they will
3 be out in the form of one of the FAQs. So
4 watch there for it.

5 And, no, we can't pay for the
6 states to come out.

7 MR. TAKUMI: Okay. You can do it
8 in Hawaii, if you want to.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MS. WEISS: I am sure that that
11 would get a lot of support around this room
12 right about in December.

13 Webinar?

14 MS. CLARK: This is a question
15 from Holly Edenfield in Florida.

16 Can a charter school or group of
17 charter schools within a district that does
18 not participate in Race to the Top apply for,
19 or otherwise receive funding, and the state
20 charters are not LEAs?

21 MS. WEISS: Jane?

22 MS. HESS: No. Under the law,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 only states can be applicants, and the
2 criteria are laid out with the LEAs as part of
3 it. But a participating LEA that may
4 authorize a charter school, if there is a
5 charter school that is a school within an LEA,
6 it may work with its LEA, if the LEA chooses
7 to be a participating LEA.

8 MS. ADAMS: Hello. Ruth Adams with
9 International Baccalaureate.

10 Back when you were discussing
11 Criterion (B)(1), there were questions that
12 asked about what the Department meant by
13 internationally-benchmarked standards. As
14 International Baccalaureate has a very long
15 history of internationally-benchmarked
16 standards, would it behoove a state to take a
17 look at those, or are they applicable?

18 MS. WEISS: Well, I mean I really
19 can't answer that question the way you asked
20 it. That is going to be up to states to
21 figure out, and we don't have a point of view
22 on that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, if what you are asking is
2 whether International Baccalaureate standards
3 are internationally-benchmarked, you would,
4 for that, if you used those standards, you
5 would provide evidence that they are, and you
6 could get that evidence from the International
7 Baccalaureate people.

8 MS. ADAMS: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. TAPPEN: Mary Jane Tappen,
10 Florida.

11 This is about struggling schools.
12 Our folks emailed and they don't think these
13 have been addressed, but forgive us if they
14 have been.

15 Is the intent to keep the list of
16 low-achieving schools the same throughout the
17 four years of the grant?

18 MS. WEISS: I think the goal is to
19 turn these schools around over the course of
20 four years. So this isn't like 5 percent per
21 year. This is over the course of the four-
22 year grant, to pick your lowest-achieving 5

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 percent that you are going to turn around, and
2 you can sort of apportion the start date for
3 that across the four years.

4 Did that answer your question?
5 Was that what you were asking?

6 MS. TAPPEN: I am not sure whether
7 you just said yes or no.

8 MS. WEISS: So tell me your
9 question again, then.

10 MS. TAPPEN: Okay. Once we are --
11 I'll reword it -- once we identify our lower 5
12 percent, year one, does that list remain the
13 same for the lifetime of the grant?

14 MS. WEISS: So I think the answer
15 is yes, because that is the list that over the
16 four years of the grant you are turning
17 around, and you might have start dates. They
18 don't all have to start tomorrow, either. In
19 this, they can, at least in Race to the Top,
20 you can start them over the course of a couple
21 of years.

22 MS. TAPPEN: So, if one suddenly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 became a high-performing school, would it be
2 replaced by another school?

3 MS. WEISS: So that is just one
4 example of things that could change throughout
5 the course of the four years. There's
6 probably tons of examples of those. And, yes,
7 we would expect that that would be something
8 you would talk to the program officer at the
9 Department about and be able to talk about it.

10 Because if it has magically become high-
11 performing, we have no desire to make you turn
12 it around. You've done it.

13 MS. TAPPEN: Okay. Additionally,
14 we have secondary schools where districts
15 chose, LEAs chose not to serve them with Title
16 I funds. And now they are seeing the
17 possibilities by doing so. So, if we had a
18 high school with a -- I'm making this up, but
19 I'm sure one exists -- a graduation rate of 55
20 percent, and suddenly the LEA determines that
21 it is going to be served with Title I funds,
22 can it, then, be added to the list as one of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our lowest 5 percent?

2 MS. WEISS: So is that an LEA that
3 would be Title I-eligible, but has not chosen
4 to take Title I funds? Because that is one of
5 the categories in the definitions.

6 MS. TAPPEN: Yes, but --

7 MS. WEISS: So the answer would
8 be, yes, that they would be eligible for this.

9 MS. TAPPEN: Okay.

10 MS. WEISS: And they are eligible
11 for School Improvement grants as well.

12 MS. TAPPEN: And finally, do the
13 turnaround options replace corrective action
14 and restructuring options under No Child Left
15 Behind for these schools?

16 MS. WEISS: No, they don't.

17 MS. TAPPEN: Thank you.

18 MS. WEISS: Jessica?

19 MS. CLARK: This is from Sarah
20 Archibald in Wisconsin regarding MOUs.

21 Can an SEA in its standard MOU
22 redefine who can bind an LEA for the narrow

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 purposes of MOUs accompanying the state's Race
2 to the Top grant application?

3 MS. WEISS: Can you read that one
4 again?

5 (Laughter.)

6 Maybe it's just late, but --

7 MS. CLARK: So she is asking if an
8 SEA can, in the MOU it uses for Race to the
9 Top applications, redefine who can bind an
10 LEA.

11 MS. FARACE: Oh, so instead of
12 maybe the superintendent, they would have
13 somebody else be the binding signature?

14 MS. CLARK: That is my
15 understanding.

16 MS. WEISS: So we have said, at a
17 minimum, the three signatures that we laid out
18 are the signatures on an MOU. Which one is
19 the binding signature is a legal question. If
20 the state has some point of view on that, they
21 can express that point of view to the LEAs.
22 If the state wanted to add a fourth or fifth

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 signature, they could do that as well. The
2 three we have suggested are the three
3 minimally-required.

4 And if that didn't answer your
5 question out in webinarland --

6 MS. HESS: And it would just have
7 to be consistent with state law.

8 MS. WEISS: Right.

9 MS. HESS: I think we thought at
10 the outset that the state laws would already
11 kind of individually say who it was that could
12 bind, but if they are thinking of something
13 else or if some law is changing, it would
14 still be by the state law, whatever it is by
15 the application date.

16 MS. COURTS: Amelia Courts, West
17 Virginia.

18 Do references to the summative
19 assessment and the summative assessment data
20 to be submitted throughout the application
21 also include the alternate assessment and
22 alternate assessment data of the 1 percent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 special ed?

2 MS. FARACE: Yes.

3 MS. WEISS: Yes.

4 MS. COURTS: All right. And a
5 second follow-up question: can you give us
6 any insight regarding the upcoming aligned
7 assessment dollars that are going to be --

8 MS. FARACE: The enhanced
9 assessment grant?

10 MS. COURTS: Enhanced. Sorry.
11 Yes, enhanced assessment. Will there be funds
12 for alternative assessments?

13 MS. FARACE: You mean the next --

14 MS. COURTS: Yes.

15 MS. FARACE: I don't think
16 anything has been posted on --

17 MS. COURTS: Well, is that part of
18 the conversation, including alternate --

19 MS. WEISS: So are you talking
20 about the Race to the Top assessment?

21 MS. COURTS: Uh-huh.

22 MS. WEISS: Meredith?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. FARACE: Not what's currently
2 in OESE the enhanced assessment?

3 MS. COURTS: No.

4 MS. FARACE: You're not talking
5 about that?

6 MS. COURTS: No.

7 MS. FARACE: You're talking about
8 the Race to the Top assessment?

9 MS. COURTS: Yes.

10 MS. FARACE: Okay. Sorry.

11 MS. WEISS: So, in our expert
12 input meetings, we have gotten a lot of input
13 around that, and we are taking it under
14 consideration. We are not coming out with the
15 rules around that one until sometime probably
16 early in March. So we are still considering
17 it, but it is definitely on the table as one
18 of the things that we are looking at.

19 MS. HIRSCH: Hi. Margaret Hirsch
20 with the National Math and Science Initiative.

21 I've got a question going back to
22 the MOUs. When you were talking about the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 states would list all the programs that LEAs
2 might participate in, but that some of those
3 programs might be competitive in nature, my
4 question is, for the programs that are
5 competitive, do the LEAs just indicate their
6 willingness to participate in those programs,
7 with the understanding that they may or may
8 not implement the programs, depending on
9 whether or not they were selected?

10 MS. WEISS: Go ahead, Josh.

11 MR. BENDOR: So I think we've got
12 a bit of a misunderstanding here. States set
13 the rules under which LEAs choose to
14 participate. You have to participate in all
15 or significant portions. It wouldn't be
16 competitive to choose which LEAs participate.

17 I think what you are referring to
18 is we were talking about in the budget section
19 the state, from its 50 percent of the funds,
20 not the 50 percent that goes through the
21 subgrant to LEAs, from its 50 percent of the
22 funds, it could choose, as Joanne was talking

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about, pilot programs for certain things. And
2 it could choose if it wanted to do those
3 things competitively. That wouldn't be for
4 determining who is a participating LEA. So
5 that wouldn't be necessarily in the MOU.

6 MS. HIRSCH: So, then, I think I
7 have a follow-up question. So the MOU, then,
8 is only to indicate which programs you are
9 going to implement under the LEAs' 50 percent?

10 There is no MOU or indication for what the
11 state is going to do with its 50 percent?

12 MS. WEISS: Yes, so I guess the
13 way we had envisioned that is, if it was some
14 separate program that the state was
15 administering to some select group of LEAs or
16 schools, however they were selected, whether
17 through competition or through opting in, or
18 whether the state just said you're the ones
19 that we want to do this program with, that
20 that would be not covered by the MOU.

21 That would be separately budgeted
22 by the state. It would probably be budgeted

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as an activity, and you wouldn't even
2 necessarily have to, at the beginning, figure
3 out which LEAs were in that. You could or
4 not, depending on how the state wanted to
5 organize that.

6 But you could still set the budget
7 aside and say we are going to do it with 10
8 schools, and here is how we are going to pick
9 them, or we are going to do it with 10
10 schools, and they have all said, yes, they are
11 interested in doing it today. But that would
12 be in a budget that's not part of the MOU.

13 MS. HIRSCH: That makes more
14 sense. Thank you.

15 MS. SHEK: Hi. Kathryn from the
16 National School Boards Association.

17 You mentioned earlier that, when a
18 participating LEA drops out, the state can
19 reallocate the funding to other LEAs. I was
20 just wondering, at what point in the process
21 can a participating LEA drop out, given that
22 they have signed an MOU already? And is there

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a point in the process that it is impossible
2 for a participating LEA to drop out? Can you
3 clarify that, please?

4 MS. HESS: This is something that
5 we will end up looking at on a case-by-case
6 basis. I think our example before was that,
7 if a single LEA chooses to drop out, neither a
8 state nor we could probably prevent them from
9 doing it. At some point, if a significant
10 number of LEAs drop out, then what would be
11 called into question, as to whether the scope
12 of the state's application has significantly
13 changed as a result of what they were judged
14 on by the peer reviewers, and that is not what
15 it is that they now have.

16 Then there would have to be a
17 conversation with the Department as to whether
18 the grant, the entire grant, could continue.

19 MS. SHEK: So an individual --

20 MS. HESS: And there isn't a
21 number. I mean, you know, we just can't tell
22 you that there's a specific number where that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 happens or doesn't happen. It really will
2 depend on the specifics of what the state's
3 application is in the first place, and how
4 many participating LEAs it has or involved
5 LEAs, and, you know, kind of just what the
6 whole scope of the application is.

7 MS. SHEK: So a participating LEA
8 can choose to drop out after it signs the MOU?

9 MS. WEISS: Well, it is a binding
10 agreement. So, consistent with whatever the
11 termination terms of the agreement are, we
12 have suggested one in our model MOU that you,
13 again, can change, but that is something that
14 the state can set. The state is writing that
15 agreement, and it will have termination
16 clauses in it, and consistent with those
17 termination clauses, an LEA may be able to
18 drop out, depending on how you have written
19 the termination.

20 MR. BENDOR: That's on page 68 of
21 your application, if you are looking for our
22 suggested language.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HESS: No Romanette.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. WEISS: Any other questions?

4 I want to make sure especially the states are
5 getting your questions answered. Have we
6 tuckered you out or are there a couple left?
7 Mary?

8 MS. WELLS: Mary Wells from Rhode
9 Island.

10 With regard to the budgets that
11 are required, it doesn't appear to me that
12 LEAs are required to give any indication of
13 how they will spend the 50 percent that goes
14 to them. Is that correct?

15 MS. WEISS: So that is the part
16 that, for the sake of streamlining, we have
17 said could come once the LEA wins. You could
18 decide, as a state -- I mean once the state
19 wins, the LEA has to do the detailed budgets
20 and plans and everything within 90 days. A
21 state could decide -- we were trying to think
22 of, how do you get this done by January 19th?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 A state could decide that you are going to
2 require more than that from an LEA, and that
3 you really want to see the whole plan and
4 budget. There is nothing precluding you from
5 doing that. We are just saying, from our
6 point of view, you don't have to go that far.

7 And for Phase 2, if that is what
8 you are applying for, you may decide that you
9 do want all of that before they apply because
10 it gives you, as a state, a better snapshot of
11 the level of work and commitment that they
12 have got.

13 So a lot of that would be up to
14 the state. We are just saying, at a minimum,
15 it needs to look like this.

16 MS. WELLS: All right. Thank you.

17 MS. STUMBO: Hi. Circe Stumbo
18 with Iowa.

19 As we think about how we will hold
20 LEAs accountable and do some quality
21 assurance, trying to sort of balance the idea
22 that it is a non-competitive process, but if

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they sign on, they sign on, but we've got to
2 make sure they are doing what they say they
3 are going to do. Will you have guidance on
4 sort of how?

5 I know you offer that we've got
6 some state recourse we should write into the
7 MOU directly, but do you have sense of how
8 much the state is going to be allowed to sort
9 of say, "Look, LEA, you are just not doing
10 what you need to be doing. We are going to
11 take back the funds and reallocate them."?

12 MS. HESS: I mean most of you
13 administer federal grants already. So, you
14 know, if an LEA chooses to be a participating
15 LEA, they will be a subgrantee to the state.
16 So they will be subject to all of the
17 administrative rules that the Department has
18 in place for federal grantees and their
19 subgrantees, as well as the cost principles.

20 You know, it is not like it is
21 free money for them. They will have to follow
22 the same rules; the costs and the expenditures

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will be reasonable, necessary, allowable, and
2 all of the other rules.

3 Some of them in the administrative
4 regulations are based on what your state
5 provisions are. So they have plenty of
6 requirements to follow, I think.

7 (Laughter.)

8 Is that --

9 MS. STUMBO: That is responsive.
10 I think what I was thinking about is, if in
11 those 90 days they submit this scope of work
12 and a budget, and we look at it and we say,
13 you know, "You're only saying you're going to
14 put money into one out of the ten things we're
15 asking that you said you would do, and that's
16 not appropriate", is that the sort of thing we
17 could go back and say --

18 MS. WEISS: Yes, because one of
19 the things that we have said is, in the
20 preliminary scope of work, whatever they say
21 that they are signing up and committing to do
22 is what their plans that they give you in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 final scope of work; the plans and budgets
2 have to match the commitments that they made
3 in that preliminary scope of work.

4 So, yes, if they gave you back
5 plans or budgets that were not consistent with
6 that, you would absolutely have a conversation
7 that you could have.

8 MR. BENDOR: We also have an FAQ
9 on whether states can limit LEA uses of funds,
10 and we say, well, LEAs have to use them
11 consistent with the MOU and the state plan,
12 and the state can set other limits, as long as
13 they are consistent with ARRA.

14 DR. HYDE: Sheila Hyde from New
15 Mexico.

16 I would like to take us back to
17 the theory of change. You mentioned, about an
18 hour ago or so, looking at the difference
19 between innovation -- because when Race to the
20 Top came out, there was a lot of conversation
21 about what innovation meant and looking for
22 those big ideas. I know some states won't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 even share what their ideas are, for fear
2 people might steal those.

3 But what I heard you say earlier
4 was the theory of change revolves around
5 looking for something transformative or
6 something that has been turned around in your
7 state that is a promising practice, and you
8 want to take it to scale using these dollars.

9 Am I missing something or is that
10 accurate?

11 MS. WEISS: No. So I would say it
12 is both. I think one of the things we are
13 saying is there is a lot of innovation
14 happening already. Make sure you are looking
15 for it and identifying it as part of what you
16 are doing. It is not necessarily all about
17 brand-new, untried ideas. It might be all
18 about great ideas that are working, but just
19 in small places. So be sure that you are sort
20 of casting a wide net and looking at all of
21 that.

22 MR. VAISHNAV: Hi. Anand from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Tennessee.

2 I just wanted to clarify something
3 you said earlier about the list for
4 persistently low-achieving schools. Let's say
5 that number is 100. Do we have the
6 flexibility to target, say, 50 of the 100 over
7 the course of four years? Or should we target
8 all 100 over the course of four years? Do you
9 have any guidance on, once we identify the
10 list, the numbers that we should be looking
11 at?

12 MS. WEISS: So the guidance is or
13 the criteria state that it is the lowest 5
14 percent of these schools in your state. So
15 whatever that number turns out to be is the
16 number for your state. Or five, whichever is
17 greater.

18 MS. GAGE: Heather Gage from
19 Arkansas.

20 Could you provide just your
21 insight on the struggle that I know Arkansas
22 is having, as well as other states that I have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 talked to, on being risk-taking and innovative
2 and doing those things that we've always
3 wanted to do, but just lacked the human
4 capacity or resources, to the sustainability
5 factor that kind of just slaps us down every
6 now and then? Just what your thoughts are on
7 that?

8 And I know you can't provide too
9 much guidance, and I am not talking about
10 programs or anything like that, but just your
11 insight of the conversations you have had
12 internally?

13 MS. WEISS: Yes, I mean a lot of
14 that are the judgment calls that states are
15 going to have to, obviously, make for
16 themselves. But some of the thinking is that
17 a lot of the things we are talking about are
18 different practices, not necessarily more
19 expensive practices.

20 So, once you sort of invest in
21 getting a new system in place, does it become
22 self-sustaining at the level of funding that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is not too dissimilar from what the level of
2 funding is now? So it is the retooling that
3 is expensive, not the ongoing cost, for some
4 of these things. For others, we realize that
5 is not true, and that is where the balancing
6 act is going to come into play and the
7 judgment calls will have to happen.

8 Have all the non-state folks -- I
9 know some of you have already been asking
10 questions. Any more questions from the
11 members of the public who are here?

12 I think there's one over here.

13 DR. KIRBY: Yes, I apologize if
14 you answered this, but in calculating the
15 state's, I mean an LEA's proportionate share,
16 does that get calculated over the five years
17 or does it have to be calculated each year of
18 the five years?

19 MS. WEISS: So the LEA share would
20 be calculated once at the beginning, when
21 looking at the entire grant. Then it would be
22 spent down over the course of the four years

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in whichever way, you know, consistent with
2 the budgets that you put together.

3 DR. KIRBY: So that LEA doesn't
4 have to get something every year, as long as
5 it gets its share over the course of the
6 grant?

7 MS. WEISS: Oh, I see what you're
8 saying. So the LEA could, with your approval,
9 one LEA could decide I'm spending all the
10 money in the first year for this reason, and
11 then I'm done?

12 DR. KIRBY: Actually, I was
13 thinking that the state might want to give an
14 LEA more money one year, so that it could
15 maybe kick off some turnaround schools. Then,
16 the next year, give another group their -- I
17 mean staying with their proportionate share,
18 but not giving them that proportion each year,
19 so that we could have more money to an LEA in
20 one year and maybe none or less in another
21 year.

22 MS. WEISS: So the consensus up

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here is that you should send that question in
2 to us.

3 DR. KIRBY: Okay.

4 MS. WEISS: Just because you have
5 sort of tested the extremes. In general, an
6 LEA doesn't have to spend the money in equal
7 amounts through every year of the four years.

8 But you have asked it in a way that sort of
9 tests some extremes. So send it in to us, so
10 that we can just make sure that we are
11 answering you right at those extremes.

12 Any other questions? One right
13 here.

14 MS. KNOX: Hi. I'm Allyson Knox
15 from Microsoft.

16 We are just curious about the
17 identification process with the peer review,
18 how that happens. How do you identify them?
19 How are they nominated? Which groups
20 nominated the people?

21 I know it is probably on the
22 website somewhere, but I didn't find it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WEISS: Yes. So, back at the
2 end of August, the Secretary actually issued
3 an open call for reviewers, in which he put
4 forward a number of criteria for the kinds of
5 experiences and expertise that we were looking
6 for in the people who would review this
7 competition.

8 We actually are preparing one of
9 the FAQs that has to do with just more
10 descriptions of the competition. We will give
11 you the link that lets you find the letter,
12 because the call expired at the end of
13 September. So it is still on the website, but
14 the links to it are gone.

15 So, if you are interested in
16 seeing the letter and seeing what those
17 criteria are, we will give you back the link
18 in the FAQ, so you can see that.

19 The call expired on September
20 30th. And as of September 30th, we had
21 received about 1500 applications or
22 nominations from around the country for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people.

2 So we have been in the process of
3 going through a process of both checking out
4 those people against the criteria that we put
5 forward as well as checking for availability.

6 We have narrowed that list down to a mere
7 1,000 and are still narrowing it further.
8 That group also has to go through intensively
9 conflict-of-interest vetting with our General
10 Counsel's office.

11 So the big picture steps are
12 vetting them against whether they actually
13 meet the criteria that we set and vetting them
14 against conflict-of-interest issues. And that
15 will allow us to get the final group. We need
16 about 70 -- we are not sure until we know how
17 many applications, but we are something in the
18 60-to-75-people range for each phase of the
19 competition.

20 Any other questions?

21 DR. SLACK: Hi. This is a charter
22 question. If a CMO manages seven charters,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 each serving as its own LEA, can any of the
2 funds be allocated for the CMO to help those
3 seven LEAs with their -- or does the money
4 have to flow through or be directed just to
5 those seven charters that serve as LEAs?

6 MS. WEISS: The money has to flow
7 through to LEAs. LEAs can have an agreement
8 with some central office to pass funds back
9 between the charter and the CMO, but the money
10 flows to the LEA.

11 DR. SLACK: Right. So the CMO can
12 have some of the funding or be allocated some
13 of the funding through some sort of agreement
14 to assist with that?

15 MS. WEISS: Not through an
16 agreement with the state, though. The state
17 money flows to the LEA.

18 DR. SLACK: Uh-hum. But with the
19 seven --

20 MS. WEISS: So, then, the LEA is
21 putting together its budget with the state,
22 and that budget might have --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. SLACK: Okay. Thank you.

2 MS. WEISS: There's one over here,
3 guys. Mississippi.

4 MR. HILL: Martez Hill,
5 Mississippi.

6 Are there any restrictions on the
7 use of these dollars in terms of
8 supplement/not supplant, maintenance of
9 effort, so on and so forth?

10 MS. WEISS: Jane?

11 MS. HESS: There isn't a
12 supplement/supplant provision. I mean there
13 are things in the FAQs, one which is like on
14 summative assessments. But there's not a
15 matching -- there is not a supplement/not
16 supplant provision. No maintenance of effort.

17 It is a discretionary grant. It
18 is a discretionary grant that, oddly, has 50
19 percent of it going by formula to your group
20 of LEAs.

21 MS. WEISS: But we do want to say
22 that the work has to be in support of this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 grant. So that is the sort of weird thing,
2 right? There is no supplement/not supplant
3 provision in the law, but the law says that
4 the work has to go to the work of this grant.

5 So the bottom line is the money has to be
6 spent to do this work.

7 MS. HESS: Always has to be
8 consistent with your state's plan that gets
9 approved.

10 DR. JONAS: Hi. Deborah Jonas
11 from Virginia.

12 Page 97 of the application
13 specifies that we should not include
14 information about specific contractors that
15 may be used to provide services or goods in
16 the proposed project.

17 Would that apply as well to, say,
18 naming validated measures of something as part
19 of a project?

20 MS. WEISS: So naming validated
21 measures of something? Say more about what
22 that is.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. JONAS: So, if we wanted to
2 pilot measures of teacher or principal
3 evaluation, and we wanted to give the LEAs
4 some options for existing validated measures
5 to use for that work, can we name some of
6 those validated measures as potential options
7 in the application?

8 MS. WEISS: Yes, I think that the
9 thing you are pointing to in the application
10 is really us just saying we are not trying to
11 violate procurement laws within the state.
12 So, to the extent that the state can't
13 determine contractors until it has the funds
14 in hand and goes through whatever its normal
15 procurement process is, for that reason, you
16 don't have to name contractors before you have
17 gone through your procurement process. So
18 that is all that that is talking about.

19 So tell me if I'm not
20 understanding how that does or doesn't connect
21 to your question.

22 DR. JONAS: I'll just check with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our Procurement Office.

2 MS. WEISS: Okay. And then send
3 in a question to us if it is still unclear.

4 MS. COTMAN-DIXON: Hi. My name is
5 Yinda Dixon. I am with the College of
6 Southern Nevada.

7 I just had a quick question. You
8 talk a lot in the MOU about state recourse.
9 On the other side of that, if funds are passed
10 out to the LEA and the state is sort of
11 disqualified, or whatever, for non-
12 performance, what happens to those funds?

13 MS. HESS: The state is the
14 grantee. And if the state loses the grant, so
15 would everyone else.

16 MS. WEISS: And on that happy
17 note -- (laughter) -- do you have one more
18 question? Do you have a happier question to
19 end on? Because we are just about at five
20 o'clock, and I do want to be respectful of the
21 fact that people have planes to catch.

22 MS. HESS: I have one also happy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 note maybe.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. WEISS: Well, good.

4 MS. HESS: We'll just add to it.

5 And Meredith did a great job of
6 covering this before, but, humorously and
7 seriously, 4:30 and one second is too late,
8 and we really don't want to reject anyone's
9 application because it came in one second too
10 late on the date stamp. So really make sure
11 that we get it before 4:30 on the deadline
12 day.

13 MS. WEISS: Well, there you go.

14 (Laughter.)

15 And now it is almost five o'clock
16 and one second.

17 So I will let you go with a couple
18 of requests for you. We are going to send you
19 a follow-up evaluation form. We really would
20 like your feedback.

21 In many ways, this is sort of the
22 kickoff of the TA activities that we are going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to be engaging in over the course of this
2 grant. So, even though we don't have any more
3 events exactly like this one, your feedback
4 will really help us get better and better at
5 trying to run events that really are effective
6 and meet your needs.

7 We have done the best we could of
8 putting ourselves in your shoes and trying to
9 provide you with the information and a
10 structure for giving you that information that
11 we hoped would be effective for you, but,
12 really, you are the judges of that. So we
13 will send you an evaluation form, and please
14 do let us know anything that you think that we
15 could do differently in the future that would
16 make meetings like this more effective and
17 more efficient for all of you.

18 And thank you so much for coming.

19 I know that many of you have flown long
20 distances to be here. We really appreciate
21 it, hope that it was a good use of your time,
22 and that you are walking away with a better

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sense of what it is you need to do and how it
2 is that you need to organize your work over
3 the coming weeks to get through this process.

4 We know that we have put a lot on
5 your shoulders in the last couple of weeks, as
6 we have put out the SFSF Phase 2 guidance, the
7 School Improvement grant guidance, the Race to
8 the Top information. So we know that there is
9 a lot on you and that there's fewer of you
10 than maybe there were in your state offices a
11 year ago. We really do appreciate that.

12 We will continue to do our best to
13 be quick in getting you answers to questions,
14 trying to make sure that things that we do are
15 as consistent and aligned as possible, so at
16 least we are not sending you in 12 different
17 directions.

18 And please consider it an open
19 line to get us input of any type that you
20 think we could benefit from to help you do a
21 better job.

22 So thank you very, very much for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 coming. We really appreciate your time.

2 (Applause.)

3 (Whereupon, at 5:00 p.m., the
4 proceedings in the above-entitled matter were
5 adjourned.)

6

7

8

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701