FY 2013 Race to the Top - District
Application for Funding

CFDA Number: 84.416

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202
OMB Number: 1894-0014
Expiration Date: TBD
Paperwork 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 225 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 (Title III of Division F of P.L. 112-74, the "Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012", Dec. 23, 2011). 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 20202-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-0014. Note: Please do not return the completed Race to the Top-District application to this address.

APPLICATION FOR FUNDING UNDER RACE TO THE TOP - DISTRICT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dear Colleague:

Today, we are excited to announce the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition. The Race to the Top – District program builds on four years of bold reform efforts at the state and local level to reduce barriers to effective teaching and create better conditions for learning. This competition provides another opportunity for school districts to build upon local innovation, demonstrate how they can personalize education for students in their schools, and lay a blueprint for raising student achievement, decreasing the achievement gap across student groups, and increasing the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. The Department anticipates awarding approximately $120 million to LEAs through this competition.

Last year's competition generated 372 applicants and the Department awarded approximately $383 million to 16 grantees representing 55 school districts, based on their plans to deepen student learning and make equity and access to high-quality education a priority. Today, we are taking the next step forward by formally inviting applications for this second phase.

This competition builds on the momentum catalyzed by past Race to the Top competitions, and we look forward to the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition further accelerating innovation at the local level. We must educate our way forward to a stronger and brighter future and invest in teachers and leaders who are forging the path. It is our absolute hope and expectation that this competition will help achieve that goal.

Sincerely,

Arne Duncan

I. APPLICATION INTRODUCTION, INSTRUCTIONS, AND SUBMISSION PROCEDURES

Introduction

Race to the Top is authorized under sections 14005 and 14006 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The Race to the Top State competitions provided incentives to States to adopt bold and comprehensive reforms in elementary and secondary education and laid the foundation for unprecedented innovation. A total of 46 States and the District of Columbia put together plans to implement college- and career-ready standards, use data systems to guide learning and teaching, evaluate and support teachers and school leaders, and turn around their lowest-performing schools. The purpose of the Race to the Top – District competition is to build on the momentum of other Race to the Top competitions by encouraging bold, innovative reform at the local level. In the FY 2012 competition, the Department awarded approximately $383 million to 16 Race to the Top – District grantees representing 55 local educational agencies (LEAs), with grants ranging from $10 to $40 million.

The Race to the Top – District competition invites applicants to demonstrate how they can personalize education for all students in their schools. The Race to the Top – District competition is aimed squarely at classrooms and the all-important relationship between educators and students. An LEA or consortium of LEAs receiving an award under this competition will build on the experience of States and districts in implementing reforms in the four core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice[1]) through Race to the Top and other key programs. A successful applicant will provide teachers the information, tools, and supports that will enable them to meet the needs of each student and substantially accelerate and deepen each student's learning. These LEAs will have the policies, systems, infrastructure, capacity, and culture to enable teachers, teacher teams, and school leaders to continuously focus on improving individual student achievement and closing achievement gaps. These LEAs will also make equity and access a priority and aim to prepare each student to master the content and skills required for college- and career-readiness, provide each student the opportunity to pursue a rigorous course of study, and accelerate and deepen students' learning through attention to their individual needs. As important, they will create opportunities for students to identify and pursue areas of personal academic interest – all while ensuring that each student masters critical areas identified in college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready high school graduation requirements.

General Instructions

The U.S. Department of Education (the Department) encourages all potential applicants to read through the entire application package – including this application, the electronic budget spreadsheets, and the notice inviting applications (NIA) – and the Frequently Asked Questions

1 The NFP establishes the priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria and the Notice Inviting Applications (NIA) explains how the priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria established in the NFP apply to the FY 2013 competition. When we refer to the term "notice" in these FAQs, we are referring to the NIA. Many relevant sections of the notice are included in this document for the convenience of applicants. The Department will publish the NFP and the NIA for the Fiscal Year 2013 Race to the Top – District competition in the Federal Register. The final NFP and NIA will be posted on the Race to the Top –District Web site at www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district once they are published in the Federal Register.

document before beginning to prepare the application proposal. The Frequently Asked Questions document will be posted on our website at www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district, and may be updated periodically.

This application includes Parts that require a response or an action by the applicant, as well as several Parts of background information that are directly relevant to the program. For example, Part XII includes definitions that are used throughout the application.

Instructions for Responding to Priorities and Selection Criteria

The application provides space for an applicant to address the selection criteria, including performance measures and supporting evidence. As required by Absolute Priority 1 (explained in more detail below), in responding to the selection criteria, an applicant must coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the four core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) to create personalized learning environments. Applicants need not address every individual selection criterion. However, an applicant will not earn points for selection criteria that it does not address.

Evidence: Some selection criteria require applicants to provide specific evidence; this is indicated in the criteria. In addition, an applicant may provide additional evidence for any criterion it chooses.

An applicant must provide the evidence in the narrative text below each selection criterion or provide an attachment in the Appendix. Where an applicant chooses to include evidence in the Appendix, it must describe the evidence and how it demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion in the narrative text and note its location in the Appendix.

Appendix: The Appendix must include a complete Table of Contents. Each attachment in the Appendix should include page numbers and be described in the narrative text of the relevant selection criterion, including how it demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion and a notation of its location in the Appendix.

Competition Priorities: The Race to the Top - District competition includes five absolute priorities and a competitive preference priority. These competition priorities can be found in Parts VIII and X of this application. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3) we consider only applications that meet Absolute Priority 1 and one of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5. Applicants must address Absolute Priority 1 in their responses to the selection criteria. Applicants do not write to Absolute Priority 1 separately. Applicants must also identify, through the Application Assurances in Part V (for individual LEA applicants) or VI (for consortia applicants), which one of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 applies to the applicant. Applicants may not select more than one of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5. Applicants address the Competitive Preference Priority in Part X of its application response and should provide any evidence in the narrative text or in an attachment in the Appendix.

Competition Description and Scoring Chart

For information on the competition review and selection process, see (a) the section titled Review and Selection Process in the NIA; and (b) Part XIV, Scoring Overview and Chart (Appendix A in the NIA). In addition, maximum point values have been included throughout the application.

Technical Assistance

To assist applicants in preparing the application and to respond to questions, the Department will host a Technical Assistance webinar for potential applicants. The purpose of the webinar is for Department staff to review the selection criteria, requirements, and priorities, and answer technical questions about the Race to the Top - District competition. For more information about the webinar, please visit www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district. Updates about all events will be available on the Race to the Top - District website at www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district. Webinar participation is strongly encouraged. For those who cannot attend, the webinar and transcripts will be available on our website. Announcements of any other conference calls or webinars and Frequently Asked Questions (see below) will also be available on the Race to the Top - District website www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district.

Frequently Asked Questions

The Department will prepare Frequently Asked Questions in order to assist applicants in completing an application. The Frequently Asked Questions will be available at www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district. Any updated Frequently Asked Questions will be available at this website as well.

Notice of Intent to Apply

We will be able to develop a more efficient process for reviewing grant applications if we know the approximate number of applicants that intend to apply for funding under this competition. Therefore, the Secretary strongly encourages each potential applicant to notify us of the applicant's intent to submit an application for funding by completing a Web-based form by August 23, 2013. When completing this form, applicants will provide (1) the applicant's name and address; (2) whether the applicant is applying as an individual LEA or as a consortium of LEAs, including a list of the names of expected participating LEAs; (3) expected budget request; and (4) contact person (and phone number and email). Applicants may access this form online at www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district. Applicants that do not complete this form may still apply for funding. In addition, the Secretary encourages LEAs that submit a notice of intent to apply to also notify relevant local stakeholders so that such stakeholders are aware of the applicant's intent to apply and can engage in the application process as appropriate.

Submission Information

Applications for the Race to the Top – District competition **must be received** by the Department on or before **October 3, 2013**.

Applications for grants under this competition must be submitted in electronic format on a CD or DVD, with CD-ROM or DVD-ROM preferred, by mail or hand delivery. The Department strongly recommends the use of overnight mail. Applications not received by the submission date and time (e.g., postmarked on the deadline date but arriving late) will not be considered.

Designation of Proprietary Information in Appendix A

Given the types of projects that may be proposed in applications for the Race to the Top – District program, an application may include business information, generally commercial or financial information, that the applicant considers proprietary. The Department's regulations define "business information" in 34 CFR 5.11.

Following the process used with our previous Race to the Top competitions, we plan to post applications on our website, so you may wish to request confidentiality of business information.

Consistent with Executive Order 12600, please designate in your application any information that you feel is exempt from disclosure under Exemption 4 of the Freedom of Information Act. In an attachment in Appendix A, titled "Disclosure Exemption," please list the page number or numbers on which we can find this information. For additional information please see 34 CFR 5.11(c).

Accommodation or Auxiliary Aid

Individuals with disabilities who need an accommodation or auxiliary aid in connection with the application process should contact the person listed under For Further Information Contact in section VII of the NIA. If the Department provides an accommodation or auxiliary aid to an individual with a disability in connection with the application process, the individual's application remains subject to all other requirements and limitations in this notice.

Application Format

The application narrative is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria and priorities that reviewers use to evaluate your application. We strongly recommend you limit the application narrative to no more than 200 pages, using the following standards:

- A "page" is 8.5" x 11", on one side only, with 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.
- Each page has a page number.
- Line spacing for the narrative is set to 1.5 spacing, and the font used is 12 point Times New Roman.

The recommended page limit does not apply to the appendices; however we strongly recommend that you limit appendix length to the extent possible. The Department strongly requests applicants to follow the recommended page limits, although the Department will consider applications of greater length.

Submission Procedures

Applicants for a grant under this competition must submit: (1) an electronic copy of the application; and (2) signed originals of certain sections of the application. Applicants must submit their application in electronic format on a CD or DVD, with CD-ROM or DVD-ROM preferred. We strongly recommend that the applicant submit three CDs or DVDs. Each of these three CDs or DVDs should include the following four files:

(1) A single file that contains the body of the application narrative, including required budget tables, that has been converted into a searchable .PDF document. Note that a .PDF created from a scanned document will not be searchable (see Application Format section above);
(2) A single file that contains all application appendices in a .PDF format;
(3) A single file in a .PDF format that contains all of the required signature pages. The signature pages may be scanned and turned into a PDF. Consortia applicants should also include all signed MOUs or other binding agreements for each LEA in the consortium; and
(4) A single, separate file of the completed electronic budget spreadsheets (e.g., .XLS or .XLSX formats) that includes the required budget tables and budget justifications (the spreadsheets will be used by the Department for budget reviews).

Each of these items must be clearly labeled with the LEA's or lead LEA's name, city, State, and any other relevant identifying information. Applicants also must not password-protect these files. Additionally, please ensure that: (1) all three CDs or DVDs contain the same four files; (2) the files are not corrupted; and (3) all files print correctly. The Department is not responsible for reviewing any information that is not able to be opened or printed from your application package.
In addition to the electronic files, applicants must submit signed originals of certain sections of the application. An individual LEA applicant must submit signed originals of Parts IV, V, and VII of the application. An application from a consortium of LEAs must include signed originals of Parts IV, VI, and VII of the application as well as a signed memorandum of understanding (MOU) from each LEA in the consortium (as described in Part XIII of the application).

The Department will not review any paper submissions of the application narrative and appendices.

All applications must be submitted by mail or hand delivery. Whether you submit an application by mail or hand delivery, you must indicate on the envelope the CFDA number, including suffix letter, if any, of the competition under which you are submitting your application. The instructions for each delivery method are provided below.

The Department must receive the application by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on or before October 3, 2013. If we receive an application after the application deadline, we will not consider that application.

Submission of Applications by Mail
If you submit your application by mail (through the U.S. Postal Service or a commercial carrier), we must receive your three CDs or DVDs containing the four application files, and the signed originals of the appropriate Parts (Parts IV, V, and VII for an individual LEA applicant, or Parts IV, VI, and VII and memoranda of understanding for a consortium applicant) on or before the application deadline date and time. Therefore, to avoid delays, we strongly recommend sending the application via overnight mail. Mail the application to the Department at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Attention: CFDA Number 84.416
LBJ Basement Level 1
400 Maryland Avenue, SW.
Washington, DC 20202-4260

If we receive an application after the application deadline, we will not consider that application.

Submission of Applications by Hand Delivery
If you submit your application by hand delivery, you (or a courier service) must deliver the three CDs or DVDs containing the four application files, and the signed originals of the appropriate Parts (Parts IV, V, and VII for an individual LEA applicant, or Parts IV, VI, and VII and memoranda of understanding for a consortium applicant), on or before the application deadline date and time, to the Department at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Attention: CFDA Number 84.416
550 12th Street, SW.
Room 7041, Potomac Center Plaza
Washington, DC 20202-4260

The Application Control Center accepts hand deliveries daily between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Washington, DC time, except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays. In accordance with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) §75.216 (b) and (c), an application will not be evaluated for funding if the applicant does not comply with all of the procedural rules that govern the submission of the application or the application does not contain the information required under the program.

Note for Mail or Hand Delivery of Applications: When you mail or hand deliver your application to the Department--

(1) You must indicate on the envelope the CFDA number, including suffix letter, if any, of the competition under which you are submitting your application; and

(2) The Application Control Center will mail to you a notification of receipt of your grant application. If you do not receive this notification within 15 business days from the application deadline date, you should call the U.S. Department of Education Application Control Center at (202) 245-6288.

II. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

(1) Eligible applicants: To be eligible for a grant under this competition:

(a) An applicant must be an individual LEA (as defined in this notice) or a consortium of individual LEAs from one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(i) LEAs may apply for all or a portion of their schools, for specific grades, or for subject-area bands (e.g., lowest-performing schools, secondary schools, schools connected by a feeder pattern, middle school math, or preschool through third grade).

(ii) Consortia may include LEAs from multiple States.

(iii) Each LEA may participate in only one Race to the Top – District application. Successful applicants (i.e., grantees) from past Race to the Top – District competitions may not apply for additional funding.

(b) An applicant must serve a minimum of 2,000 participating students (as defined in this notice) or may serve fewer than 2,000 participating students (as defined in this notice) provided those students are served by a consortium of at least 10 LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students (as defined in this notice). An applicant must base its requested award amount on the number of participating students (as defined in this notice) it proposes to serve at the time of application or within the first 100 days of the grant award.

(c) At least 40 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) across all participating schools (as defined in this notice) must be students from low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, or other poverty measures that LEAs use to make awards under section 1113(a) of the ESEA. If an applicant has not identified all participating schools (as defined in this notice) at the time of application, it must provide an assurance that within 100 days of the grant award it will meet this requirement.

(d) An applicant must demonstrate its commitment to the core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice), including, for each LEA included in an application, an assurance signed by the LEA's superintendent or CEO that—

(i) The LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year—

(A) A teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice);

(B) A principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice); and

(C) A superintendent evaluation (as defined in this notice);

(ii) The LEA is committed to preparing all students for college or career, as demonstrated by—

(A) Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice); or

(B) Measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

(iii) The LEA has a robust data system that has, at a minimum—

(A) An individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match; and

(B) The capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth (as defined in this notice);

(iv) The LEA has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12th grade and higher education data; and

(v) The LEA ensures that any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with the FERPA.

(e) Required signatures for the LEA or lead LEA in a consortium are those of the superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable).

III. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

(1) State comment period. Each LEA included in an application must provide its State at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and submit as part of its application package--

(a) The State's comments or, if the State declined to comment, evidence that the LEA offered the State 10 business days to comment; and

(b) The LEA's response to the State's comments (optional).

(2) Mayor (or city or town administrator) comment period. Each LEA included in an application must provide its mayor or other comparable official at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and submit as part of its application package --

(a) The mayor or city or town administrator's comments or, if that individual declines to comment, evidence that the LEA offered such official 10 business days to comment; and

(b) The LEA's response to the mayor or city or town administrator comments (optional).

(3) Consortium. For LEAs applying as a consortium, the application must--

(a) Indicate, consistent with 34 CFR 75.128, whether—

(i) One member of the consortium is applying for a grant on behalf of the consortium; or

(ii) The consortium has established itself as a separate, eligible legal entity and is applying for a grant on its own behalf;

(b) Be signed by--

(i) If one member of the consortium is applying for a grant on behalf of the consortium, the superintendent or chief executive officer (CEO), local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable) of that LEA; or

(ii) If the consortium has established itself as a separate eligible legal entity and is applying for a grant on its own behalf, a legal representative of the consortium; and

(c) Include, consistent with 34 CFR 75.128, for each LEA in the consortium, copies of all memoranda of understanding or other binding agreements related to the consortium. These binding agreements must —

(i) Detail the activities that each member of the consortium plans to perform;

(ii) Describe the consortium governance structure (as defined in this notice);

(iii) Bind each member of the consortium to every statement and assurance made in the application; and

(iv) Include an assurance signed by the LEA's superintendent or CEO that—

(A) The LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year—

(1) A teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice);

(2) A principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice); and

(3) A superintendent evaluation (as defined in this notice);

(B) The LEA is committed to preparing students for college or career, as demonstrated by—

(1) Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice); or

(2) Measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

(C) The LEA has a robust data system that has, at a minimum—

(1) An individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match; and

(2) The capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth (as defined in this notice);

(D) The LEA has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12th grade and higher education data; and

(E) The LEA ensures that any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA); and

(v) Be signed by the superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable).

IV. APPLICATION ASSURANCES
(CFDA No. 84.416)

Legal Name of Applicant[2]:	Applicant's NCES District ID[3]:
Applicant's Mailing Address:	
Employer Identification Number:	Organizational DUNS Number:
Race to the Top – District Contact Name: (Single point of contact for communication)	Contact Position and Office:
Contact Telephone:	Contact E-mail Address:
Required Applicant Signatures: • To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct. • I further certify that I have read the application, am fully committed to it, and will support its implementation. • I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)	
Superintendent or CEO of individual LEA or lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of Superintendent or CEO of individual LEA or lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity:	Date:
Local School Board President (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of Local School Board President:	Date:
President of the Local Teacher Union or Association, where applicable, if not applicable provide rationale on pg.18 or pg.24 (Printed Name)[4]:	Telephone:
Signature of the President of the Local Teacher Union or Association:	Date:

2 Individual LEA, lead LEA for the consortium, or eligible legal entity.
3 Consortium applicants must provide the NCES District ID for each LEA in the consortium in Part VI, Program - Specific Assurances for Consortia Applicants. Applicants may obtain the NCES District ID at http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch.
4 Where the signature is not applicable, write "N/A" and provide a rationale for why the signature is not applicable.

V. PROGRAM-SPECIFIC ASSURANCES FOR INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANTS

Individual LEA applicants must complete the forms in this part. For consortia applicants, the lead LEA or representative of the eligible legal entity must complete the forms in Part VI.

ABSOLUTE PRIORITIES – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANT

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments.

An applicant must address Absolute Priority 1 in its response to the selection criteria. Applicants do not write to Absolute Priority 1 separately.

Absolute Priorities 2 through 5

Applicants do not write to Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 separately. Instead, they complete this part by identifying the one (and only one) of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 that applies. Please check one of the priorities below.

_**Absolute Priority 2: Non-Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition

_**Absolute Priority 3: Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

_**Absolute Priority 4: Non-Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

_**Absolute Priority 5: Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

NOTE: Race to the Top Phase 1, 2, and 3 States are: Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and the District of Columbia.

BUDGET REQUIREMENT – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANT
By completing this part, the applicant assures that its Race to the Top – District budget request conforms to the established budget ranges for the competition. The number of participating students is . The total Race to the Top – District grant funds requested is $, which is within the following range: (Check the **one** range of participating students (all as defined in this notice) that applies) $4-10 million - 2,000-5,000 participating students $10-20 million - 5,001-10,000 participating students $20-25 million - 10,001-20,000 participating students $25-30 million - 20,001+ participating students

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANT

By checking the applicable statement(s) below, the applicant assures that:

_The applicant meets the definition of local educational agency (as defined in this notice).

The applicant is from one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

This application is the only Race to the Top – District application to which the applicant has signed on.

The applicant has not received a past Race to the Top – District grant, either as an individual LEA or as a lead or member LEA of a consortium.

This application serves a minimum of 2,000 participating students (as defined in this notice).

At least 40 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) across all participating schools (as defined in this notice) are students from low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, or other poverty measures that LEAs use to make awards under section 1113(a) of the ESEA ***OR*** if the applicant has not identified all participating schools (as defined in this notice) at the time of application, the applicant assures that within 100 days of the grant award it will meet this standard.

The applicant has demonstrated its commitment to the core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) and assures that --

(i) The LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year—

(A) A teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice);
(B) A principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice); and
(C) A superintendent evaluation (as defined in this notice);

(ii) The LEA is committed to preparing all students for college or career, as demonstrated by—(check one that applies)

(A) Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice); or

(B) Measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

(iii) The LEA has a robust data system that has, at a minimum—

(A) An individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match; and

(B) The capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth (as defined in this notice);

(iv) The LEA has the capability to receive or match student level preschool-through-12th grade and higher education data; and

(v) The LEA ensures that any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with FERPA.

_The application is signed by the superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable).

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANTS

By checking the applicable statement(s) below, the applicant assures that the:

State comment period was met. The LEA provided its State at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and has submitted as part of its application package--

- The State's comments ***OR*** evidence that the State declined to comment
- The LEA's response (optional) to the State's comments

(The submitted comments, evidence, and responses are located in Part , from pages to of the proposal.)

Mayor (or city or town administrator) comment period was met. The LEA provided its mayor or other comparable official at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and has submitted as part of its application package—

- The mayor or city or town administrator's comments ***OR***, if that individual declines to comment, evidence that the LEA offered such official 10 business days to comment
- The LEA's response (optional) to the mayor or city or town administrator comments

(The submitted comments, evidence, and responses are located in Part , from pages to of the proposal.)

Rationale why signature of President of the Local Teacher Union or Association is not applicable	
LEA Name	**Where not applicable, provide a rationale for why the signature is not applicable**
1.	

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL FOR ALL RESPONSES TO SECTION V

Superintendent or CEO of the LEA (Printed Name):	
Signature of Superintendent or CEO of the LEA:	Date:

VI. PROGRAM-SPECIFIC ASSURANCES FOR CONSORTIA APPLICANTS

The lead LEA or legal representative of the eligible legal entity must complete the forms in this part and sign on behalf of all members of the consortium. Individual LEA applicants must complete the forms in Part V.

ABSOLUTE PRIORITIES – CONSORTIUM APPLICANT

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments.

The applicant must address Absolute Priority 1 in its response to the selection criteria. Applicants do not write to Absolute Priority 1 separately.

Absolute Priorities 2 through 5

Applicants do not write to Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 separately. Instead, they complete this part by identifying the one (and only one) of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 that applies. Please check one of the priorities below.

Absolute Priority 2: Non-Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States. To meet this priority, an applicant must be a consortium of LEAs in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

Absolute Priority 3: Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States. To meet this priority, an applicant must be a consortium of LEAs in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

Absolute Priority 4: Non-Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States. To meet this priority, an applicant must be a consortium of LEAs in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

Absolute Priority 5: Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States. To meet this priority, an applicant must be a consortium of LEAs in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

NOTE: Race to the Top Phase 1, 2, and 3 States are: Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and the District of Columbia.

BUDGET REQUIREMENT – CONSORTIUM APPLICANTS
In completing this part, the applicant assures that its Race to the Top – District budget request conforms to the established budget ranges for the Race to the Top – District competition. The number of participating LEAs is , and the number of participating students is . The total Race to the Top – District grant funds requested is $, which is within the following range: (Check the **one** range of participating students (all as defined in this notice) that applies) $4-10 million - 2,000-5,000 participating students (as defined in this notice) or fewer than 2,000, provided those students are served by a consortium of at least 10 LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students (as defined in this notice) _$10-20 million - 5,001-10,000 participating students _$20-25 million - 10,001-20,000 participating students _$25-30 million - 20,001+ participating students

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS – CONSORTIUM APPLICANTS
By checking the applicable statement(s) below, the applicant assures that: _Each member (including the lead LEA) of the consortium meets the definition of local educational agency. _Each member (including the lead LEA) of the consortium is from one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. _This application is the only Race to the Top – District application to which the lead LEA and any member of the consortium has signed on. No LEA in the consortium has received a past Race to the Top – District grant, either as an individual LEA or as a lead or member LEA of a consortium.

_This application serves a minimum of 2,000 participating students (as defined in this notice) or serves fewer than 2,000, provided those students are served by a consortium of at least 10 LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students (as defined in this notice).

_At least 40 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) across all participating schools (as defined in this notice) are students from low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, or other poverty measures that LEAs use to make awards under section 1113(a) of the ESEA ***OR*** if the applicant has not identified all participating schools (as defined in this notice) at the time of application, the applicant assures that within 100 days of the grant award it will meet this standard.

_The applicant has demonstrated its commitment to the core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) and the superintendent or CEO for each LEA has assured that --

(i) The LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year—

(A) A teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice);

(B) A principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice); and

(C) A superintendent evaluation (as defined in this notice);

(ii) The LEA is committed to preparing all students for college or career, as demonstrated by—

(A) Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice); or

(B) Measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

(iii) The LEA has a robust data system that has, at a minimum—

(A) An individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match; and

(B) The capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth (as defined in this notice);

(iv) The LEA has the capability to receive or match student level preschool-through-12th grade and higher education data; and

(v) The LEA ensures that any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with FERPA.

_The application is signed by the lead LEA's superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable).

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS – CONSORTIUM APPLICANTS

By checking the applicable statement(s) below, the applicant assures that the:

_State comment period was met. Each LEA included in the consortium has provided its State at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and has submitted as part of the application package—

- The State's comments ***OR*** evidence that the State declined to comment; and
- The LEA's response (optional) to the State comment.

(The submitted comments, evidence, and responses for each LEA are located in Part , from pages to of the proposal.)

_Mayor (or city or town administrator) comment period was met. Each LEA included in the consortium has provided its mayor or other comparable official at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and submitted as part of the application package—

- The mayor or city or town administrator's comments ***OR***, if that individual declines to comment, evidence that the LEA offered such official 10 business days to comment
- The LEA's response (optional) to the mayor or city or town administrator comments

(The submitted comments, evidence, and responses for each LEA are located in Part , from pages to of the proposal.)

_The application is consistent with 34 CFR 75.128 in that: (check one that applies)

One member of the consortium is applying for a grant on behalf of the consortium; or

The consortium has established itself as a separate, eligible legal entity and is applying for a grant on its own behalf.

_The application is signed by: (check one that applies)

The superintendent or chief executive officer (CEO), local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable) of that LEA, if one member of the consortium is applying for a grant on behalf of the consortium; or

A legal representative of the consortium, if the consortium has established itself as a separate, eligible legal entity and is applying for a grant on its own behalf.

_The Application includes, consistent with 34 CFR 75.128, for each LEA in the consortium, copies of all memoranda of understanding or other binding agreements. These binding agreements must:

(i) Detail the activities that each member of the consortium plans to perform;

(ii) Describe the consortium governance structure (as defined in this notice);

(iii) Bind each member of the consortium to every statement and assurance made in the application; and

(iv) Include an assurance signed by the LEA's superintendent or CEO that—

(A) The LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year—

(1) A teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice);

(2) A principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice); and

(3) A superintendent evaluation (as defined in this notice);

(B) The LEA is committed to preparing students for college or career, as demonstrated by—

(1) Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice); or

(2) Measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

(C) The LEA has a robust data system that has, at a minimum—

(1) An individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match; and

(2) The capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth (as defined in this notice);

(D) The LEA has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12th grade and higher education data; and

(E) The LEA ensures that any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA); and

(v) Be signed by the superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable).

List of NCES District IDs for each LEA in the Consortium			
LEA Name	**State**	**Role in Consortium (i.e., Lead or Member LEA)**	**NCES District ID**[5]
1. [*Add more rows as needed*]			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

List of Individuals Who Have Signed MOUs Submitted with the Application				
LEA Name	**Name of Superintendent or CEO who signed the MOU**	**Name of Local School Board President who signed the MOU**	**Name of Local Teacher Union or Association President who signed the MOU, where applicable**[6] **(write "N/A" if not applicable)**	**Where "not applicable," provide a rationale for why the signature is not applicable**
1. [*Add more rows as needed*]				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL FOR ALL RESPONSES TO SECTION VI

5 Applicants may obtain the NCES District ID at http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch.

6 For a detailed explanation of when teacher union or association signatures are applicable, refer to the Frequently Asked Questions document posted on the Race to the Top – District website www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district.

Superintendent or CEO of Lead LEA or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity (Printed Name):	
Signature Superintendent or CEO of Lead LEA or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity:	Date:

VII. OTHER ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

Accountability, Transparency and Reporting Assurances

The Superintendent or CEO of the individual LEA or lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity, assures that:

- The LEA or consortium will comply with all of the accountability, transparency, and reporting requirements that apply to the Race to the Top – District program, including:
    - For each year of the program, the LEA or consortium will submit a report to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

Other Assurances and Certifications

The Superintendent or CEO of the individual LEA or lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity, assures or certifies the following:

- The LEA or consortium will comply with all applicable assurances in OMB Standard Forms 424B (Assurances for Non-Construction Programs) and to the extent consistent with the application, OMB Standard Form 424D (Assurances for Construction Programs), including the assurances relating to the legal authority to apply for assistance; access to records; conflict of interest; merit systems; nondiscrimination; Hatch Act provisions; labor standards; flood hazards; historic preservation; protection of human subjects; animal welfare; lead-based paint; Single Audit Act; and the general agreement to comply with all applicable Federal laws, executive orders and regulations.
- With respect to the certification regarding lobbying in Department Form 80-0013, no Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making or renewal of Federal grants under this program; the applicant, and for consortia each LEA, will complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," when required (34 CFR Part 82, Appendix B); and the applicant will require the full certification, as set forth in 34 CFR Part 82, Appendix A, in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers.
- Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State a set of assurances that meets the requirements of section 442 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (20 U.S.C. 1232e).
- Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State (through either its State Fiscal Stabilization Fund application or another U.S. Department of Education Federal grant) a description of how the LEA will comply with the requirements of section 427 of GEPA (20 U.S.C. 1228a). The description must include information on the steps the LEA proposes to take to permit students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries to

overcome barriers (including barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability, and age) that impede access to, or participation in, the program.

- All entities receiving funds under this grant will comply with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including the following provisions as applicable: 34 CFR Part 74–Administration of Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; 34 CFR Part 75–Direct Grant Programs; 34 CFR Part 77– Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations; 34 CFR Part 80– Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, including the procurement provisions; 34 CFR Part 81–General Education Provisions Act–Enforcement; 34 CFR Part 82– New Restrictions on Lobbying; 34 CFR Part 84–Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Financial Assistance); and with the debarment and suspension regulations found at 2 CFR Part 3485.

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL FOR ALL ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS IN SECTION VII

Superintendent or CEO of Individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity (Printed Name):	
Signature of Superintendent or CEO of Individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity:	Date:

VIII. ABSOLUTE PRIORITIES

Absolute Priority 1

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments. To meet this priority, an applicant must coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

An applicant must address Absolute Priority 1 in its responses to the selection criteria. Applicants do not write to Absolute Priority 1 separately.

Absolute Priorities 2 – 5

Absolute Priority 2: Non-Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States.[7] To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA or a consortium of LEAs in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

Absolute Priority 3: Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States. To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA or a consortium of LEAs in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

Absolute Priority 4: Non-Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States. To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA or a consortium of LEAs in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

Absolute Priority 5: Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States. To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA or a consortium of LEAs in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

The applicant must identify, through the Program-Specific Assurances in Part V or VI, which one of the Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 applies to the applicant.

---

7 Race to the Top Phase 1, 2, and 3 States are: Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and the District of Columbia.

IX. SELECTION CRITERIA

A. Vision (40 total points)

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision *(10 points)*

The extent to which the applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that--

(a) Builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice);

(b) Articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests; and

(c) Describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation *(10 points)*

The extent to which the applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal (e.g., schools, grade bands, or subject areas) will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of that proposal, including—

(a) A description of the process that the applicant used or will use to select schools to participate. The process must ensure that the participating schools (as defined in this notice) collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements;

(b) A list of the schools that will participate in grant activities (as available); and

(c) The total number of participating students (as defined in this notice), participating students (as defined in this notice) from low-income families, participating students (as defined in this notice) who are high-need students (as defined in this notice), and participating educators (as defined in this notice). If participating schools (as defined in this notice) have yet to be selected, the applicant may provide approximate numbers.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change *(10 points)*

The extent to which the application includes a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools (as defined in this notice), and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals (e.g., the applicant's logic model or theory of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served by the applicant).

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes *(10 points)*

The extent to which the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA(s), overall and by student subgroup (as defined in this notice), for each participating LEA in the following areas:

(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth).
(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice).
(c) Graduation rates (as defined in this notice).
(d) College enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates.

Optional: The extent to which the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals for each participating LEA in the following area:

(e) Postsecondary degree attainment.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

The high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) should include key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Peer reviewers will reward applicants for developing goals that – in light of the applicant's proposal – are "ambitious yet achievable." In determining whether an applicant has "ambitious yet achievable" annual goals, peer reviewers will examine the applicant's goals in the context of the applicant's proposal and the evidence submitted in support of the proposal. There is no specific goal that peer reviewers will be looking for here; nor will higher goals necessarily be rewarded above lower ones.

For optional goal (A)(4)(e): Applicants scores will not be adversely impacted if they choose not to address optional goal (A)(4)(e).

(Enter text here.)

(A)(2) Applicant's Approach to Implementation (Note to applicant: Add more rows as needed)

			School Demographics								
			Raw Data Actual numbers or estimates (Please note where estimates are used)						**Percentages**		
			A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**
LEA *(Column relevant for consortium applicants)*	**Participating School**	**Grades/Subjects included in Race to the Top - District Plan**	# of Participating Educators	# of Participating Students	# of Participating high-need students	# of Participating low-income students	Total # of low-income students in LEA or Consortium	Total # of Students in the School	% of Participating Students in the School (B/F)*100	% of Participating students from low-income families (D/B)*100	% of Total LEA or consortium low-income population (D/E)*100
[*LEA Name*]	*[Name of school] (If known at time of application)*		#	#	#	#	#	#	%	%	%
[*LEA Name*]	*[Name of school]*										
[*LEA Name*]	*[Name of school]*										
	[Add or delete rows as needed]										
TOTAL											100%

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes
(Note to applicant: Add more rows or subgroups as needed, e.g., to provide information on both proficiency status and growth, to address additional grade levels, subjects, etc.)

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test):

Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above):

Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels):

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2011-12 (optional)	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17	SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)
[e.g., subject, grade, proficiency status or growth]	OVERALL							
	[Subgroup 1]							
	[Subgroup 2]							
	[Subgroup 3]							
	[Subgroup 4]							
	[Subgroup 5]							
	[Subgroup 6]							
	[Subgroup 7]							
	[Subgroup 8]							
[e.g., subject, grade, proficiency status or growth]	OVERALL							
	[Subgroup 1]							
	[Subgroup 2]							
	[Subgroup 3]							
	[Subgroup 4]							

	[Subgroup 5]							
	[Subgroup 6]							
	[Subgroup 7]							
	[Subgroup 8]							
[Repeat as necessary for all applicable grade levels, subjects, etc.]	OVERALL							
	[Subgroup 1]							
	[Subgroup 2]							
	[Subgroup 3]							
	[Subgroup 4]							
	[Subgroup 5]							
	[Subgroup 6]							
	[Subgroup 7]							
	[Subgroup 8]							

(A)(4)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice)									
Specific methodology for determining achievement gap (as defined in this notice), specified for each assessed grade in reading or language arts and in mathematics:									
Goal area	**Identify subgroup and comparison group**		**Baseline(s)**		**Goals**				
	Subgroup	**Comparison Group**	**SY 2011-12 (optional)**	**SY 2012-13**	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17**	**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**
[Achievement Gap measurement (specify grade, subject, and assessment for each)] e.g., Mathematics State Test, Grade 5	*[Subgroup 1]*	*[Comparison Group]*							
	[Subgroup 2]								
	[Subgroup 3]								
	[Subgroup 4]								
	[Subgroup 5]								
	[Subgroup 6]								
	[Subgroup 7]								
	[Subgroup 8]								

[Repeat as necessary] e.g., Mathematics State Test, Grade 6	*[Subgroup 1]*	*[Comparison Group]*							
	[Subgroup 2]								
	[Subgroup 3]								
	[Subgroup 4]								
	[Subgroup 5]								
	[Subgroup 6]								
	[Subgroup 7]								
	[Subgroup 8]								

(A)(4)(c) Graduation rates (as defined in this notice)								
Goal area	**Subgroup**	**Baseline(s)**		**Goals**				
		SY 2011-12 (optional)	**SY 2012-13**	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17**	**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**
High school graduation rate	OVERALL							
	[Subgroup 1]							
	[Subgroup 2]							
	[Subgroup 3]							
	[Subgroup 4]							
	[Subgroup 5]							
	[Subgroup 6]							
	[Subgroup 7]							
	[Subgroup 8]							

(A)(4)(d) College enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates

NOTE: College enrollment should be calculated as the ratio between college-enrolled students and their graduating cohort. For example, for SY 2011-12, the applicant should report college enrollment (as defined in this notice) as a percentage, to be calculated as follows:

- (College enrollment SY 2011-12) = Number of SY 2009-10 graduates enrolled in a higher-education institution during the 16 months after graduation
- (College enrollment rate) = (College enrollment SY 2011-12)÷(Cohort Population, e.g., total number of SY 2009-10 graduates)*100

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2011-12 (optional)	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17	SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)
College enrollment rate	OVERALL							
	[Subgroup 1]							
	[Subgroup 2]							
	[Subgroup 3]							
	[Subgroup 4]							
	[Subgroup 5]							
	[Subgroup 6]							
	[Subgroup 7]							
	[Subgroup 8]							

Optional: (A)(4)(e) Postsecondary Degree Attainment								
Methodology for postsecondary degree attainment:								
Goal area	**LEA**	**Baseline(s)**		**Goals**				
		SY 2011-12 (optional)	**SY 2012-13**	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17**	**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**
Postsecondary degree attainment	OVERALL							
	[LEA 1] (Relevant for consortium applicants)							
	[LEA 2] (Relevant for consortium applicants)							
	[Add or delete rows as needed]							

(B) Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success *(15 points)* The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of— (1) A clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching, including a description, charts or graphs, raw student data, and other evidence that demonstrates the applicant's ability to— (a) Improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps (as defined in this notice), including by raising student achievement, high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), and college enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates; (b) Achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) or in its low-performing schools (as defined in this notice); and (c) Make student performance data (as defined in this notice) available to students, educators (as defined in this notice), and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. *In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria.* *The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.*
(Enter text here.)

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments *(5 points)* The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of— A high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. At a minimum, this information must include a description of the extent to which the applicant already makes available the following four categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds: (a) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances (information on the survey can be found at http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/f33agency.asp); (b) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only; (c) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and (d) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level (if available). *In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria.* *The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.*
(Enter text here.)

(B)(3) State context for implementation *(10 points)* The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of— Successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant’s proposal. *In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria.* *The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant’s success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.*
(Enter text here.)

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support *(15 points)* The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of— Meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal, including— (a) A description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools (as defined in this notice) were engaged in the development of the proposal and, as appropriate, how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback, including— (i) For LEAs with collective bargaining representation, evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools (as defined in this notice); or (ii) For LEAs without collective bargaining representation, at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools (as defined in this notice) support the proposal; and (b) Letters of support from such key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education. *In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria.* *The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.*
(Enter text here.)

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

(C)(1) Learning *(20 points)*

The extent to which the applicant has a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This plan must include an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students (as defined in this notice) that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) and college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs. This includes the extent to which the applicant proposes an approach that includes the following:

<u>Learning</u>: An approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students (as defined in this notice), in an age-appropriate manner such that:

(a) With the support of parents and educators, all students—

(i) Understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals;

(ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals;

(iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest;

(iv) Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning; and

(v) Master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving;

(b) With the support of parents and educators (as defined in this notice), each student has access to—

(i) A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready;

(ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments;

(iii) High-quality content, including digital learning content (as defined in this notice) as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

(iv) Ongoing and regular feedback, including, at a minimum—

(A) Frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); and

(B) Personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and available content, instructional approaches, and supports; and

(v) Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students (as defined in this notice) to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); and

(c) Mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

The high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) should include key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

(Enter text here.)

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading *(20 points)*

The extent to which the applicant has a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This plan must include an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students (as defined in this notice) that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) and college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs. This includes the extent to which the applicant proposes an approach that includes the following:

Teaching and Leading: An approach to teaching and leading that helps educators (as defined in this notice) to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students, in particular high-need students (as defined in this notice), such that:

(a) All participating educators (as defined in this notice) engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity to—

(i) Support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready;

(ii) Adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches (e.g., discussion and collaborative work, project-based learning, videos, audio, manipulatives);

(iii) Frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators (as defined in this notice); and

(iv) Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems (as defined in this notice), including frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness, as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement.

(b) All participating educators (as defined in this notice) have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice). Those resources must include—

(i) Actionable information that helps educators (as defined in this notice) identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests;

(ii) High-quality learning resources (e.g., instructional content and assessments), including digital resources, as appropriate, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and the tools to create and share new resources; and

(iii) Processes and tools to match student needs (see Selection Criterion (C)(2)(b)(i)) with specific resources and approaches (see Selection Criterion (C)(2)(b)(ii)) to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs.

(c) All participating school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice). The training, policies, tools, data, and resources must include:

(i) Information, from such sources as the district's teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice), that helps school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement; and

(ii) Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice).

(d) The applicant has a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals (as defined in this notice), including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education).

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

The high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) should include key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

(Enter text here.)

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

The extent to which the applicant has a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. This includes the extent to which--

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules *(15 points)*

The applicant has practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning by—

(a) Organizing the LEA central office, or the consortium governance structure (as defined in this notice), to provide support and services to all participating schools (as defined in this notice);

(b) Providing school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) in participating schools (as defined in this notice) with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets;

(c) Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic;

(d) Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways; and

(e) Providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners; and

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure *(10 points)*

The LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning by—

(a) Ensuring that all participating students (as defined in this notice), parents, educators (as defined in this notice), and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning), regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal;

(b) Ensuring that students, parents, educators (as defined in this notice), and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies (e.g., peer support, online support, or local support);

(c) Using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format (as defined in this notice) and to use the data in other electronic learning systems (e.g., electronic tutors, tools that make recommendations for additional learning supports, or software that securely stores personal records); and

(d) Ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems (as defined in this notice) (e.g., systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data).

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria. *The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.* *The high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) should include key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.*
(Enter text here.)

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

Because the applicant's plans represent the best thinking at a point in time, and may require adjustments and revisions during implementation, it is vital that the applicant have a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans. This will be determined by the extent to which the applicant has—

(E)(1) Continuous improvement process *(15 points)*
A high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The plan must address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff;

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement *(5 points)*
A high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders; and

(E)(3) Performance measures *(5 points)*
Ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup (as defined in this notice), with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. For each applicant-proposed measure, the applicant must describe—

(a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;

(b) How the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and

(c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The applicant should have a total of approximately 12 to 14 performance measures.
The chart below outlines the required and applicant-proposed performance measures based on an applicant's applicable population. *(Note: A table is provided below to support responses to performance measures in the applicant's narrative.)*

Applicable Population	Performance Measure
All	a) The number and percentage of participating students (as defined in this notice), by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are a highly effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and a highly effective principal (as defined in this notice); and

	b) The number and percentage of participating students (as defined in this notice), by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are an effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and an effective principal (as defined in this notice).
PreK-3	a) Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate measure of students' academic growth (e.g., language and literacy development or cognition and general learning, including early mathematics and early scientific development); and b) Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate non-cognitive indicator of growth (e.g., physical well-being and motor development, or social-emotional development).
4-8	a) The number and percentage of participating students (as defined in this notice), by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice); b) Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan; and c) Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan.
9-12	a) The number and percentage of participating students (as defined in this notice) who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form; b) The number and percentage of participating students (as defined in this notice), by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice); c) Applicant must propose at least one measure of career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students (as defined in this notice) who are or are on track to being career-ready; d) Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan; and e) Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments *(5 points)*
A high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix. *The high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) should include key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.*
(Enter text here.)

(E)(3) Performance Measures – Required for all applicants

Performance Measure (All Applicants – a) a) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are a highly effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and a highly effective principal (as defined in this notice).	**Applicable Population**: All participating students

		Baseline ***[Provide Year]***			**Target**														
					SY 2013-14			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17**			**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**		
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**Highly Effective Teacher and Principal**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**
All participating students	Teacher	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
	Principal																		
[Specific subgroup 1]	Teacher																		
	Principal																		
[Specific subgroup 2]	Teacher																		
	Principal																		
[Add or delete rows as needed]	Teacher																		
	Principal																		

Performance Measure (All Applicants – b) b) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are an effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and an effective principal (as defined in this notice).														**Applicable Population**: All participating students					
		Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
					SY 2013-14			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17**			**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**		
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**Effective Teacher and Principal**	**# of Participating Students with Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# of Participating Students with Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# of Participating Students with Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# of Participating Students with Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# of Participating Students with Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**# of Participating Students with Effective**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teacher/Principal**
All participating students	Teacher	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
	Principal																		
[Specific subgroup 1]	Teacher																		
	Principal																		
[Specific subgroup 2]	Teacher																		
	Principal																		
[Add or delete rows as needed]	Teacher																		
	Principal																		

(E)(3) Performance Measures – Required for applicants with participating students in grades PreK-3
(Note to applicants: Delete chart if the PreK-3 population is not part of your proposal)

Performance Measure (Grades PreK-3 – a, b) [Please describe the Performance Measure in the cells below, as well as the methodology for calculating the measure.]	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline** ***[Provide Year]***	**Target**				
				SY 2013-14	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17**	**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**
a) [*Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan*]	*[e.g., grade bands or subject areas]*	All participating students						
		[Specific subgroup 1]						
		[Specific subgroup 2]						
		[Add or delete rows as needed]						
b) [*Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan*]	*[e.g., grade bands or subject areas]*	All participating students						
		[Specific subgroup 1]						
		[Specific subgroup 2]						
		[Add or delete rows as needed]						
[*Additional proposed performance measure (Optional, add more rows as needed)*]	*[e.g., grade bands or subject areas]*	All participating students						
		[Specific subgroup 1]						
		[Specific subgroup 2]						
		[Add or delete rows as needed]						

(E)(3) Performance Measures – Required for applicants with participating students in grades 4-8
(Note to applicants: Delete chart if the 4-8 population is not part of your proposal)

Performance Measure (Grades 4-8 – a) a) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice).												**Applicable Population**: [e.g., grade bands or subject areas]						
	Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
				SY 2013-14			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17**			**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**		
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**
All participating students	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
[Specific subgroup 1]																		
[Specific subgroup 2]																		
[Add or delete rows as needed]																		

Performance Measure (Grades 4-8 –b, c) [Please describe the Performance Measure in the cells below, as well as the methodology for calculating the measure.]	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline *[Provide Year]***	**Target**				
				SY 2013-14	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17**	**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**
b) [*Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan*]	*[e.g., grade bands or subject areas]*	All participating students						
		[Specific subgroup 1]						
		[Specific subgroup 2]						
		[Add or delete rows as needed]						
c) [*Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan*]	*[e.g., grade bands or subject areas]*	All participating students						
		[Specific subgroup 1]						
		[Specific subgroup 2]						
		[Add or delete rows as needed]						
[*Additional proposed performance measure (Optional, add more rows as needed)*]	*[e.g., grade bands or subject areas]*	All participating students						
		[Specific subgroup 1]						
		[Specific subgroup 2]						
		[Add or delete rows as needed]						

(E)(3) Performance Measures – Required for applicants with participating students in grades 9-12
(Note to applicants: Delete chart if the 9-12 population is not part of your proposal)

Performance Measure (Grades 9-12 – a) a) The number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form.												**Applicable Population**: [e.g., grade bands or subject areas]						
	Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
				SY 2013-14			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17**			**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**		
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**# Participating Students who have completed and submitted FAFSA**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who completed and submitted FAFSA**	**# Participating Students who have completed and**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who completed and submitted FAFSA**	**# Participating Students who have completed and**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who completed and submitted FAFSA**	**# Participating Students who have completed and**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who completed and submitted FAFSA**	**# Participating Students who have completed and**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who completed and submitted FAFSA**	**# Participating Students who have completed and**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who completed and submitted FAFSA**
All participating students	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
[Specific subgroup 1]																		
[Specific subgroup 2]																		
[Add or delete rows as needed]																		

Performance Measure (Grades 9-12 – b) b) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice).	**Applicable Population**: [e.g., grade bands or subject areas]

	Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
				SY 2013-14			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17**			**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**		
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**# Participating Students who are on track to**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness**
All participating students	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
[Specific subgroup 1]																		
[Specific subgroup 2]																		
[Add or delete rows as needed]																		

Performance Measure (Grades 9-12 – c) c) Applicant must propose at least one measure of career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students who are or are on track to being career-ready. **[Please describe the Performance Measure here, as well as the methodology for calculating the measure.]**	**Applicable Population:** [e.g., grade bands or subject areas]

	Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
				SY 2013-14			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17**			**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**		
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**# Participating Students on track**	**Total # of Participating**	**% on track (A/B)*100**	**# Participating Students on track**	**Total # of Participating**	**% on track (D/E)*100**	**# Participating Students on track**	**Total # of Participating**	**% on track (G/H)*100**	**# Participating Students on track**	**Total # of Participating**	**% on track (J/K)*100**	**# Participating Students on track**	**Total # of Participating**	**% on track (M/N)*100**	**# Participating Students on track**	**Total # of Participating**	**% on track (P/Q)*100**
All participating students	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
[Specific subgroup 1]																		
[Specific subgroup 2]																		
[Add or delete rows as needed]																		

Performance Measure (Grades 9-12 – d, e) [Please describe the Performance Measure in the cells below, as well as the methodology for calculating the measure.]	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline *[Provide Year]***	**Target**				
				SY 2013-14	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17**	**SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)**
d) [*Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan*]	*[e.g., grade bands or subject areas]*	All participating students						
		[Specific subgroup 1]						
		[Specific subgroup 2]						
		[Add or delete rows as needed]						
e) [*Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan*]	*[e.g., grade bands or subject areas]*	All participating students						
		[Specific subgroup 1]						
		[Specific subgroup 2]						
		[Add or delete rows as needed]						
[Additional proposed performance measure (Optional, add more rows as needed)]	*[e.g., grade bands or subject areas]*	All participating students						
		[Specific subgroup 1]						
		[Specific subgroup 2]						
		[Add or delete rows as needed]						

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

The extent to which—

(F)(1) Budget for the project *(10 points)*

The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables—

(a) Identifies all funds that will support the project (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds);

(b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal; and

(c) Clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities, including--

(i) A description of all of the funds (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds) that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from these sources; and

(ii) Identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, as described in the proposed budget and budget narrative, with a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments; and

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals *(10 points)*

The applicant has a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The plan should include support from State and local government leaders, financial support, and a description of how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments. Such a plan may address how the applicant will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget, and include an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative

and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix. *The high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) should include key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.*
(Enter text for (F)(1) in Part XI: Budget. Enter text for (F)(2) here.)

X. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY

Competitive Preference Priority

Competitive Preference Priority: Results, Resource Alignment, and Integrated Services. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate the extent to which the applicant proposes to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students (as defined in this notice), giving highest priority to students in participating schools (as defined in this notice) with high-need students (as defined in this notice). To meet this priority, an applicant's proposal does not need to be comprehensive and may provide student and family supports that focus on a subset of these needs.

To meet this priority, an applicant must—

(1) Provide a description of the coherent and sustainable partnership to support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1 that it has formed with public or private organizations, such as public health, before-school, after-school, and social service providers; integrated student service providers; businesses, philanthropies, civic groups, and other community-based organizations; early learning programs; and postsecondary institutions;

(2) Identify not more than 10 population-level desired results for students in the LEA or consortium of LEAs that align with and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top – District proposal. These results must include both (a) educational results or other education outcomes (e.g., children enter kindergarten prepared to succeed in school, children exit third grade reading at grade level, and students graduate from high school college- and career-ready) and (b) family and community supports (as defined in this notice) results;

(3) Describe how the partnership would –

> (a) Track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the LEA or consortium and at the student level for the participating students (as defined in this notice);
>
> (b) Use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students (as defined in this notice), with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty (including highly mobile students), family instability, or other child welfare issues;
>
> (c) Develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students (as defined in this notice) to at least other high-need students (as defined in this notice) and communities in the LEA or consortium over time; and
>
> (d) Improve results over time;

(4) Describe how the partnership would, within participating schools (as defined in this notice), integrate education and other services (e.g., services that address social-emotional, and behavioral needs, acculturation for immigrants and refugees) for participating students (as defined in this notice);

(5) Describe how the partnership and LEA or consortium would build the capacity of staff in participating schools (as defined in this notice) by providing them with tools and supports to –

> (a) Assess the needs and assets of participating students (as defined in this notice) that are aligned with the partnership's goals for improving the education and family and community supports (as defined in this notice) identified by the partnership;

(b) Identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports (as defined in this notice) identified by the applicant; (c) Create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students (as defined in this notice) and support improved results; (d) Engage parents and families of participating students (as defined in this notice) in both decision-making about solutions to improve results over time and in addressing student, family, and school needs; and (e) Routinely assess the applicant's progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems; and (6) Identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe desired results for students. *In the text box below, the applicant should describe its proposal for meeting the priority.* *The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the priority (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the priority. Evidence or attachments and the rationale for their inclusion must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.*
(Enter text here.)

Competitive Preference Priority: Population-Level Desired Results

Population Group	**Type of Result** (*Indicate whether the type of result is (a) educational results or other education outcomes or (b) family and community supports*)	Desired Results

Competitive Preference Priority: Performance Measures
(Note: May use performance measures from (E)(3) as appropriate)

Performance Measure	Applicable Population	Baseline(s)		Target				
		SY 2011-12 (optional)	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17	SY 2017-18 (Post-Grant)
[Describe performance measures here and related desired result]								
[Add more rows as needed]								

XI. BUDGET
(Budget Requirements and Evidence for Selection Criteria (F)(1))

Budget Requirements (from Program Requirement 1)

(1) An applicant's budget request for all years of its project must fall within the applicable budget range as follows:

Number of participating students (as defined in this notice)	**Award range**
2,000-5,000 or Fewer than 2,000, provided those students are served by a consortium of at least 10 LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students (as defined in this notice)	$4-10 million
5,001-10,000	$10-20 million
10,001-20,000	$20-25 million
20,001+	$25-30 million

The Department will not consider an application that requests a budget outside the applicable range of awards.

Budget Summary and Narrative Instructions (Evidence for Selection Criterion (F)(1))

In the following budget parts and subparts, the applicant is responding to Selection Criterion (F)(1). The applicant should use its budget narrative and tables to address the specific elements of Selection Criterion (F)(1), including the extent to which:

The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables--

(a) Identifies all funds that will support the project (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds); and

(b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal; and

(c) Clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities, including--

(i) A description of all of the funds (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds) that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from these sources; and

(ii) Identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, as described in the proposed budget and budget narrative, with a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

The budget narrative should be of sufficient scope and detail for the Department to determine whether the costs are necessary, reasonable, and allowable. For further guidance on Federal cost principles, an applicant may wish to consult OMB Circular A-87. (See www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars).

The applicant will provide summary and itemized costs for projects that the applicant believes are necessary in order to implement its proposal. The applicant's budgets should reflect the work associated with fully implementing the high-quality plans and other aspects of its proposal described under the selection criteria and competitive preference priority. Some projects might address one selection criterion or the competitive preference priority, while others might address several selection criteria.

To support the budgeting process and in addition to instructions and forms included in this application package, we strongly suggest that applicants use the Race to the Top – District electronic budget spreadsheets prepared by the Department to build the applicant's budget. These electronic budget spreadsheets have formulas built into them that are intended to help applicants produce the budget tables that they submit as part of their response to selection criterion (F)(1). Applicants should include the relevant tables in the appropriate place in their proposal (e.g., by copying and pasting from the electronic budget spreadsheets into the appropriate place in the applicant's proposal).

Please note that the Race to the Top – District electronic budget spreadsheets will not be used by peer reviewers to judge or score the applicant's proposal. Only the budget summaries and narratives in the applicant's proposal will be reviewed and scored by peer reviewers. However, the electronic budget spreadsheets will be used by the Department to conduct its budget review for grantees.

1. Overall Budget Summary
    a. **Subpart 1:** Overall Budget Summary Table. This is the cover sheet for the budget summary (see Budget Table 1-1). In the Overall Budget Summary Table, the applicant should include the budget totals for each budget category and each year of the grant. These line items are derived by adding together the line items from each of the Project-Level Budget Summary Tables. (Note: the electronic budget spreadsheet should generate these sums automatically, which the applicant should copy and paste into the application proposal.)
    b. **Subpart 2:** Overall Budget Summary Narrative. The budget narrative that accompanies the Budget Summary Table should respond to Selection Criterion (F)(1) and be of sufficient scope and detail for the Department to determine whether the costs are necessary, reasonable, and allowable. This subpart should also include a summary of the projects that the applicant has included in its budget, including the project name, associated criteria, total grant funds requested, and total budget (see Budget Table 2-1). (Note: the electronic budget spreadsheet should generate this summary automatically, which the applicant should copy and paste into the application proposal.)

2. Project-Level Detail
    a. **Subpart 3:** Project-Level Budget Summary Tables. This is the cover sheet for each project-level budget (see Budget Table 3-1). (Note: the applicant should complete the electronic budget spreadsheets and copy and paste the information into the application proposal.) This should include the sums of project-level itemized costs described in the Project-Level Budget Narrative.
    b. **Subpart 4:** Project-Level Budget Narratives. The Project-Level Budget Narrative accompanies the Project-Level Budget Summary Table for each project and provides the rationale for the budget. The narrative should address Selection Criterion (F)(1), including an overview of each project for which the applicant requests grant funds and include itemized project costs for each project, by budget category and for each project year (See Budget Table 4-1). (Note: the applicant should complete the electronic budget spreadsheets and copy and paste the information into the application proposal.) Identify here, per Selection Criterion (F)(1), whether the costs will be one-time investments or ongoing operational costs.

BUDGET SUBPART 1: OVERALL BUDGET SUMMARY

Note: See budget summary narrative and instructions above, in particular "Subpart 1: Overall Budget Summary Table."

Budget Table 1-1: Overall Budget Summary Table

Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
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. Total Grant Funds Requested (lines 9-10)					
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project					
13. Total Budget (lines 11-12)					

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-13.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If the applicant plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget part.

BUDGET SUBPART 2: OVERALL BUDGET SUMMARY NARRATIVE

Note: See budget summary narrative and instructions above, in particular "Subpart 2: Overall Budget Summary Narrative."

(Enter narrative here.)

Budget Table 2-1: Overall Budget Summary Project List

Project Name	Primary Associated Criterion and location in application	Additional Associated Criteria and location in application	Total Grant Funds Requested	Total Budget
			Total for Grant Funds	**Total Budget**

BUDGET SUBPART 3: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET SUMMARIES

Note: See budget summary narrative and instructions above, in particular "Subpart 3: Project-Level Budget Summary Tables."

Table 3-1: Project-Level Budget Summary Table
Project Name: [fill in the project name the applicant has assigned to this work]
Primary Associated Criterion and Location in Application: [fill in primary selection criterion, Part number and page numbers]
Additional Associated Criteria (if any) and Location in Application: [fill in the additional selection criteria (if any), Part number(s) and page numbers]

Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
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. Total Grant Funds Requested (lines 9-10)					
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project					
13. Total Budget (lines 11-12)					

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-13.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If the applicant plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget part.

BUDGET SUBPART 4: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Note: See budget summary narrative and instructions above, in particular "Subpart 4: Project-Level Budget Narratives."

(Enter narrative here and in Table 4-1 below.)

Table 4-1: Project-Level Itemized Costs						
Cost Description and Justification (including whether the cost is one-time investment or ongoing operational cost)		**Year 1 Cost**	**Year 2 Cost**	**Year 3 Cost**	**Year 4 Cost**	**Total Cost**
1. Personnel Explain the importance of each position to the success of the project and connections back to specific project plans. If curriculum vitae, an organizational chart, or other supporting information will be helpful to reviewers, attach in the Appendix and describe its location.						
• The title of the position to be compensated under this project • The role/ responsibility of that position • Why the position is necessary to implement the project	• The salary of the position • The number of employees • The amount of time (hours, percent full-time-employee, months, etc.) to be expended • Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost
Add more rows as needed						
2. Fringe Benefits Explain the nature and extent of fringe benefits to be received and by whom.						

• The title of the position to be compensated with fringe benefits under this project	• The fringe benefit percentages for all personnel in the project • The basis for cost estimates or computations	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost
Add more rows as needed						
3. Travel Explain the purpose of the travel, how it relates to project goals, and how it will contribute to project success.						
• A description of the travel • The parties that will engage in the travel • Purpose of travel	• An estimate of the number of trips • An estimate of transportation and/or subsistence costs for each trip • Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost
Add more rows as needed						
4. Equipment Explain what equipment is needed and why it is needed to meet program goals. Consistent with SEA and LEA policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit.						
• The type of equipment to be purchased • Purpose of purchase	• The estimated unit cost for each item to be purchased • The number of units being purchased • The definition of equipment used by the applicant • Any additional basis for	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost

	cost estimates or computations					
Add more rows as needed						
5. Supplies Explain what supplies are needed and why they are necessary to meet program goals. Consistent with LEA policy, supplies are defined as tangible personal property excluding equipment.						
• The supplies being purchased • Purpose of purchase	• An estimate of materials and supplies needed for the project, by nature of expense or general category (e.g., instructional materials, office supplies) • The basis for cost estimates or computations	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost
Add more rows as needed						
6. Contractual Explain what goods/services will be acquired, and the purpose and relation to the project for each expected procurement. **NOTE:** Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants do not need to include information in their applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.						
• The products to be acquired and/or the professional services to be provided • Purpose of acquisition	• The estimated cost per expected procurement • For professional services contracts, the amount of time to be devoted to the project, including the costs to be charged to this proposed grant award • A brief statement that the	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost

	applicant has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36 • For any meeting or logistics support, identify anticipated locations and approximate rates • Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations					
Add more rows as needed						
7. Training Stipends Explain what training is needed, and the purpose and relation to the project. **NOTE:** The training stipend line item only pertains to costs associated with long-term training programs and college or university coursework, not workshops or short-term training supported by this program. Salary stipends paid to teachers and other school personnel for participating in short-term professional development should be reported in Personnel (line 1).						
• The training to be acquired, consistent with the note above. • Purpose of purchase	• The personnel who will participate in the training • Cost per session/trainee (if available) • The cost estimates and basis for these estimates	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost
Add more rows as needed						
8. Other Explain other expenditures that may exist and are not covered by other categories.						
• Other items by major type or category (e.g., communications,	• The cost per item (e.g., printing = $500, postage = $750)	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost

printing, postage, equipment rental). • Purpose of the expenditures	• Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations					
Add more rows as needed						
9. Total Direct Costs Sum lines 1-8.						
• n/a		• Sum of lines 1-8	• Sum of lines 1-8	• Sum of lines 1-8	• Sum of lines 1-8	• Sum of lines 1-8
Add more rows as needed						
10. Total Indirect Costs Identify and apply the indirect cost rate.						
• Identify and apply the Indirect Cost Rate	• Indirect Cost Rate as indicated in the Budget Indirect Cost Information part	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost
Add more rows as needed						
11. Total Grant Funds Requested Sum lines 9-10.						
• n/a		• Sum of lines 9-10	• Sum of lines 9-10	• Sum of lines 9-10	• Sum of lines 9-10	• Sum of lines 9-10
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project Identifies all non-grant funds that will support the project (e.g., external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds)						
• Project or activity to be funded or other description of use of	• Source of funds and amount of funding from each source	• Year 1 Cost	• Year 2 Cost	• Year 3 Cost	• Year 4 Cost	• Total Cost

funds					
Add more rows as needed					
13. Total Budget Sum lines 11-12.					
• n/a	• Sum of lines 11-12	• Sum of lines 11-12	• Sum of lines 11-12	• Sum of lines 11-12	• Sum of lines 11-12

BUDGET: INDIRECT COST INFORMATION

To request reimbursement for indirect costs, please answer the following questions:

1. Does the applicant have an Indirect Cost Rate approved by its State Educational Agency?

YES ☐ NO ☐

If yes to question 1, please provide the following information:

Period Covered by the approved Indirect Cost Rate (mm/dd/yyyy):

From: / / To: / /

Current approved Indirect Cost Rate:

Approving State agency:
(Please specify agency)

Directions for this form:

1. Indicate whether or not the applicant has an Indirect Cost Rate that was approved by its State Educational Agency.
2. If "No" is checked, the applicant should contact the business office of its State Educational Agency.
3. If "Yes" is checked, indicate the beginning and ending dates covered by the approved Indirect Cost Rate. In addition, indicate the name of the State agency that approved the approved rate.
4. If "Yes" is checked, the applicant should include a copy of the Indirect Cost Rate agreement in the Appendix.

XII. DEFINITIONS

Achievement gap means the difference in the performance between each subgroup (as defined in this notice) within a participating LEA or school and the statewide average performance of the LEA's or State's highest-achieving subgroups in reading or language arts and in mathematics as measured by the assessments required under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended.

College- and career-ready graduation requirements means minimum high school graduation expectations (e.g., completion of a minimum course of study, content mastery, proficiency on college- and career-ready assessments) that are aligned with a rigorous, robust, and well-rounded curriculum and that cover a wide range of academic and technical knowledge and skills to ensure that by the time students graduate high school, they satisfy requirements for admission into credit-bearing courses commonly required by the State's public four-year degree-granting institutions.

College- and career-ready standards means content standards for kindergarten through 12th grade that build towards college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice). A State's college- and career-ready standards must be either (1) standards that are common to a significant number of States; or (2) standards that are approved by a State network of institutions of higher education, which must certify that students who meet the standards will not need remedial course work at the postsecondary level.

College enrollment means the enrollment of students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) and who enroll in a public institution of higher education in the State (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1001) within 16 months of graduation.

Consortium governance structure means the consortium's structure for carrying out its operations, including--

(1) The organizational structure of the consortium and the differentiated roles that a member LEA may hold (e.g., lead LEA, member LEA);

(2) For each differentiated role, the associated rights and responsibilities, including rights and responsibilities for adopting and implementing the consortium's proposal for a grant;

(3) The consortium's method and process (e.g., consensus, majority) for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational);

(4) The protocols by which the consortium will operate, including the protocols for member LEAs to change roles or leave the consortium;

(5) The consortium's procedures for managing funds received under this grant;

(6) The terms and conditions of the memorandum of understanding or other binding agreement executed by each member LEA; and

(7) The consortium's procurement process, and evidence of each member LEA's commitment to that process.

Core educational assurance areas means the four key areas originally identified in the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) to support comprehensive education reform: (1) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; (2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction; (3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and (4) turning around lowest-achieving schools.

Digital learning content means learning materials and resources that can be displayed on an electronic device and shared electronically with other users. Digital learning content includes both open source and commercial content. In order to comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, any digital learning content used by grantees must be accessible to individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use screen readers. For additional information regarding the application of these laws to technology, please refer to www.ed.gov/ocr/letters/colleague-201105-ese.pdf and www.ed.gov/ocr/docs/dcl-ebook-faq-201105.pdf.

Discipline means any disciplinary measure collected by the 2009-2010 or 2011-2012 Civil Rights Data Collection (see http://ocrdata.ed.gov).

Educators means all education professionals and education paraprofessionals working in participating schools (as defined in this notice), including principals or other heads of a school, teachers, other professional instructional staff (e.g., staff involved in curriculum development or staff development, bilingual/English as a Second Language (ESL) specialists, or instructional staff who operate library, media, and computer centers), pupil support services staff (e.g., guidance counselors, nurses, speech pathologists), other administrators (e.g., assistant principals, discipline specialists), and education paraprofessionals (e.g., assistant teachers, bilingual/ESL instructional aides).

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 this notice) as defined in the LEA's principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice).

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 this notice) as defined in the LEA's teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice).

Family and community supports means—

(1) Child and youth health programs, such as physical, mental, behavioral, and emotional health programs (e.g., home visiting programs; Head Start; Early Head Start; programs to improve nutrition and fitness, reduce childhood obesity, and create healthier communities);

(2) Safety programs, such as programs in school and out of school to prevent, control, and reduce crime, violence, drug and alcohol use, and gang activity; programs that address classroom and school-wide behavior and conduct; programs to prevent child abuse and neglect; programs to prevent truancy and reduce and prevent bullying and harassment; and programs to improve the physical and emotional security of the school setting as perceived, experienced, and created by students, staff, and families;

(3) Community stability programs, such as programs that: (a) provide adult education and employment opportunities and training to improve educational levels, job skills, and readiness in order to decrease unemployment, with a goal of increasing family stability; (b) improve families' awareness of, access to, and use of a range of social services, if possible at a single location; (c) provide unbiased, outcome-focused, and comprehensive financial education, inside and outside the classroom and at every life stage; (d) increase access to traditional financial institutions (e.g., banks and credit unions) rather than alternative financial institutions (e.g., check cashers and payday lenders); (e) help families increase their financial literacy, financial assets, and savings; (f) help families access transportation to education and employment opportunities; and (g) provide supports and services to students who are homeless, in foster care, migrant, or highly mobile; and

(4) Family and community engagement programs that are systemic, integrated, sustainable, and continue through a student's transition from K–12 schooling to college and career. These programs may include family literacy programs and programs that provide adult education and training and opportunities for family members and other members of the community to support student learning and establish high expectations for student educational achievement; mentorship programs that create positive relationships between children and adults; programs that provide for the use of such community resources as libraries, museums, television and radio stations, and local businesses to support improved student educational outcomes; programs that support the engagement of families in early learning programs and services; programs that provide guidance on how to navigate through a complex school system and how to advocate for more and improved learning opportunities; and programs that promote collaboration with educators and community organizations to improve opportunities for healthy development and learning.

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

High-minority school is defined by the LEA in a manner consistent with its State's Teacher Equity Plan, as required by section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA. The LEA must provide, in its Race to the Top – District application, the definition used.

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 this notice), 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 learners.

High-quality plan means a plan that includes key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities.

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 this notice) as defined under the LEA's principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice).

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 this notice) as defined under the LEA's teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice).

Interoperable data system means a system that uses a common, established structure such that data can easily flow from one system to another and in which data are in a non-proprietary, open format.

Local educational agency is an entity as defined in section 9101(26) of the ESEA, except that an entity described under section 9101(26)(D) must be recognized under applicable State law as a local educational agency.

Low-performing school means a school that is in the bottom 10 percent of performance in the State, or that has significant achievement gaps, based on student academic performance in reading/language arts and mathematics on the assessments required under the ESEA, or that has a graduation rate (as defined in this notice) below 60 percent.

Metadata means information about digital learning content such as the grade or age for which it is intended, the topic or standard to which it is aligned, or the type of resource it is (e.g., video, image).

On-track indicator means a measure, available at a time sufficiently early to allow for intervention, of a single student characteristic (e.g., number of days absent, number of discipline referrals, number of credits earned), or a composite of multiple characteristics, that is both predictive of student success (e.g., students demonstrating the measure graduate at an 80 percent rate) and comprehensive of students who succeed (e.g., of all graduates, 90 percent demonstrated the indicator). Using multiple indicators that are collectively comprehensive but vary by student characteristics may be an appropriate alternative to a single indicator that applies to all students.

Open data format means data that are available in a non-proprietary, machine-readable format (e.g., Extensible Markup Language (XML) and JavaScript Object Notation (JSON)) such that they can be understood by a computer. Digital formats that require extraction, data translation such as optical character recognition, or other manipulation in order to be used in electronic systems are not machine-readable formats.

Open-standard registry means a digital platform, such as the Learning Registry, that facilitates the exchange of information about digital learning content (as defined in this notice), including (1) alignment of content with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) and (2) usage information about learning content used by educators (as defined in this notice). This digital platform must have the capability to share content information with other LEAs and with State educational agencies.

Participating school means a school that is identified by the applicant and chooses to work with the applicant to implement the plan under Absolute Priority 1, either in one or more specific grade spans or subject areas or throughout the entire school and affecting a significant number of its students.

Participating student means a student enrolled in a participating school (as defined in this notice) and who is directly served by an applicant's plan under Absolute Priority 1.

Persistently lowest-achieving school means, as determined by the State, consistent with the requirements of the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program authorized by section 1003(g) of the ESEA,[8] (1) 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 this notice) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and (2) 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 this notice) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

To identify the lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both (1) 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 or language arts and in mathematics combined; and (2) the school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group.

Principal evaluation system means a system that: (1) is used for continual improvement of instructional leadership; (2) meaningfully differentiates performance using at least three performance levels; (3) uses multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including, as a significant factor, data on student growth (as defined in this notice) for all students (including English learners and students with disabilities), as well as other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous leadership performance standards, teacher evaluation data, and student and parent surveys); (4) evaluates principals on a regular basis; (5) provides clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies and guides professional development needs; and (6) is used to inform personnel decisions.

Rural local educational agency means an LEA, at the time of the application, that is eligible under the Small Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program or the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program authorized under Title VI, Part B of the ESEA. Eligible applicants may determine whether a particular LEA is eligible for these programs by referring to information on the Department's website at http://www2.ed.gov/programs/reapsrsa/eligible13/index.html.

School leadership team means a team that leads the implementation of improvement and other initiatives at the school and is composed of the principal or other head of a school, teachers, and other educators (as defined in this notice), and, as applicable, other school employees, parents, students, and other community members. In cases where statute or local policy, including collective bargaining agreements, establishes a school leadership team, that body shall serve as the school leadership team for the purpose of this program.

8 The Department considers schools that are identified as Tier I or Tier II schools under the SIG Program (see 75 FR 66363) as part of a State's approved applications to be persistently lowest-achieving schools. A list of these Tier I and Tier II schools can be found on the Department's website at http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html

Student growth means the change in student achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time, defined as—

(1) For grades and subjects in which assessments are required under ESEA section 1111(b)(3): (a) a student's score on such assessments; and (b) may include other measures of student learning, such as those described in (2) below, provided they are rigorous and comparable across schools within an LEA.

(2) For grades and subjects in which assessments are not required under ESEA section 1111(b)(3): alternative measures of student learning and performance, such as student results on pre-tests, end-of-course tests, and objective performance-based assessments; performance against student learning objectives; student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across schools within an LEA.

Student-level data means demographic, performance, and other information that pertains to a single student.

Student performance data means information about the academic progress of a single student, such as formative and summative assessment data, information on completion of coursework, instructor observations, information about student engagement and time on task, and similar information.

Subgroup means each category of students identified under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA, and any combined subgroup used in the State accountability system that is approved by the Department in a State's request for ESEA flexibility.

Superintendent evaluation means a rigorous, transparent, and fair annual evaluation of an LEA superintendent that provides an assessment of performance and encourages professional growth. This evaluation must reflect: (1) the feedback of many stakeholders, including but not limited to educators, principals, and parents; and (2) student outcomes, including student growth for all students (including English learners and students with disabilities).

Teacher evaluation system means a system that: (1) is used for continual improvement of instruction; (2) meaningfully differentiates performance using at least three performance levels; (3) uses multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including, as a significant factor, data on student growth (as defined in this notice) for all students (including English learners and students with disabilities), as well as other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys); (4) evaluates teachers on a regular basis; (5) provides clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies and guides professional development needs; and (6) is used to inform personnel decisions.

Teacher of record means an individual (or individuals in a co-teaching assignment) who has been assigned the lead responsibility for a student's learning in a subject or course.

XIII. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR CONSORTIA APPLICANTS (Appendix B in the Notice Inviting Applicants)

<u>Background</u>:

LEAs that apply to the Race to the Top – District competition as members of a consortium are required to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or other binding agreements with each other.

To support consortia in working together effectively, the U.S. Department of Education has produced a model MOU, which is attached. This model MOU may serve as a template for eligible LEAs that are considering entering into a consortium for the purpose of applying for a Race to the Top – District grant; however, consortia are not required to use it. They may use a different document that includes the key features noted below and in the model, and they should consult with their attorneys on what is most appropriate for their consortia.

The purpose of the model MOU is to help to specify a relationship that is specific to the Race to the Top – District competition. It is not meant to detail all typical aspects of consortia grant management or administration. At a minimum, each MOU must include the following key elements, each of which is described in detail below: (i) terms and conditions, (ii) consortium governance structure, and (iii) signatures.

(i) Terms and conditions: Each member of a consortium should sign a standard set of terms and conditions that includes, at a minimum, key roles and responsibilities of the applicant for the consortium (lead LEA) and member LEAs and assurances that make clear what the applicant and member LEAs are agreeing to do. In accordance with the requirements for consortia applicants in the Race to the Top – District notice inviting applications and the requirements for group applicants under 34 CFR 75.127-129, the MOU must:

- Designate one member of the group to apply for the grant or establish a separate legal entity to apply for the grant;
- Detail the activities that each member of the consortium plans to perform;
- Bind each member of the consortium to every statement and assurance made by the applicant in the application;
- State that the applicant for the consortium (the lead LEA) is legally responsible for:
    - The use of all grant funds;
    - Ensuring that the project is carried out by the consortium in accordance with Federal requirements;
    - Ensuring that the indirect cost funds are determined as required under 34 CFR 75.564(e);
    - Carrying out the activities it has agreed to perform; and
    - Using the funds that it receives under the MOU in accordance with the Federal requirements that apply to the Race to the Top – District grant;
- State that each member of the consortium is legally responsible for:
    - Carrying out the activities it has agreed to perform; and

    - Using the funds that it receives under the MOU in accordance with the Federal requirements that apply to the Race to the Top – District grant; and
- Contain an assurance that each LEA:
    - At a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year--
        - A teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice)[9];
        - A principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice); and
        - A superintendent evaluation (as defined in this notice);
    - Is committed to preparing students for college or career, as demonstrated by:
        - Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice); or
        - Measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);
    - Has a robust data system that has, at a minimum--
        - An individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match; and
        - The capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth;
    - Has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12th grade and higher education data; and
    - Ensures that any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

(ii) Consortium governance structure: As stated in the notice, at a minimum, the MOU must describe the consortium's structure for carrying out its operations, including:

- The organizational structure of the consortium and the differentiated roles that a member LEA may hold (e.g., lead LEA, member LEA);
- For each differentiated role, the associated rights and responsibilities (including rights and responsibilities for adopting and implementing the consortium's proposal for a grant);
- The consortium's method and process (e.g., consensus, majority) for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational);
- The protocols by which the consortium will operate, including the protocols for member LEAs to change roles or leave the consortium;
- The consortium's plan for managing funds received under this grant;
- The terms and conditions of the memorandum of understanding or other binding agreement executed by each member LEA; and
- The consortium's procurement process, and evidence of each member LEA's commitment to that process.

(iii) Signatures: As stated in the notice, each MOU must be signed by the LEA's superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable).

MODEL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

9 The term "as defined in this notice" is used throughout this Appendix and model memorandum of understanding. "This notice" refers to the notice inviting applications (NIA) for the Race to the Top – District competition.

For
Race to the Top - District Grant

[CONSORTIUM NAME]

I. Parties

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made and effective as of this [DAY] day of [MONTH, YEAR], by and between the [LEA] and all other member LEAs of [CONSORTIUM ("Consortium")] that have also executed this MOU.

[LEA] has elected to participate in [CONSORTIUM] as (check one):

_____ Lead LEA

_____ Member LEA

II. Scope of MOU

This MOU constitutes an understanding between the Consortium member LEAs to participate in the Consortium. This document describes the purpose and goals of the Consortium, explains its organizational and governance structure, and defines the terms and responsibilities of participation in the Consortium.

III. Binding Commitments and Assurances

To support these goals, each signatory LEA that signs this MOU assures, certifies, and represents that the signatory LEA:

a. Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU;
b. Is familiar with all the contents of the Consortium application;
c. At a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year--
    I. A teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice)[10];
    ii. A principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice); and
    iii. A superintendent evaluation (as defined in this notice);
d. Is committed to preparing students for college or career, as demonstrated by:
    i. Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice); or
    ii. Measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);
e. Has a robust data system that has, at a minimum--
    i. An individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match; and
    ii. The capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth;
f. Has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12th grade and higher education data;

10 The term "as defined in this notice" is used throughout the model memorandum of understanding. "This notice" refers to the notice inviting applications (NIA) for the Race to the Top – District competition.

g. Ensures that any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA);
h. Will comply with all of the terms of the Grant, and all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR (34 CFR parts 75, 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 86, 97, 98, and 99) and 2 CFR part 3485;
i. Meets all the eligibility requirements described in the application and notice;
j. Will bind itself to and comply with all elements of the Consortium governance structure described in this MOU and the individual LEA's role in the structure as described in this MOU; and
k. Will bind itself to every statement and assurance made in the Consortium's application, including but not limited to programs, plans, policies, strategies, and requirements that the Consortium plans to implement.

IV. Consortium Membership

A. Each member LEA and the lead LEA will sign on to only one application for a Race to the Top – District grant.
B. Each LEA in the Consortium is legally responsible for:
   1. Carrying out the activities it has agreed to perform; and
   2. Using the funds that it receives under the MOU in accordance with the Federal requirements that apply to the Race to the Top – District grant.

c. Each LEA in the Consortium will support the activities of the Consortium as follows:
   1. Participate in all activities and projects that the Consortium board approves in support of the Consortium's application;
   2. Participate in the management of all those activities and projects;
   3. [Other activities as necessary]

d. [If applicable, the MOU should also describe the unique activities and roles that each LEA will perform for the Consortium.]

V. Lead LEA

a. The lead LEA will serve as the "Applicant" LEA for purposes of the grant application, applying as the member of the Consortium on behalf of the Consortium, pursuant to the Application Requirements of the notice and 34 CFR 75.127-129.
b. The lead LEA is legally responsible for:
   i. The use of all grant funds;
   ii. Ensuring that the project is carried out by the Consortium in accordance with Federal requirements; and
   iii. Ensuring that the indirect cost funds are determined as required under 34 CFR 75.564(e).

c. The lead LEA or another LEA participating in the consortium will act as the fiscal agent on behalf of the Consortium.
d. The LEA acting as fiscal agent will comply with [STATE's] statutes regarding procurement, accounting practices, and all other relevant areas of law, including but not limited to [CITATIONS].

VI. Consortium Governance: [In this section the Consortium should describe its governance structure. As stated in the notice, at a minimum, the MOU must describe the Consortium's structure for carrying out its operations, including:

a. The organizational structure of the Consortium and the differentiated roles that a member LEA may hold (e.g., lead LEA, member LEA);
b. For each differentiated role, the associated rights and responsibilities (including rights and responsibilities related for adopting and implementing the Consortium's proposal for a grant);
c. The Consortium's method and process (e.g., consensus, majority) for making different types of decisions (e.g., policy, operational);
d. The protocols by which the Consortium will operate, including the protocols for member LEAs to change roles or leave the Consortium;
e. The Consortium's plan for managing funds received under this grant;
f. The terms and conditions of the MOU or other binding agreements executed by each member LEA; and
g. The Consortium's procurement process, and evidence of each member LEA's commitment to that process.]

VII. Modification

This MOU may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the parties involved, and in consultation with the U.S. Department of Education.

[A Consortium may find it necessary to include other terms and conditions in its MOU, such as provisions explaining governing law, liability and risk of loss, and resolution of conflicts.]

VIII. Duration/Termination

This MOU shall be effective, beginning with the date of the last signature hereon, and if the grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period, or upon mutual agreement of the parties, whichever occurs first.

IX. Points of Contact

Communications with the LEA regarding this MOU should be directed to:

Name: [NAME]

Mailing Address: [ADDRESS]

Telephone: [(###) ###-####]

Fax: [(###) ###-####]

Email: [EMAIL@EMAIL]

Or hereinafter to another individual that may be designated by the LEA in writing transmitted to the [appropriate party of the Consortium].

X. Signatures

[LEA] hereby joins the Consortium as a lead / member (circle one), and agrees to be bound by all the assurances and commitments associated with lead / member (circle one) classification. Further, the LEA agrees to perform the duties and carry out the responsibilities associated with the lead / member (circle one) membership classification as described in this MOU.

Superintendent or CEO of the LEA (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of Superintendent or CEO of the LEA:	Date:
Local School Board President (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of Local School Board President:	Date:
President of the Local Teacher Union or Association, if applicable (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the President of the Local Teacher Union or Association:	Date:

XIV. SCORING OVERVIEW AND CHART
(Appendix A in the Notice Inviting Applications)

I. Introduction

To help ensure inter-reviewer reliability and transparency for reviewing Race to the Top – District applications, the U.S. Department of Education has created a detailed scoring chart for scoring applications. The chart details the allocation of point values that reviewers will be using. Race to the Top – District grants will be awarded on a competitive basis to LEAs or consortia of LEAs. The chart will be used by reviewers to ensure consistency across and within review panels.

Reviewers will be assessing multiple aspects of each Race to the Top – District application. It is possible that an applicant that fails to earn points or earns a low number of points on one criterion might still win a Race to the Top – District award by earning high points on other criteria.

Reviewers will be required to make many thoughtful judgments about the quality of the applications. For example, reviewers will be assessing, based on the criteria, the comprehensiveness and feasibility of the plans. Reviewers will be asked to evaluate whether applicants have set ambitious yet achievable performance measures and annual targets in their applications. Reviewers will need to make informed judgments about applicants' goals, performance measures, annual targets, proposed activities and the rationale for those activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and credibility of applicants' plans.

Applicants must address Absolute Priority 1 throughout their applications, and Absolute Priority 1 must be met in order for an applicant to receive funding. Additionally, an applicant must designate which of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 it meets. Applicants may choose to address the competitive preference priority in Part X of the application and may earn extra points under that priority.

This section includes the point values for each criterion and for the competitive preference priority, guidance on scoring, and the scoring chart that the Department will provide to reviewers.

II. Points Overview

The scoring chart below shows the maximum number of points that may be assigned to each criterion and to the competitive preference priority.

	Detailed Points	Section Points	Section %
Selection Criteria:			
A. Vision:		**40**	**19%**
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision	**10**		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation	**10**		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change	**10**		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes	**10**		
B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform		**45**	**21%**
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success	**15**		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, & investments	**5**		
(B)(3) State context for implementation	**10**		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support	**15**		
C. Preparing Students for College and Careers		**40**	**19%**
(C)(1) Learning	**20**		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading	**20**		
D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure		**25**	**12%**
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules	**15**		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure	**10**		
E. Continuous Improvement		**30**	**14%**
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process	**15**		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement	**5**		
(E)(3) Performance measures	**5**		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments	**5**		
F. Budget and Sustainability		**20**	**10%**
(F)(1) Budget for the project	**10**		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals	**10**		
Competitive Preference Priority	**10**	**10**	**5%**
	210	*210*	*100%*

III. About Scoring

The Department will give reviewers general guidance on how to evaluate and score the information that each applicant submits; this guidance will be consistent with the requirements, priorities, selection criteria, and definitions in the NIA. Reviewers will allot points based on the extent to which the applicant meets the criteria and the competitive preference priority, including existing track record and conditions as well as future plans. For plans, reviewers will allot points based on the quality of the applicant's plan and, where specified in the text of the criterion or competitive preference priority, whether the applicant has set ambitious yet achievable goals, performance measures, and annual targets. In making these judgments, reviewers will consider the extent to which the applicant has:

- *A high-quality plan.* In determining the quality of an applicant's plan, reviewers will evaluate the key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan (as judged, in part, by the information submitted as supporting evidence). Applicants should submit this information for each criterion that the applicant addresses that includes a plan. Applicants may also submit additional information that they believe will be helpful to peer reviewers.

- *Ambitious yet achievable goals, performance measures, and annual targets*. In determining whether an applicant has ambitious yet achievable goals, performance measures, and annual targets, reviewers will examine the applicant's goals, measures, and annual targets in the context of the applicant's proposal and the evidence submitted (if any) in support of the proposal. There are no specific goals, performance measures, or annual targets that reviewers will be looking for here; nor will higher ones necessarily be rewarded above lower ones. Rather, reviewers will reward applicants for developing "ambitious yet achievable" goals, performance measures, and annual targets that are meaningful for the applicant's proposal and for assessing implementation progress, successes, and challenges.

Note that the evidence that applicants submit may be relevant both to judging whether the applicant has a high-quality plan and whether its goals, performance measures, and annual targets are ambitious yet achievable.

<u>About Assigning Points:</u> For each criterion, reviewers will assign points to an application. The Department has specified maximum point values at the criterion level.

The reviewers will use the general ranges below as a guide when awarding points.

Maximum Point Value	Quality of Applicant's Response		
	Low	Medium	High
20	0-4	5-15	16-20
15	0-3	4-11	12-15
10	0-2	3-7	8-10
5	0-1	2-3	4-5

About Priorities: There are two types of priorities in the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition.

Absolute Priorities

- Absolute Priority 1 cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It will be assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority. If an application has not met the priority, it will be eliminated from the competition. In those cases where there is a disparity in the reviewers' determinations on the priority, the Department will consider Absolute Priority 1 met only if a majority of the reviewers on a panel determine that an application meets the priority.
- Absolute Priorities 2-5 are not judged by peer reviewers. Applicants indicate in the Application Assurances in Parts V or VI of the application which one of Absolute Priorities 2-5 applies to them. The Department will review Application Assurances before making grant awards.

Competitive Preference Priority

- The competitive preference priority is optional and applicants may respond to it in Part X of the application. It is worth up to 10 points, and reviewers will allot points based on the extent to which the applicant meets the priority.

In the Event of a Tie: If two or more applications have the same score and there is not sufficient funding to support all of the tied applicants in the funding range, the applicants' scores on criterion (B)(1) will be used to break the tie.

Review and Selection Process:

We remind potential applicants that in reviewing applications in any discretionary grant competition, the Secretary may consider, under 34 CFR 75.217(d)(3), the past performance of the applicant in carrying out a previous award, such as the applicant's use of funds, achievement of project objectives, and compliance with grant conditions. The Secretary may also consider whether the applicant failed to submit a timely performance report or submitted a report of unacceptable quality.

In addition, in making a competitive grant award, the Secretary also requires various assurances including those applicable to Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department of Education (34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23).

XV. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

(1) An applicant's budget request for all years of its project must fall within the applicable budget range as follows:

Number of participating students (as defined in this notice)	Award range
2,000-5,000 or Fewer than 2,000, provided those students are served by a consortium of at least 10 LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students (as defined in this notice)	$4-10 million
5,001-10,000	$10-20 million
10,001-20,000	$20-25 million
20,001+	$25-30 million

The Department will not consider an application that requests a budget outside the applicable range of awards.

(2) A grantee must commit to participate in any national evaluation of the program and work with the Department and with a national evaluator or another entity designated by the Department to ensure that data collection and program design are consistent with plans to conduct a rigorous national evaluation of the program and of specific solutions and strategies pursued by individual grantees. This commitment must include, but need not be limited to—

(i) Consistent with 34 CFR 80.36 and State and local procurement procedures, grantees must include in contracts with external vendors provisions that allow contractors to provide implementation data to the LEA, the Department, the national evaluator, or other appropriate entities in ways consistent with all privacy laws and regulations.

(ii) Developing, in consultation with the national evaluator, a plan for identifying and collecting reliable and valid baseline data for program participants.

(3) LEAs must share metadata about content alignment with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) and use through open-standard registries.

(4) LEAs in which minority students or students with disabilities are disproportionately subject to discipline (as defined in this notice) and expulsion (according to data submitted through the Department's Civil Rights Data Collection, which is available at http://ocrdata.ed.gov/), must conduct a district assessment of the root causes of the disproportionate discipline and expulsions. These LEAs must also develop a detailed plan over the grant period to address these root causes and to reduce disproportionate discipline (as defined in this notice) and expulsions.

(5) Each grantee must make all project implementation and student data available to the Department and its authorized representatives in compliance with FERPA, as applicable.

(6) Grantees must ensure that requests for information (RFIs) and requests for proposal (RFPs) developed as part of this grant are made public, and are consistent with the requirements of State and local law.

(7) Within 100 days of award, each grantee must submit to the Department--

(i) A scope of work that is consistent with its grant application and includes specific goals, activities, deliverables, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures; and

(ii) An individual school implementation plan for participating schools (as defined in this notice).

(8) Within 100 days of award, each grantee must demonstrate that at least 40 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) in participating schools (as defined in this notice) are from low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, or other poverty measures that LEAs use to make awards under section 1113(a) of the ESEA.

XVI. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Each grantee receiving Race to the Top – District funds must submit to the Department an annual report that must include a description of its progress to date on its goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, and budgets, and a comparison of actual performance to the annual targets the grantee established in its application for each performance measure. Further, a grantee receiving funds under this program is accountable for meeting the goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, budget, and annual targets established in the application; adhering to an annual fund drawdown schedule that is tied to meeting these goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, budget, and annual targets; and fulfilling and maintaining all other conditions for the conduct of the project. The Department will monitor a grantee's progress in meeting its goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, budget, and annual targets and in fulfilling other applicable requirements. In addition, the Department may collect additional data as part of a grantee's annual reporting requirements.

To support a collaborative process between the grantee and the Department, the Department may require that applicants that are selected to receive an award enter into a written performance agreement or cooperative agreement with, or complete a scope of work to be approved by, the Department. If the Department determines that a grantee is not meeting its goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, budget, or annual targets or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, the Department will take appropriate action, which could include a collaborative process between the Department and the grantee, or enforcement measures with respect to this grant, such as placing the grantee in high-risk status, putting it on reimbursement payment status, or delaying or withholding funds.

An LEA that receives a Race to the Top – District grant must also meet the reporting requirements for the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) for subaward and executive compensation data. Grantees, referred to as "prime awardees," must report using the FFATA Subaward Reporting System (FSRS), and must, therefore, register in FSRS. More specific information regarding the FFATA reporting requirements will be provided after the grants are awarded.

XVII. CONTRACTING FOR SERVICES

Generally, all procurement transactions by LEAs made with Race to the Top – District grant funds must be conducted in a manner providing full and open competition, consistent with the standards in Section 80.36 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). This section requires that grantees use their own procurement procedures (which reflect State and local laws and regulations) to select contractors, provided that those procedures meet certain standards described in EDGAR.

Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants should not include information in their grant applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.

XVIII. INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW

Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs (Executive Order 12372)

This program falls under the rubric of Executive Order 12372 (Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs) and the regulations in 34 CFR Part 79. One of the objectives of the Executive order is to strengthen federalism--or the distribution of responsibility between localities, States, and the Federal government--by fostering intergovernmental partnerships. This idea includes supporting processes that State or local governments have devised for coordinating and reviewing proposed Federal financial grant applications.

The process for doing this requires grant applicants to contact State Single Points of Contact for information on how this works. Multi-state applicants should follow procedures specific to each state.

Further information about the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) process and a list of names by State can be found at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc

Absent specific State review programs, applicants may submit comments directly to the Department. All recommendations and comments must be mailed or hand-delivered by the date indicated in the actual application notice to the following address: The Secretary, EO 12372—CFDA Number 84.416 , U.S. Department of Education, room 7E200, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20202.

Proof of mailing will be determined on the same basis as applications (see 34 CFR §75.102). Recommendations or comments may be hand-delivered until 4:30 p.m. (Eastern time) on the closing date indicated in this notice.

Important note: The above address is not the same address as the one to which the applicant submits its completed applications. **Do not send applications to the above address.**

Not all states have chosen to participate in the intergovernmental review process, and therefore do not have a SPOC. If you are located in a State that does not have a SPOC, you may send application materials directly to the Department as described in the Federal Register notice.

XIX. APPLICATION CHECKLIST FOR INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANTS

Formatting Recommendations and Application Submission Procedures (Part I)

- ❑ Are all pages 8.5” x 11”, on one side only, with 1” margins at the top, bottom, and both sides?
- ❑ Does each page have a page number, including the appendix?
- ❑ Do all pages have line space set to 1.5 spacing and 12 point Times New Roman font?
- ❑ Has the LEA complied with the submission format requirements, including the application deadline for submission?
- ❑ Does the LEA’s submission include three CDs or DVDs, each containing the following four separate files?
    - Body of the application narrative, including budget tables
    - Application appendix
    - Required signature pages
    - Completed electronic budget spreadsheets
- ❑ Has the LEA provided sufficient time for the application to be received by the deadline date?

Application Requirements (Part III)

- ❑ Has the LEA provided the State ten business days to comment on the Race to the Top – District application?
- ❑ Has the LEA provided all relevant information regarding the State comment period asked for in Part III?
- ❑ Has the LEA provided the mayor, city or town administrator or other comparable official ten business days to comment on the Race to the Top – District application?
- ❑ Has the LEA provided all relevant information regarding the mayor, city or town administrator comment period asked for in Part III?

Application Assurances (Part IV)

- ❑ Is all of the requested information included on the Race to the Top – District Application Assurances cover page, including NCES district ID, DUNS number, and Employer Identification number?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED –** Has the LEA Superintendent or CEO signed and dated the Application Assurances?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED –** Has the President of the LEA’s School Board signed and dated the Application Assurances?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED (where applicable) –** Has the President of the Local Teacher’s Union or Association signed and dated the Application Assurances?

Program-Specific Assurances for Individual LEA Applicants (Part V)

- ❑ Has the LEA made all necessary assurances in Part V for individual LEA applicants?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED –** Has the LEA Superintendent or CEO signed and

dated the Program-Specific Assurances for Individual LEAs?

Other Assurances and Certifications (Part VII)

- **SIGNATURE REQUIRED –** Has the LEA Superintendent or CEO signed and dated the Other Assurances?

Selection Criteria (Part IX)

- Has the LEA responded to all of the selection criteria to which it plans to respond?
- For each selection criterion to which the LEA is responding, has the LEA provided as necessary:
  - Narrative response?
  - Performance measures?
  - Evidence?
- Has the LEA organized the Appendix properly such that each attachment in the Appendix is described in the narrative text of the relevant selection criterion, indicating the relevant part and page number to which it refers as well as a rationale for its inclusion?

Competitive Preference Priority (Part X)

- **(Optional)** Has the LEA responded to the competitive preference priority?

Budget (Part XI)

- Has the LEA completed and attached all required elements of the budget, including all relevant forms, charts, tables, electronic budget spreadsheets, and narrative descriptions?
- Has the LEA included the assumptions underlying each budget section using Table 4-1?

Program Requirements (Part XV)

- Has the LEA reviewed the program requirements?

Reporting Requirements (Part XVI)

- Has the LEA reviewed the reporting requirements?

Appendix (Part XXI)

- Has the LEA created a table of contents for its Appendix?
- Has the LEA included all required Appendix documents per the instructions in the application, as well as any other documents it refers to in its narratives?
- Has the LEA ensured that each page of the Appendix includes page numbers?

XX. APPLICATION CHECKLIST FOR CONSORTIA APPLICANTS

Formatting Recommendations and Application Submission Procedures (Part I)

- ❑ Are all pages 8.5” x 11”, on one side only, with 1” margins at the top, bottom, and both sides?
- ❑ Does each page have a page number, including the appendix?
- ❑ Do all pages have line space set to 1.5 spacing and 12 point Times New Roman font?
- ❑ Has the applicant complied with the submission format requirements, including the application deadline for submission?
- ❑ Does the LEA’s submission include three CDs or DVDs, each containing the following four separate files?
    - Body of the application narrative, including budget tables
    - Application appendix
    - Required signature pages
    - Completed electronic budget spreadsheets
- ❑ Has the applicant provided sufficient time for the application to be received by the deadline date?

Application Requirements (Part III)

- ❑ Has each LEA in the consortium provided its State at least ten business days to comment on the Race to the Top – District application?
- ❑ Has the applicant provided all relevant information regarding the State comment period asked for in Part III?
- ❑ Has each LEA in the consortium provided its mayor, city or town administrator or other comparable official at least ten business days to comment on the Race to the Top – District application?
- ❑ Has the applicant provided all relevant information regarding the mayor, city or town administrator comment period asked for in Part III?
- ❑ Has the applicant complied with all the requirements in Application Requirement 3 for consortia applicants?

Application Assurances (Part IV)

- ❑ Is all of the requested information included on the Race to the Top – District Application Assurances cover page, including NCES district ID, DUNS number, and Employer Identification number?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED –** Has the lead LEA Superintendent or CEO or the Legal Representative of the Eligible Legal Entity signed and dated the Application Assurances?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED –** Has the President of the lead LEA School Board signed and dated the Application Assurances?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED (where applicable) –** Has the President of the Local Teacher’s Union or Association signed and dated the Application Assurances?

Program-Specific Assurances for Consortia Applicants (Part VI)

- Has the applicant made all necessary assurances in Part VI for consortium LEA applicants?
- Has the applicant provided a list of NCES District IDs for each LEA in the Consortium?
- Has the applicant listed all the MOU signatures?
- **SIGNATURE REQUIRED –** Has the lead LEA Superintendent or CEO or the Legal Representative of the Eligible Legal Entity signed and dated the Program-Specific Assurances for Consortia applicants?

Other Assurances and Certifications (Part VII)

- Has the lead LEA Superintendent or CEO or Legal Representative of the Eligible Legal Entity signed and dated the Other Assurances?

Selection Criteria (Part IX)

- Has the applicant responded to all of the selection criteria to which it plans to respond?
- For each selection criterion to which the applicant is responding, has the applicant provided as necessary:
    - Narrative response?
    - Performance measures?
    - Evidence?
- Has the applicant organized the Appendix properly such that each attachment in the Appendix is described in the narrative text of the relevant selection criterion, indicating the relevant part and page number to which it refers as well as a rationale for its inclusion?

Competitive Preference Priority (Part X)

- **(Optional)** Has the LEA responded to the competitive preference priority?

Budget (Part XI)

- Has the applicant completed the following elements of the budget, including all relevant forms, charts, tables, electronic budget spreadsheets, and narrative descriptions?
- Has the LEA included the assumptions underlying each budget section using Table 4-1?

Memorandum of Understanding (Part XIII)

- Has the applicant attached a memorandum of understanding or binding agreement between the members of the consortium?
    - Has the applicant's memorandum of understanding met the requirements set forth in the notice, including but not limited to application requirement 3?
    - Does the applicant's memorandum of understanding describe a consortium governance structure consistent with the definition in this notice?

Program Requirements (Part XVI)

- Has the applicant reviewed the program requirements?

Reporting Requirements (Part XVI)

- ❑ Has the applicant reviewed the reporting requirements?

Appendix (Part XXI)

- ❑ Has the applicant created a table of contents for its Appendix?
- ❑ Has the applicant included all required Appendix documents per the instructions in the application, as well as any other documents it refers to in its narratives?
- ❑ Has the LEA ensured that each page of the Appendix includes page numbers?

XXI. APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Appendix must include a complete Table of Contents, which includes the page number or attachment number, attachment title, and relevant selection criterion. A sample table of contents form is included below. Each attachment in the Appendix must be described in the narrative text of the relevant selection criterion, along with a rationale in the narrative text for how the attachment's inclusion supports the narrative and the location of the attachment in the Appendix.

Attachment Title	**Relevant Selection Criterion**	**Appendix Page #**
Appendix A – Disclosure Exemption	TBD	e.g., pp. 1-3

APPENDIX A – DISCLOSURE EXEMPTION

Consistent with Executive Order 12600, please designate in your application any information that you feel is exempt from disclosure under Exemption 4 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please provide a list of any proprietary information included in the application and the page number or numbers on which we can find this information.

Proprietary Information	Page Number(s)
1. [*Add more rows as needed*]	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	