

# **Race to the Top Annual Performance Report**

**CFDA Number: 84.395**

**U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, D.C. 20202**

**OMB Number: 1894-XXXX  
Expiration Date: XX/XX/XXXX**

## **Public Burden Statement**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 17 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit under P.L. 111-5 Section 406 (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-4536 or email [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-XXXX. Note: Please do not return the completed Race to the Top Annual Performance Report to this address.

## **Race to the Top Annual Performance Report**

The Department has developed a Race to the Top program review process that not only addresses the Department's responsibilities for fiscal and programmatic oversight, but is designed to identify areas to differentiate support based on individual State needs, as well as certain topics where States can leverage work with each other and with experts to achieve and sustain educational reforms that improve student outcomes. The program review process is composed of multiple components including onsite reviews, stocktakes and annual performance reports. For more information on the full program review process, please visit <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/review-guide.pdf>.

The Race to the Top Annual Performance Report (APR) will document grantees' progress toward the annual targets set forth by the grantees in their Race to the Top applications. The annual performance measures States included in their applications are leading indicators of their success towards increasing student outcomes. Therefore, the APR is one mechanism for holding States accountable for meeting their annual targets or making significant progress towards them. States will provide information on the laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines that affect key elements of their Race to the Top plans, and report on their progress in meeting the absolute priority (a comprehensive and coherent approach to education reform), and competitive preference priority (an emphasis on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics). In addition, States will provide information on their progress in meeting the invitational priority areas in their approved plans, which may include innovations for improving early learning outcomes; expansion and adaptation of statewide longitudinal data systems; P-20 coordination, vertical and horizontal alignment; and school-level conditions for reform, innovation, and learning.

In the Year 1 APR, grantees will provide data from school year (SY) 2010-11. In subsequent years, data will be collected for SYs 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15. In States' Race to the Top applications, States provided percentage baselines for some metrics. States also provided denominators for these baseline percentages for some metrics, while for others the Department noted that these data would be requested of grantees in the future. For purposes of cross-State comparison, clarity, and data integrity, we are purposely asking grantees to provide both the numerator and denominator that would produce the percentages for the identified metrics. After grantees have uploaded the data requested in the APR to the online collection tool, the system will generate a report that shows percentages. This report will also permit comparison between the baseline, the targets for SY 2010-11 provided in the State's Race to the Top plan, and the actual SY 2010-11 data provided in the APR.

For each of the elements numbered (1 to 21) below, a grantee may enter text to clarify or explain the data provided in that element. Grantees are asked to reference the date of any relevant approved amendments to their applications.

States should report data in a manner consistent with the definitions in the Race to the Top application package, which are provided at the end of this document. To provide additional context for data analysis, States are asked in several instances to define the assumptions behind the calculations of figures provided in the application for baselines and targets. For example, States provided a number of principals statewide, and are now asked to provide an updated count and to define “principal.”

Where indicated, the report data will be prepopulated with data from the grantees’ Race to the Top application, or with data provided to the Department through other data collections, such as the Common Core of Data (CCD) from the National Center for Education Statistics.

**(A) State Success Factors**

**1a) (A)(1): Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it.**

**(A)(1)(iii):** Report on the number of LEAs that are participating in the State’s Race to the Top plans.

	<b>Statewide (#)</b>	<b>Participating LEAs (as indicated in the application)</b>	<b>Participating LEAs (#) as of June 30, 2011</b>	<b>Involved LEAs (#) as of June 30, 2011</b>
<b>LEAs</b>	<i>[CCD data, SY10-11-]</i>	[Prepopulated]		
<b>Schools</b>	<i>[CCD data, SY10-11]</i>	[Prepopulated]		
<b>K-12 Students</b>		[Prepopulated]		-
<b>Students in poverty</b>		[Prepopulated]		

For statewide data that is prepopulated, confirm the data or provide alternative figures and a brief explanation. Since States provided LEA and school-level poverty data in the Race to the Top application, the Department expects that States aggregated the data to

produce a statewide total. If in the initial application, the State used a different method to provide this figure, please provide an explanation of the method used.

**1b) (A)(1)(iii): Provide the name and NCES ID for each participating LEA as of June 30, 2011.**

<b>LEA</b>	<b>NCES ID</b>
<b>[Prepopulated]</b>	<b>[Prepopulated]</b>

Provide a brief explanation of any change in the number of participating LEAs from figure provided in the application.

**1c) (A)(1)(ii)(b):** Complete the summary table below, indicating the number of participating LEAs committed to implementing the State’s plan in each of the reform areas listed below.

<b>Elements of State Reform Plans</b>	<b>Number of LEAs Participating (#) as of June 30, 2011</b>	<b>Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)</b> [The Department will calculate the percentage based on the number of LEAs participating in each element and the total number of LEAs participating; these numbers will be provided by the States.]
<b>B. Standards and Assessments</b>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments		[See note above.]
<b>C. Data Systems to Support Instruction</b>		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:		

<b>Elements of State Reform Plans</b>	<b>Number of LEAs Participating (#) as of June 30, 2011</b>	<b>Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)</b> [The Department will calculate the percentage based on the number of LEAs participating in each element and the total number of LEAs participating; these numbers will be provided by the States.]
(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems		[See note above.]
(ii) Professional development on use of data		
(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers		
<b>D. Great Teachers and Leaders</b>		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:		
(i) Measure student growth		[See note above.]
(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems		
(iii) Conduct annual evaluations		
(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development		
(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention		
(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification		
(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal		
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers		

<b>Elements of State Reform Plans</b>	<b>Number of LEAs Participating (#) as of June 30, 2011</b>	<b>Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)</b> [The Department will calculate the percentage based on the number of LEAs participating in each element and the total number of LEAs participating; these numbers will be provided by the States.]
and principals:		
(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools		[See note above.]
(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas		
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:		
(i) Quality professional development		[See note above.]
(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development		
<b>E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools</b>		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools		[See note above.]

**1d) (D)(4):** Report on the number of teachers in participating LEAs. Report on the number of principals in participating LEAs.

Please provide the State’s definition of “teacher,”<sup>1</sup> and “principal.” Please note that States are to use headcount numbers (rather than full-time equivalents) when reporting the numbers of teachers and principals.

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of National Center for Education Statistics and EdFacts data collections, “teacher” is defined as “a professional school staff member who instructs students in prekindergarten, kindergarten, grades 1–12, or ungraded classes and maintains daily student attendance records.”

<b>Term</b>	<b>State's definition</b>
"Teacher"	
"Principal"	

Please provide the State's definition of "mathematics teachers," "science teachers," "special education teachers," and "teachers in language instruction educational programs."

<b>Term</b>	<b>State's definition</b>
"Mathematics teachers"	
"Science teachers"	
"Special education teachers"	
"Teachers in language instruction educational programs"	

	<b>Statewide (#)</b>	<b>Participating LEAs (#) as of June 30, 2011</b>	<b>Involved LEAs (#) as of June 30, 2011</b>
<b>Principals</b>			
<b>Teachers</b>			

**(A)(1)(iii) Student outcomes data:** States will be held accountable for increasing student achievement, increasing high school graduation rates, narrowing the achievement gaps, and preparing students for success in college and the workforce. Accordingly, student outcomes data will be collected to inform Race to the Top Program Review activities. For year 1, it was not feasible to entirely

align the collection of student outcomes data for Race to the Top with the EDFacts data collection; however, in subsequent years we anticipate better aligning the collections. Data will be cross-checked with EDFacts data when available. Reading and math assessment results are to be submitted to EDFacts in December 2011, while high school graduation rate, college enrollment, and college course completion are to be submitted in February 2012. Please note that the Department will use the data provided by grantees to calculate achievement gaps to determine progress toward States' performance targets.

**2a): English language arts and mathematics assessment results**

- (i) If available, provide data on English language arts and mathematics assessments results (as required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or ESEA) for 2010-11 by grade and subgroup (racial/ethnic groups, gender, disability status, Limited English Proficiency (LEP) status, economically disadvantaged status), including how many students were tested and how many students tested as proficient or higher.
- (ii) Confirm the 2009-10 data on reading and math assessment results reported through EDFacts.

**2b) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading and mathematics assessment results:** NAEP data, including achievement gaps based on NAEP data, will be provided by Department sources as available.

**2c) High school graduation rate:** Provide high school graduation rate (as defined in the Race to the Top application) in total and by subgroup (racial/ethnic groups, gender, disability status, LEP status, economically disadvantaged status) for the most recent year available (e.g. 2009-10) and the year prior.

**2d) College enrollment:** Provide college enrollment data (as defined in the Race to the Top application) in total and by subgroup (racial/ethnic groups, gender, disability status, LEP status, economically disadvantaged status) for the most recent year available (e.g. 2009-10) and the year prior.

**2e) College course completion:** Provide the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education (as indicated in the Race to the Top application) in total and by subgroup (racial/ethnic groups, gender, disability status, LEP status, economically disadvantaged status) for the most recent year available (e.g. 2009-10) and the year prior.

**(B) Standards and Assessments**

**3) (B)(2): Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments.** Has the State implemented any common, high-quality assessments aligned to college- and career-ready standards in SY 2010-11? If so, please indicate what assessment and for which grades. Please note that the Department does not expect States to begin implementing such assessments until SY 2014-15.



**4) (B)(3): Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments.** If the State provided optional performance measures in its approved application or approved amendments to its plan, the State is to report against those measures.

**(C) Data System to Support Instruction**

**5) (C)(1): Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system.** For each of the America COMPETES elements, indicate if the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes the element as of June 30, 2011.

<u>America COMPETES Element</u>	<u>Included (Yes/No)</u>	Optional explanatory comment (provide a short update or a State website URL where progress reports are available)
1: A unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system		
2: Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information		
3: Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete P-16 education programs		
4: The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems		
5: A State data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability		

6: Yearly test records of individual students with respect to assessments under section 1111(b) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b))		
7: Information on students not tested by grade and subject		
8: A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students		
9: Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned		
10: Student-level college readiness test scores		
11: Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll		
12: Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.		

**6) (C)(2): Accessing and using State data.** If the State provided optional performance measures in its approved application or approved amendments to its plan, the State must report against those measures.

**7) (C)(3): Using data to improve instruction.** If the State provided optional performance measures in its approved application or approved amendments to its plan, the State must report against those measures.

**(D) Great Teachers and Leaders**

Use headcount numbers (rather than full-time equivalents) when reporting data for criteria (D)(1) through (D)(4).

**(D)(1): Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals.**

**8a):** In narrative form, describe any changes to legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions made since the submission of the Race to the Top application that allow alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals.

For 8(b)-(d), report the data for the most recent year for which data is available, and for the year prior (e.g. school years 2009-10 and 2008-09).

**8b) (i):** Report the number of programs that currently provide alternative routes to certification, and specify if it certifies teachers, principals, or both.

**8c)(ii):** Report the number of teachers who successfully completed an alternative route to certification in the State. Report the number of principals who successfully completed an alternative route to certification in the State.

**8d)(iii):** Report the number of teachers who were newly certified statewide. Report the number of principals who were newly certified statewide.

**9) (D)(2): Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance.**

Note: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions in the Race to the Top application package. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii): rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that: (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.		Baseline (Percentage)	End of SY 2010- 2011 (Number)
Criteria			
(D)(2)(i)	Number of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application)	Prepopulated from application	
(D)(2)(ii)	Number of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers	Prepopulated from application	
(D)(2)(ii)	Number of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals	Prepopulated from application	
(D)(2)(iv)	Number of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:		

(D)(2)(iv)(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher and principal development</li> </ul>	Prepopulated from application	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher and principal compensation</li> </ul>	Prepopulated from application	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher and principal promotion</li> </ul>	Prepopulated from application	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of effective teachers and principals</li> </ul>	Prepopulated from application	
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Granting of tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals</li> </ul>	Prepopulated from application	
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal of ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals</li> </ul>	Prepopulated from application	
		<b>Teachers</b>	<b>Principals</b>
(D)(2)(ii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems		
(D)(2)(iii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year		
(D)(2)(iii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year		
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year		
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year		
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior		

	academic year		
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year		
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year		

**10) (D)(3): Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals.**

Provide the number of teachers, principals, or schools in the applicable rating category (the numerator) and the total number of teachers (or principals) in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (or, as the case may be, low-poverty, low-minority, or both), for participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems (the denominator). The Department will calculate the percentages.

	Baseline	End of SY 2010-2011 (Number)
<b>Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)</b>  All information below is requested for all schools in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems (as defined in the Race to the Top application).		
Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application).	[Prepopulated from application]	
Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application).	[Prepopulated]	
Note: The Department will calculate percentages later in this section based on the separate denominator and numerator information provided by the State in the tables below. Since the State initially provided this data as percentages, baseline data are not relevant.	<b>Teachers</b>	<b>Principals</b>

Total number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application).		
Total number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application).		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in the RTT application) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in the RTT application) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application) who were evaluated as effective or better (as defined in the Race to the Top application) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application) who were evaluated as effective or better (as defined in the Race to the Top application) in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.		
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top application) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.		
<b>Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)</b>	Baseline (Percentage)	End of SY 2010-2011 (Percentage)
Note: Do not submit data for the table below. The SY10-11 targets will be calculated based on the data provided (as numerators and denominators) in the tables above.		
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	[Prepopulated from application]	[The Department

		will calculate each cell in this column based on data provided by States in tables above]
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	[Prepopulated from application]	
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are effective or better (as defined in this notice).	N/A	
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are effective or better (as defined in this notice).	N/A	
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	[Prepopulated from application]	
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	[Prepopulated from application]	
Percentage of principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	[Prepopulated from application]	
Percentage of principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	[Prepopulated from application]	
Percentage of principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are effective or better (as defined in this notice).	N/A	
Percentage of principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are effective or better (as defined in this notice).	N/A	
Percentage of principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	[Prepopulated from application]	
Percentage of principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	[Prepopulated from application]	

<b>Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii)</b>  Note: All information below is requested for participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.	Baseline (Percentage)	End of SY 2010- 2011 (Number)
Number of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	[Percentage prepopulated from application]	
Number of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.		
Number of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.		
Number of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.		
Total number of mathematics teachers.	[Prepopulated]	
Total number of science teachers.	[Prepopulated]	
Total number of special education teachers.	[Prepopulated]	
Total number of teachers in language instruction educational programs.	[Prepopulated]	

**11) (D)(4): Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs.**  
 Provide the numerator and the denominator, and the Department will calculate the percentage.



	Baseline	End of SY 2010-2011
Number of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application) of the graduates' students.	[Percentage prepopulated from application]	
Number of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application) of the graduates' students.	[Percentage prepopulated from the application]	
Total number of teacher preparation programs in the State.	[Prepopulated]	
Total number of principal preparation programs in the State.	[Prepopulated]	
Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.		
Number of principals prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.		
Number of teachers in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs.		
Number of principals in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs.		

**12) (D)(5): Providing effective support to teachers and principals.** If the State provided optional performance measures in its approved application or approved amendments to its plan, the State is to report against those measures.

**13) (E)(1): Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs.** Report any changes, from the time of application through June 30, 2011, in the State's legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

**14) (E)(2): Turning around the lowest-achieving schools.** For each school for which one of the four school intervention models was initiated (that is, school(s) in the first year of implementation) in SY 2010-11, list the school name and the respective school ID. For

each of those schools, indicate the participating LEA with which it is affiliated and that LEA’s NCES ID number. Lastly, indicate which of the four school intervention models was initiated.

<b>School name</b>	<b>School ID</b>	<b><i>Participating LEA</i></b>	<b>NCES ID</b>	<b>School intervention model initiated in SY 2010-11</b> Models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, transformation model

Total number of schools for which an intervention model was implemented in SY 2010-11: \_\_\_\_\_

**15) (F)(1)(ii): Making education funding a priority**

Describe in narrative form any changes from the time of application through June 30, 2011, to State policies that relate to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools and other schools.

**16) (F)(2): Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools**

Describe in narrative form any changes from the time of application through June 30, 2011, in the extent to which--

**16a):** The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools in the State, measured by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;

**16b):** The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

**16c):** The State’s charter schools receive equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

**16d):** The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

**16e):** The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools.

### **Absolute Priority**

**17) Comprehensive approach to education reform:** Describe the State’s progress in implementing a comprehensive and coherent approach to education reform from the time of application through June 30, 2011. In particular, highlight key accomplishments over the reporting period in the four reform areas: standards and assessments, data systems to support instruction, great teachers and leaders, and turning around lowest-achieving schools. States are also encouraged to describe examples of LEAs’ progress in the four reform areas.

### **Competitive Priority: Emphasis on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM):**

**18 a):** Provide at least two performance measures to report on the State’s progress in STEM. Provide baseline data for SY 2009-10 and SY 2010-11, and targets for SY 2011-12, SY 2012-13, and SY 2013-14. If applicable to the selected performance measure(s), provide targets for student subgroups (racial/ethnic groups, gender, disability status, LEP status, economically disadvantaged status). Note that the State may use existing goals provided in the Race to the Top application by adding targets and baseline data.

**18b) (Optional):** Describe the State’s progress in implementing, consistent with its approved application, a high-quality plan to address the need to (i) offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering; (ii) cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other STEM-capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students; and (iii) prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

**Invitational Priorities: Describing the State’s progress in the four invitational priority areas listed below is optional. A State may address an invitational priority area even if it did not respond directly to the priority in its Race to the Top application. Report on progress from the time of application through June 30, 2011.**

**19a) Innovations for improving early learning outcomes (Optional):** Describe the State’s progress in implementing, consistent with its approved application, practices, strategies, or programs to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (pre-kindergarten through third grade) by enhancing the quality of preschool programs. Describe the State’s progress specifically in implementing practices that (i) improve school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive); and (ii) improve the transition between preschool and kindergarten.

**19b) Expansion and adaptation of statewide longitudinal data Systems (Optional):** Describe the State’s progress expanding, consistent with its approved application, statewide longitudinal data systems to include or integrate data from special education programs, English language learner programs, early childhood programs, at-risk and dropout prevention programs, and school climate and culture programs, as well as information on student mobility, human resources (*i.e.*, information on teachers, principals, and other staff), school finance, student health, postsecondary education, and other relevant areas, with the purpose of connecting and coordinating all parts of the system to allow important questions related to policy, practice, or overall effectiveness to be asked, answered, and incorporated into effective continuous improvement practices. In addition, describe the State’s progress in working together with other States to adapt one State’s statewide longitudinal data system so that it may be used, in whole or in part, by one or more other States, rather than having each State build or continue building such systems independently.<sup>2</sup>

**19c) P-20 coordination, vertical, and horizontal alignment (Optional):** Describe the State’s progress addressing, consistent with the approved application, how early childhood programs, K-12 schools, postsecondary institutions, workforce development organizations, and other State agencies and community partners (*e.g.*, child welfare, juvenile justice, and criminal justice agencies) will coordinate to improve all parts of the education system and create a more seamless preschool-through-graduate school (P-20) route for students. Vertical alignment across P-20 is particularly critical at each point where a transition occurs (*e.g.*, between early childhood and K-12, or between K-12 and postsecondary/careers) to ensure that students exiting one level are prepared for success, without remediation, in the next. Horizontal alignment, that is, coordination of services across schools, State agencies, and community partners, is also important in ensuring that high-need students (as defined in the Race to the Top application) have access to the broad array of opportunities and services they need and that are beyond the capacity of a school itself to provide.

---

<sup>2</sup> Successful applicants that receive Race to the Top grant awards will need to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), including 34 CFR Part 99, as well as State and local requirements regarding privacy.

**19d) School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning (Optional):** Describe progress consistent with the State’s approved application, of participating LEAs creating the conditions for reform and innovation as well as the conditions for learning by providing schools with flexibility and autonomy in such areas as—

- (i) Selecting staff;
- (ii) Implementing new structures and formats for the school day or year that result in increased learning time (as defined in the Race to the Top application);
- (iii) Controlling the school’s budget;
- (iv) Awarding credit to students based on student performance instead of instructional time;
- (v) Providing comprehensive services to high-need students (as defined in the Race to the Top application) (e.g., by mentors and other caring adults; through local partnerships with community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other providers);
- (vi) Creating school climates and cultures that remove obstacles to, and actively support, student engagement and achievement; and
- (vii) Implementing strategies to effectively engage families and communities in supporting the academic success of their students.

**20) Additional optional performance measures:** If the State submitted additional optional performance measures in its approved application or approved amendments to its plan, the State must report against those measures.

**Budget:**

**21a) Expenditures:** Report the actual expenditure totals for each of the categories listed in the summary budget table and project-level budget tables in the State’s approved budget as of June 30, 2011.

<b>Summary Expenditure Table</b>
----------------------------------

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1</b>	<b>Project Year 2</b>	<b>Project Year 3</b>	<b>Project Year 4</b>	<b>Total</b>
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)					
14. Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (50% of Total Grant)					
15. Total Budget (lines 13-14)					

**Project-Level Expenditure Table**

**Project Name:**

**Associated with Criteria:**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 (c)</b>	<b>Project Year 4 (d)</b>	<b>Total (e)</b>
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)					

**21b) Obligations (Optional):**

To provide additional context for the spending activity on the Race to the Top grant, grantees may include additional budgetary information, such as figures for funds obligated in addition to funds expended or descriptive text.



**Definitions (as set forth in the Race to the Top Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria, and Race to the Top program guidance, and as found in the Race to the Top application)**

**Alternative routes to certification** means pathways to certification that are authorized under the State’s laws or regulations, that allow the establishment and operation of teacher and administrator preparation programs in the State, and that have the following characteristics (in addition to standard features such as demonstration of subject-matter mastery, and high-quality instruction in pedagogy and in addressing the needs of all students in the classroom including English language learners<sup>3</sup> and student with disabilities): (a) can be provided by various types of qualified providers, including both institutions of higher education and other providers operating independently from institutions of higher education; (b) are selective in accepting candidates; (c) provide supervised, school-based experiences and ongoing support such as effective mentoring and coaching; (d) significantly limit the amount of coursework required or have options to test out of courses; and (e) upon completion, award the same level of certification that traditional preparation programs award upon completion.

**College enrollment** refers to the enrollment of students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1) and who enroll in an institution of higher education as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1001).

**Common set of K-12 standards** means a set of content standards that define what students must know and be able to do and that are substantially identical across all States in a consortium. A State may supplement the common standards with additional standards, provided that the additional standards do not exceed 15 percent of the State's total standards for that content area.

**Effective principal** means a principal whose students, overall and for each subgroup, achieve acceptable rates (*e.g.*, at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that principal effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application). Supplemental measures may include, for example, high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates, as well as evidence of providing supportive teaching and learning conditions, strong instructional leadership, and positive family and community engagement.

**Effective teacher** means a teacher whose students achieve acceptable rates (*e.g.*, at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that

---

<sup>3</sup> The term English language learner, as used in this notice, is synonymous with the term limited English proficient, as defined in section 9101 of the ESEA.

teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application). Supplemental measures may include, for example, multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance.

**Formative assessment** means assessment questions, tools, and processes that are embedded in instruction and are used by teachers and students to provide timely feedback for purposes of adjusting instruction to improve learning.

**Graduation rate** means the four-year or extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as defined by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1).

**Highly effective principal** means a principal whose students, overall and for each subgroup, achieve high rates (*e.g.*, one and one-half grade levels in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that principal effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application). Supplemental measures may include, for example, high school graduation rates; college enrollment rates; evidence of providing supportive teaching and learning conditions, strong instructional leadership, and positive family and community engagement; or evidence of attracting, developing, and retaining high numbers of effective teachers.

**Highly effective teacher** means a teacher whose students achieve high rates (*e.g.*, one and one-half grade levels in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application). Supplemental measures may include, for example, multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance or evidence of leadership roles (which may include mentoring or leading professional learning communities) that increase the effectiveness of other teachers in the school or LEA.

**High-minority school** is defined by the State in a manner consistent with its Teacher Equity Plan. The State should provide, in its Race to the Top application, the definition used.

**High-need LEA** means an LEA (a) that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or (b) for which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the LEA are from families with incomes below the poverty line.

**High-need students** means students at risk of educational failure or otherwise in need of special assistance and support, such as students who are living in poverty, who attend high-minority schools (as defined in the Race to the Top application), who are far below grade level, who have left school before receiving a regular high school diploma, who are at risk of not graduating with a diploma on time, who are homeless, who are in foster care, who have been incarcerated, who have disabilities, or who are English language learners.

**High-performing charter school** means a charter school that has been in operation for at least three consecutive years and has demonstrated overall success, including (a) substantial progress in improving student achievement (as defined in the Race to the Top application); and (b) the management and leadership necessary to overcome initial start-up problems and establish a thriving, financially viable charter school.

**High-poverty school** means, consistent with section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA, a school in the highest quartile of schools in the State with respect to poverty level, using a measure of poverty determined by the State.

**High-quality assessment** means an assessment designed to measure a student's knowledge, understanding of, and ability to apply, critical concepts through the use of a variety of item types and formats (*e.g.*, open-ended responses, performance-based tasks). Such assessments should enable measurement of student achievement (as defined in the Race to the Top application) and student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application); be of high technical quality (*e.g.*, be valid, reliable, fair, and aligned to standards); incorporate technology where appropriate; include the assessment of students with disabilities and English language learners; and to the extent feasible, use universal design principles (as defined in section 3 of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 3002) in development and administration.

**Increased learning time** means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, including English; reading or language arts; mathematics; science; foreign languages; civics and government; economics; arts; history; and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.<sup>4</sup>

**Innovative, autonomous public schools** means open enrollment public schools that, in return for increased accountability for student achievement (as defined in the Race to the Top application), have the flexibility and authority to define their instructional models and

---

<sup>4</sup> Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year. (See Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. "The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School." *Child Development*. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-497 and research done by Mass2020.) Extending learning into before- and after-school hours can be difficult to implement effectively, but is permissible under this definition with encouragement to closely integrate and coordinate academic work between in-school and out-of school. (See James-Burdumy, Susanne; Dynarski, Mark; Deke, John. "When Elementary Schools Stay Open Late: Results from The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." <[http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/redirect\\_PubsDB.asp?strSite=http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/296](http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/redirect_PubsDB.asp?strSite=http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/296)> *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 29 (4), December 2007, Document No. PP07-121.)

associated curriculum; select and replace staff; implement new structures and formats for the school day or year; and control their budgets.

**Instructional improvement systems** means technology-based tools and other strategies that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with meaningful support and actionable data to systemically manage continuous instructional improvement, including such activities as: instructional planning; gathering information (*e.g.*, through formative assessments (as defined in the Race to the Top application), interim assessments (as defined in the Race to the Top application), summative assessments, and looking at student work and other student data); analyzing information with the support of rapid-time (as defined in the Race to the Top application) reporting; using this information to inform decisions on appropriate next instructional steps; and evaluating the effectiveness of the actions taken. Such systems promote collaborative problem-solving and action planning; they may also integrate instructional data with student-level data such as attendance, discipline, grades, credit accumulation, and student survey results to provide early warning indicators of a student's risk of educational failure.

**Interim assessment** means an assessment that is given at regular and specified intervals throughout the school year, is designed to evaluate students' knowledge and skills relative to a specific set of academic standards, and produces results that can be aggregated (*e.g.*, by course, grade level, school, or LEA) in order to inform teachers and administrators at the student, classroom, school, and LEA levels.

**Involved LEAs** means LEAs that choose to work with the State to implement those specific portions of the State's plan that necessitate full or nearly-full statewide implementation, such as transitioning to a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in the Race to the Top application). Involved LEAs do not receive a share of the 50 percent of a State's grant award that it must subgrant to LEAs in accordance with section 14006(c) of the ARRA, but States may provide other funding to involved LEAs under the State's Race to the Top grant in a manner that is consistent with the State's application.

**Low-minority school** is defined by the State in a manner consistent with its Teacher Equity Plan. The State should provide, in its Race to the Top application, the definition used.

**Low-poverty school** means, consistent with section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA, a school in the lowest quartile of schools in the State with respect to poverty level, using a measure of poverty determined by the State.

**Participating LEAs** means LEAs that choose to work with the State to implement all or significant portions of the State's Race to the Top plan, as specified in each LEA's agreement with the State. Each participating LEA that receives funding under Title I, Part A will receive a share of the 50 percent of a State's grant award that the State must subgrant to LEAs, based on the LEA's relative share of

Title I, Part A allocations in the most recent year, in accordance with section 14006(c) of the ARRA. Any participating LEA that does not receive funding under Title I, Part A (as well as one that does) may receive funding from the State's other 50 percent of the grant award, in accordance with the State's plan.

**Persistently lowest-achieving schools** means, as determined by the State: (i) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that (a) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or (b) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and (ii) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that (a) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or (b) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years. To identify the lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both (i) The academic achievement of the "all students" group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and (ii) The school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group.

**Qualifying evaluation systems** means those that meet the following criteria: rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that: (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.

**Rapid-time**, in reference to reporting and availability of locally-collected school- and LEA-level data, means that data are available quickly enough to inform current lessons, instruction, and related supports.

**Student achievement** means—

(a) For tested grades and subjects: (1) a student's score on the State's assessments under the ESEA; and, as appropriate, (2) other measures of student learning, such as those described in paragraph (b) of this definition, provided they are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

(b) For non-tested grades and subjects: alternative measures of student learning and performance such as student scores on pre-tests and end-of-course tests; student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

**Student growth** means the change in student achievement (as defined in the Race to the Top application) for an individual student between two or more points in time. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

**Total revenues available to the State** means either (a) projected or actual total State revenues for education and other purposes for the relevant year; or (b) projected or actual total State appropriations for education and other purposes for the relevant year.

**America COMPETES Act elements** means (as specified in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of that Act): (1) a unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system; (2) student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information; (3) student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete P–16 education programs; (4) the capacity to communicate with higher education data systems; (5) a State data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability; (6) yearly test records of individual students with respect to assessments under section 1111(b) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)); (7) information on students not tested by grade and subject; (8) a teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students; (9) student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned; (10) student-level college readiness test scores; (11) information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework; and (12) other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.

**SCHOOL INTERVENTION MODELS**  
**(Appendix C in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria;**  
**and in the Notice Inviting Applications)**

There are four school intervention models referred to in Selection Criterion (E)(2): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. Each is described below.

(a) Turnaround model. (1) A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must--

(i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;

(ii) Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,

(A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and

(B) Select new staff;

(iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;

(iv) Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;

(v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;

(vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and "vertically aligned" from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;

(vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;

(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the Race to the Top application); and

(ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

(2) A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as—

(i) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or

(ii) A new school model (*e.g.*, themed, dual language academy).

(b) Restart model. A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides "whole-school

operation” services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

(c) School closure. School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

(d) Transformation model. A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:

(1) Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;

(B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--

(1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top application) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high-school graduations rates; and

(2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;

(C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high-school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;

(D) Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (*e.g.*, regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and

(E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.



(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as--

(A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;

(B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or

(C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.

(2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and "vertically aligned" from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and

(B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--

(A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;

(B) Implementing a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model;

(C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;

(D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and

(E) In secondary schools--

(1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;

(2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;

(3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or

(4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

(3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the Race to the Top application); and

(B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--

(A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;

(B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;

(C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or

(D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

(4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and

(B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

(ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--

(A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA;  
or

(B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

If a school identified as a persistently lowest-achieving school has implemented, in whole or in part within the last two years, an intervention that meets the requirements of the turnaround, restart, or transformation models, the school may continue or complete the intervention being implemented.