



BLOOMFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION - SPECIAL MEETING

Special Meeting AT Tuesday, January 5, 2010

Bloomfield Board of Education 1133 Blue Hills Avenue Board Room, 1133 Blue Hills Avenue ,  
Bloomfield, CT 06002

1. Establishment of a Quorum and Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. New Business
  - A. Discussion and Possible Action on Bloomfield's Participation in "Race to the Top" 2
  - B. Approval of 2010 - 2011 School Calendar 47
  - C. Appointment of School District Curriculum Committee
  - D. Discussion of Documents Exempt from Disclosure by the Attorney-Client Privilege (Board may go into Executive Session)
4. Adjournment
5. NEXT MEETING DATE - FEBRUARY 18, 2010

Simulated Race to the Top Minimum Distribution Under  
the 50 Percent Title I Distribution Formula Portion

Item A.	Total Race to the Top (RTTT) Funds:	\$175,000,000
B.	RTTT Funds Distributed through Title I Distribution(Item B x .5):	\$87,500,000

Dist Code	District Name	(1) 2009-10 Title I Part A Regular Entitlement	(2) 2009-11 Title I Part A ARRA Entitlement	(3) Total Title I Part A Entitlement (Col 1 + Col 2)	(4) Title I Part A Entitlement Proportion (Col 3 / Col 3 Total)	(5) Simulated RTTT Formula Allocation (Col 4 x Item A)
1	Andover	8,945	0	8,945	0.0000510882	4,470
2	Ansonia	729,790	440,327	1,170,117	0.0066829675	584,760
3	Ashford	58,161	30,818	88,979	0.0005081917	44,467
4	Avon	50,612	0	50,612	0.0002890637	25,293
5	Barkhamsted	13,223	0	13,223	0.0000755214	6,608
7	Berlin	93,436	0	93,436	0.0005336473	46,694
8	Bethany	41,695	23,275	64,970	0.0003710675	32,468
9	Bethel	102,644	0	102,644	0.0005862375	51,296
11	Bloomfield	447,848	269,205	717,053	0.0040953528	358,343
12	Bolton	0	0	0	0.0000000000	0
13	Bozrah	36,860	21,936	58,796	0.0003358055	29,383
14	Branford	331,319	224,730	556,049	0.0031757998	277,882
15	Bridgeport	12,129,960	7,835,142	19,965,102	0.1140280223	9,977,452
17	Bristol	1,644,542	1,429,505	3,074,047	0.0175570102	1,536,238
18	Brookfield	79,932	0	79,932	0.0004565210	39,946
19	Brooklyn	124,489	73,488	197,977	0.0011307193	98,938
21	Canaan	15,234	8,249	23,483	0.0001341200	11,736
22	Canterbury	80,861	74,393	155,254	0.0008867126	77,587
23	Canton	48,589	0	48,589	0.0002775096	24,282
24	Chaplin	14,281	14,262	28,543	0.0001630195	14,264
25	Cheshire	149,550	0	149,550	0.0008541349	74,737
26	Chester	7,993	0	7,993	0.0000456510	3,994
27	Clinton	111,294	0	111,294	0.0006356409	55,619
28	Colchester	101,105	0	101,105	0.0005774477	50,527
29	Colebrook	0	0	0	0.0000000000	0
30	Columbia	46,470	0	46,470	0.0002654072	23,223
31	Cornwall	5,635	0	5,635	0.0000321836	2,816
32	Coventry	84,426	0	84,426	0.0004821879	42,191
33	Cromwell	233,394	139,619	373,013	0.0021304141	186,411
34	Danbury	1,470,545	980,663	2,451,208	0.0139997482	1,224,978
35	Darien	0	0	0	0.0000000000	0
36	Deep River	147,421	164,989	312,410	0.0017842881	156,125
37	Derby	334,939	208,499	543,438	0.0031037738	271,580
39	Eastford	37,820	20,373	58,193	0.0003323616	29,082
40	East Granby	30,079	0	30,079	0.0001717922	15,032
41	East Haddam	80,473	0	80,473	0.0004596108	40,216
42	East Hampton	81,855	0	81,855	0.0004675039	40,907
43	East Hartford	2,500,250	1,864,458	4,364,708	0.0249284487	2,181,239
44	East Haven	592,921	423,637	1,016,558	0.0058059357	508,019
45	East Lyme	96,765	0	96,765	0.0005526604	48,358

Simulated Race to the Top Minimum Distribution Under  
the 50 Percent Title I Distribution Formula Portion

Item A.	Total Race to the Top (RTTT) Funds:	\$175,000,000
B.	RTTT Funds Distributed through Title I Distribution(Item B x .5):	\$87,500,000

Dist Code	District Name	(1) 2009-10 Title I Part A Regular Entitlement	(2) 2009-11 Title I Part A ARRA Entitlement	(3) Total Title I Part A Entitlement (Col 1 + Col 2)	(4) Title I Part A Entitlement Proportion (Col 3 / Col 3 Total)	(5) Simulated RTTT Formula Allocation (Col 4 x Item A)
46	Easton	26,372	0	26,372	0.0001506202	13,179
47	East Windsor	153,062	125,184	278,246	0.0015891650	139,052
48	Ellington	85,527	0	85,527	0.0004884761	42,742
49	Enfield	739,400	662,256	1,401,656	0.0080053717	700,470
50	Essex	13,087	0	13,087	0.0000747447	6,540
51	Fairfield	267,766	0	267,766	0.0015293099	133,815
52	Farmington	141,527	0	141,527	0.0008083126	70,727
53	Franklin	8,705	0	8,705	0.0000497174	4,350
54	Glastonbury	146,488	0	146,488	0.0008366467	73,207
56	Granby	48,543	0	48,543	0.0002772469	24,259
57	Greenwich	423,940	0	423,940	0.0024212769	211,862
58	Griswold	203,095	121,463	324,558	0.0018536698	162,196
59	Groton	672,246	472,190	1,144,436	0.0065362939	571,926
60	Guilford	118,566	0	118,566	0.0006771739	59,253
62	Hamden	1,150,979	745,995	1,896,974	0.0108343145	948,003
63	Hampton	0	0	0	0.0000000000	0
64	Hartford	18,431,401	11,216,007	29,647,408	0.1693272241	14,816,132
65	Hartland	12,749	0	12,749	0.0000728142	6,371
67	Hebron	0	0	0	0.0000000000	0
68	Kent	8,743	0	8,743	0.0000499345	4,369
69	Killingly	372,754	217,914	590,668	0.0033735217	295,183
71	Lebanon	52,583	0	52,583	0.0003003208	26,278
72	Ledyard	105,733	0	105,733	0.0006038800	52,840
73	Lisbon	25,031	33,268	58,299	0.0003329670	29,135
74	Litchfield	108,885	80,125	189,010	0.0010795055	94,457
76	Madison	87,575	0	87,575	0.0005001730	43,765
77	Manchester	1,625,685	1,245,366	2,871,051	0.0163976256	1,434,792
78	Mansfield	124,600	67,271	191,871	0.0010958457	95,886
79	Marlborough	17,741	0	17,741	0.0001013254	8,866
80	Meriden	2,889,769	1,742,167	4,631,936	0.0264546859	2,314,785
83	Middletown	763,405	450,513	1,213,918	0.0069331311	606,649
84	Milford	634,263	377,262	1,011,525	0.0057771904	505,504
85	Monroe	93,177	0	93,177	0.0005321680	46,565
86	Montville	175,261	166,049	341,310	0.0019493466	170,568
88	Naugatuck	832,116	496,402	1,328,518	0.0075876537	663,920
89	New Britain	5,602,123	4,326,069	9,928,192	0.0567035470	4,961,560
90	New Canaan	82,253	0	82,253	0.0004697771	41,105
91	New Fairfield	68,531	0	68,531	0.0003914057	34,248
92	New Hartford	5,499	0	5,499	0.0000314068	2,748
93	New Haven	12,012,625	7,454,706	19,467,331	0.1111850695	9,728,694

Simulated Race to the Top Minimum Distribution Under  
the 50 Percent Title I Distribution Formula Portion

Item A.	Total Race to the Top (RTTT) Funds:	\$175,000,000
B.	RTTT Funds Distributed through Title I Distribution(Item B x .5):	\$87,500,000

Dist Code	District Name	(1) 2009-10 Title I Part A Regular Entitlement	(2) 2009-11 Title I Part A ARRA Entitlement	(3) Total Title I Part A Entitlement (Col 1 + Col 2)	(4) Title I Part A Entitlement Proportion (Col 3 / Col 3 Total)	(5) Simulated RTTT Formula Allocation (Col 4 x Item A)
94	Newington	299,625	264,691	564,316	0.0032230157	282,014
95	New London	1,242,867	664,780	1,907,647	0.0108952719	953,336
96	New Milford	138,329	0	138,329	0.0007900477	69,129
97	Newtown	129,033	0	129,033	0.0007369548	64,484
98	Norfolk	0	0	0	0.0000000000	0
99	North Branford	68,045	0	68,045	0.0003886300	34,005
100	North Canaan	15,438	0	15,438	0.0000881721	7,715
101	North Haven	109,759	0	109,759	0.0006268739	54,851
102	North Stonington	79,435	56,393	135,828	0.0007757635	67,879
103	Norwalk	1,767,568	1,121,366	2,888,934	0.0164997620	1,443,729
104	Norwich	1,323,112	787,384	2,110,496	0.0120538170	1,054,709
106	Old Saybrook	121,128	0	121,128	0.0006918064	60,533
107	Orange	33,350	0	33,350	0.0001904741	16,666
108	Oxford	65,539	0	65,539	0.0003743173	32,753
109	Plainfield	322,394	195,051	517,445	0.0029553182	258,590
110	Plainville	311,364	195,668	507,032	0.0028958458	253,387
111	Plymouth	147,955	117,286	265,241	0.0015148887	132,553
112	Pomfret	29,786	0	29,786	0.0001701188	14,885
113	Portland	125,320	70,756	196,076	0.0011198620	97,988
114	Preston	28,299	0	28,299	0.0001616260	14,142
116	Putnam	340,911	172,044	512,955	0.0029296742	256,346
117	Redding	32,767	0	32,767	0.0001871444	16,375
118	Ridgefield	0	0	0	0.0000000000	0
119	Rocky Hill	66,034	0	66,034	0.0003771444	33,000
121	Salem	14,291	0	14,291	0.0000816211	7,142
122	Salisbury	59,224	34,984	94,208	0.0005380565	47,080
123	Scotland	5,251	0	5,251	0.0000299904	2,624
124	Seymour	226,185	169,204	395,389	0.0022582116	197,594
125	Sharon	28,175	13,300	41,475	0.0002368789	20,727
126	Shelton	244,784	0	244,784	0.0013980512	122,329
127	Sherman	19,965	0	19,965	0.0001140274	9,977
128	Simsbury	89,223	0	89,223	0.0005095853	44,589
129	Somers	48,558	0	48,558	0.0002773326	24,267
131	Southington	255,505	0	255,505	0.0014592828	127,687
132	South Windsor	118,183	0	118,183	0.0006749865	59,061
133	Sprague	47,815	29,936	77,751	0.0004440645	38,856
134	Stafford	167,256	0	167,256	0.0009552604	83,585
135	Stamford	2,305,891	1,558,476	3,864,367	0.0220708177	1,931,197
136	Sterling	59,183	34,737	93,920	0.0005364116	46,936
137	Stonington	158,816	149,166	307,982	0.0017589982	153,912

Simulated Race to the Top Minimum Distribution Under  
the 50 Percent Title I Distribution Formula Portion

Item A. Total Race to the Top (RTTT) Funds: \$175,000,000  
 B. RTTT Funds Distributed through Title I  
 Distribution(Item B x .5): \$87,500,000

Dist Code	District Name	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		2009-10 Title I Part A Regular Entitlement	2009-11 Title I Part A ARRA Entitlement	Total Title I Part A Entitlement (Col 1 + Col 2)	Title I Part A Entitlement Proportion (Col 3 / Col 3 Total)	Simulated RTTT Formula Allocation (Col 4 x Item A)
138	Stratford	854,091	574,808	1,428,899	0.0081609664	714,085
139	Suffield	66,879	0	66,879	0.0003819705	33,422
140	Thomaston	124,504	74,602	199,106	0.0011371674	99,502
141	Thompson	114,315	67,013	181,328	0.0010356307	90,618
142	Tolland	76,563	0	76,563	0.0004372794	38,262
143	Torrington	669,993	408,096	1,078,089	0.0061573618	538,769
144	Trumbull	161,582	0	161,582	0.0009228541	80,750
145	Union	3,686	0	3,686	0.0000210521	1,842
146	Vernon	456,177	305,378	761,555	0.0043495200	380,583
147	Voluntown	43,016	26,400	69,416	0.0003964602	34,690
148	Wallingford	337,663	299,670	637,333	0.0036400426	318,504
151	Waterbury	9,886,171	7,705,190	17,591,361	0.1004707166	8,791,188
152	Waterford	272,024	166,791	438,815	0.0025062335	219,295
153	Watertown	103,852	0	103,852	0.0005931369	51,899
154	Westbrook	38,183	0	38,183	0.0002180771	19,082
155	West Hartford	762,122	599,984	1,362,106	0.0077794871	680,705
156	West Haven	2,104,350	1,371,150	3,475,500	0.0198498556	1,736,862
157	Weston	0	0	0	0.0000000000	0
158	Westport	147,106	0	147,106	0.0008401763	73,515
159	Wethersfield	262,420	183,560	445,980	0.0025471554	222,876
160	Willington	39,835	37,093	76,928	0.0004393640	38,444
161	Wilton	0	0	0	0.0000000000	0
162	Winchester	209,161	130,016	339,177	0.0019371643	169,502
163	Windham	1,314,499	680,177	1,994,676	0.0113923264	996,829
164	Windsor	497,850	410,608	908,458	0.0051885369	453,997
165	Windsor Locks	226,224	180,403	406,627	0.0023223960	203,210
166	Wolcott	222,953	174,076	397,029	0.0022675783	198,413
167	Woodbridge	40,889	0	40,889	0.0002335321	20,434
169	Woodstock	96,978	57,866	154,844	0.0008843709	77,382
201	District No. 1	30,801	0	30,801	0.0001759158	15,393
204	District No. 4	36,498	0	36,498	0.0002084535	18,240
205	District No. 5	60,065	0	60,065	0.0003430533	30,017
206	District No. 6	99,467	59,569	159,036	0.0009083129	79,477
207	District No. 7	16,751	0	16,751	0.0000956711	8,371
208	District No. 8	35,294	0	35,294	0.0002015770	17,638
209	District No. 9	14,712	0	14,712	0.0000840256	7,352
210	District No. 10	49,273	0	49,273	0.0002814162	24,624
211	District No. 11	20,742	28,474	49,216	0.0002810906	24,595
212	District No. 12	73,049	0	73,049	0.0004172096	36,506
213	District No. 13	78,906	0	78,906	0.0004506611	39,433

Simulated Race to the Top Minimum Distribution Under  
the 50 Percent Title I Distribution Formula Portion

Item A.	Total Race to the Top (RTTT) Funds:	\$175,000,000
B.	RTTT Funds Distributed through Title I Distribution(Item B x .5):	\$87,500,000

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Dist	District	2009-10	2009-11	Total	Title I	Simulated
Code	Name	Title I	Title I	Title I	Part A	RTTT
		Part A	Part A	Part A	Entitlement	Formula
		Regular	ARRA	Entitlement	Proportion	Allocation
		Entitlement	Entitlement	(Col 1 + Col 2)	(Col 3 / Col 3 Total)	(Col 4 x Item A)
214	District No. 14	183,511	121,838	305,349	0.0017439602	152,597
215	District No. 15	120,129	0	120,129	0.0006861008	60,034
216	District No. 16	122,511	107,454	229,965	0.0013134145	114,924
217	District No. 17	76,654	0	76,654	0.0004377991	38,307
218	District No. 18	45,979	0	45,979	0.0002626029	22,978
219	District No. 19	63,594	70,323	133,917	0.0007648491	66,924
241	CREC	682,264	670,833	1,353,097	0.0077280334	676,203
243	CES	127,528	81,130	208,658	0.0011917224	104,276
244	ACES	374,790	245,001	619,791	0.0035398538	309,737
245	LEARN	234,702	137,775	372,477	0.0021273528	186,143
253	Eastconn	5,845	14,403	20,248	0.0001156438	10,119
261	Jumoke	220,351	133,901	354,252	0.0020232631	177,036
263	Odyssey	31,754	21,059	52,813	0.0003016344	26,393
264	Integrated Day	34,259	21,579	55,838	0.0003189113	27,905
265	ISAAC	59,380	35,916	95,296	0.0005442704	47,624
268	Common Ground	92,305	64,095	156,400	0.0008932578	78,160
269	Bridge	119,746	77,471	197,217	0.0011263786	98,558
270	Side by Side	49,471	31,773	81,244	0.0004640143	40,601
272	Explorations	6,488	14,474	20,962	0.0001197217	10,476
278	Trailblazers	47,491	31,203	78,694	0.0004494503	39,327
279	Amistad	340,520	266,776	607,296	0.0034684903	303,493
280	New Beginnings	150,625	132,754	283,379	0.0016184814	141,617
281	Elm City College	313,868	209,671	523,539	0.0029901233	261,636
282	Stamford Academy	45,922	31,033	76,955	0.0004395182	38,458
283	Park City Prep	72,789	60,449	133,238	0.0007609711	66,585
285	A. F. Bridgeport	55,579	67,275	122,854	0.0007016643	61,396
286	Highville	136,303	111,926	248,229	0.0014177269	124,051
287	Asylum Hill	33,062	19,406	52,468	0.0002996640	26,221
288	A.F. Hartford	160,508	144,804	305,312	0.0017437488	152,578
301	CTHSS	2,042,755	1,393,660	3,436,415	0.0196266268	1,717,330
999	CT Part D Subpart 2	360,977	143,704	504,681	0.0028824183	252,212
	Totals	\$107,203,828	\$67,885,607	\$175,089,435	1.0000000006	\$87,499,999

**DRAFT**

# **Connecticut's Race to the Top State Reform Plan**

## **Vision**

“Secondary student achievement in both traditionally measured and innovatively measured outcomes will attain high levels of continuous growth as a result of deep, sophisticated, and sustained collaborations of teams and educators at all levels--State, district, school, and classroom—to improve their practice.”

## **Mission**

“Create the conditions that contribute to the achievement of a culture of collaborative work at every level of the system and eliminate factors that have sustained the traditional culture and isolated practice in our public middle and high schools.”

## **Theory of Action**

“If we successfully create and sustain the conditions for changing school and district culture from one of isolation and privately held practice to one characterized by collaboration and shared work at every level of the systems, then adult practices though the district will be substantially strengthened and student learning outcomes will show continuous and significant achievement over time.”

## **State Reform Plan Elements**

### **Goal 1: Standards and Assessments**

#### **Initiatives**

National Common Standards and Assessment Program

High School Partnerships with Community-Colleges and/or State Universities

Secondary School Reform: The Connecticut Eight-Year Plan

#### **Support Programs/Tools**

Parent Leadership Training or Equivalent

### **Goal 2: Data Systems to Support Instruction**

#### **Initiatives**

Connecticut Data Warehouse

Integrated data systems PK-16

Student Schedule and Staffing Modules

#### **Support Programs/Tools**

Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI)

Special Education Monitoring System

Grade 3-8 Vertical Scales

Grade 3-8 Benchmark Assessment System

### **Goal 3: Great Teachers and Leaders**

#### Initiatives

Revise, update, implement and monitor:

- *Connecticut's Guidelines for Teacher Supervision and Evaluation*
- *The Common Core of Teaching*
- *The Common Core of Leading*

The Connecticut STEM Leader Regional Teacher Exchange

The Charter Oak Master Teacher Placement Program

Advanced Placement Course Expansion

Developing Tomorrow's Professionals Program

The Elementary and Middle School Math and Science Coaching Academy

Hartford Science Center STEM Curriculum and Assessment Projects Gr. 4-6

#### Support Programs/Tools

T. E.A.M. Mentoring Program

CAS Executive Coaching Institute

Connecticut Institute for the Teaching of English Language Learners

Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI)

Scientific, Research-based Interventions (SRBI)

### **Goal 4: Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools**

*Tentative Districts Identified: Bridgeport, New Britain, Hartford, New Haven*

#### Initiative

Implement the Connecticut AYP Accountability System: Title I (g)

#### Program Supports/Tools

Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative

Parent Leadership Training or Equivalent

*"Participating districts" must implement all or substantially all of the elements of the Connecticut State Reform Plan.*

**I. PARTICIPATING LEA MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**  
**(Appendix D in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and**  
**Selection Criteria; and in the Notice Inviting Applications)**

**Background for Memorandum of Understanding**

---

Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in a State's Race to the Top plans are required to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or other binding agreement with the State that specifies the scope of the work being implemented by the participating LEA (as defined in this notice).

To support States in working efficiently with LEAs to determine which LEAs will participate in the State's Race to the Top application, the U.S. Department of Education has produced a model MOU, which is attached. This model MOU may serve as a template for States; however, States 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 State and local attorneys on what is most appropriate for their State that includes, at a minimum, these key elements.

The purpose of the model MOU is to help to specify a relationship that is specific to Race to the Top and is not meant to detail all typical aspects of State/LEA grant management or administration. At a minimum, a strong MOU should include the following, each of which is described in detail below: (i) terms and conditions; (ii) a scope of work; and, (iii) signatures.

(i) Terms and conditions: Each participating LEA (as defined in this notice) should sign a standard set of terms and conditions that includes, at a minimum, key roles and responsibilities of the State and the LEA; State recourse for LEA non-performance; and assurances that make clear what the participating LEA (as defined in this notice) is agreeing to do.

(ii) Scope of work: MOUs should include a scope of work (included in the model MOU as Exhibit I) that is completed by each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). The scope of work must be signed and dated by an authorized LEA and State official. In the interest of time and with respect for the effort it will take for LEAs to develop detailed work plans, the scope of work submitted by LEAs and States as part of their Race to the Top applications may be preliminary. Preliminary scopes of work should include the portions of the State's proposed reform plans that the LEA is agreeing to implement. (Note that in order to participate in a State's Race to the Top application an LEA must agree to implement all or significant portions of the State's reform plans.)

If a State is awarded a Race to the Top grant, the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) will have up to 90 days to complete final scopes of work (which could be attached to the model MOU as Exhibit II), which must contain detailed work plans that are consistent with the preliminary scope of work and with the State's grant application, and should include the participating LEA's (as defined in this notice) specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures.

(iii) Signatures: The signatures demonstrate (a) an acknowledgement of the relationship between the LEA and the State, and (b) the strength of the participating LEA's (as defined in this notice) commitment.

- With respect to the relationship between the LEA and the State, the State's counter-signature on the MOU indicates that the LEA's commitment is consistent with the requirement that a participating LEA (as defined in this notice) implement all or significant portions of the State's plans.
- The strength of the participating LEA's (as defined in this notice) commitment will be demonstrated by the signatures of the LEA superintendent (or an equivalent authorized signatory), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable) and the local teacher's union leader (if applicable).

Please note the following with regard to the State's Race to the Top application:

- In its application, the State need only provide an example of the State's standard Participating LEA MOU; it does not have to provide copies of every MOU signed by its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice). If, however, States and LEAs have made any changes to the State's standard MOU, the State must provide description of the changes that were made. Please note that the Department may, at any time, request copies of all MOUs between the State and its participating LEAs.
- Please see criterion (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii), and the evidence requested in the application, for more information and ways in which States will be asked to summarize information about the LEA MOUs.

## Model Participating LEA Memorandum of Understanding

---

This Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) is entered into by and between \_\_\_\_\_ (“State”) and \_\_\_\_\_ (“Participating LEA”). The purpose of this agreement is to establish a framework of collaboration, as well as articulate specific roles and responsibilities in support of the State in its implementation of an approved Race to the Top grant project.

### I. SCOPE OF WORK

Exhibit I, the Preliminary Scope of Work, indicates which portions of the State’s proposed reform plans (“State Plan”) the Participating LEA is agreeing to implement. (Note that, in order to participate, the LEA must agree to implement all or significant portions of the State Plan.)

### II. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

#### A. PARTICIPATING LEA RESPONSIBILITIES

In assisting the State in implementing the tasks and activities described in the State’s Race to the Top application, the Participating LEA subgrantee will:

- 1) Implement the LEA plan as identified in Exhibits I and II of this agreement;
- 2) Actively participate in all relevant convenings, communities of practice, or other practice-sharing events that are organized or sponsored by the State or by the U.S. Department of Education (“ED”);
- 3) Post to any website specified by the State or ED, in a timely manner, all non-proprietary products and lessons learned developed using funds associated with the Race to the Top grant;
- 4) Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by the State or ED;
- 5) Be responsive to State or ED requests for information including on the status of the project, project implementation, outcomes, and any problems anticipated or encountered;
- 6) Participate in meetings and telephone conferences with the State to discuss (a) progress of the project, (b) potential dissemination of resulting non-proprietary products and lessons learned, (c) plans for subsequent years of the Race to the Top grant period, and (d) other matters related to the Race to the Top grant and associated plans.

#### B. STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

In assisting Participating LEAs in implementing their tasks and activities described in the State’s Race to the Top application, the State grantee will:

- 1) Work collaboratively with, and support the Participating LEA in carrying out the LEA Plan as identified in Exhibits I and II of this agreement;
- 2) Timely distribute the LEA’s portion of Race to the Top grant funds during the course of the project period and in accordance with the LEA Plan identified in Exhibit II;
- 3) Provide feedback on the LEA’s status updates, annual reports, any interim reports, and project plans and products; and
- 4) Identify sources of technical assistance for the project.

#### C. JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1) The State and the Participating LEA will each appoint a key contact person for the Race to the Top grant.
- 2) These key contacts from the State and the Participating LEA will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
- 3) State and Participating LEA grant personnel will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant period.

4) State and Participating LEA grant personnel will negotiate in good faith to continue to achieve the overall goals of the State's Race to the Top grant, even when the State Plan requires modifications that affect the Participating LEA, or when the LEA Plan requires modifications.

**D. STATE RECOURSE FOR LEA NON-PERFORMANCE**

If the State determines that the LEA is not meeting its goals, timelines, budget, or annual targets or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, the State grantee will take appropriate enforcement action, which could include a collaborative process between the State and the LEA, or any of the enforcement measures that are detailed in 34 CFR section 80.43 including putting the LEA on reimbursement payment status, temporarily withholding funds, or disallowing costs.

**III. ASSURANCES**

The Participating LEA hereby certifies and represents that it:

- 1) Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU;
- 2) Is familiar with the State's Race to the Top grant application and is supportive of and committed to working on all or significant portions of the State Plan;
- 3) Agrees to be a Participating LEA and will implement those portions of the State Plan indicated in Exhibit I, if the State application is funded,
- 4) Will provide a Final Scope of Work to be attached to this MOU as Exhibit II only if the State's application is funded; will do so in a timely fashion but no later than 90 days after a grant is awarded; and will describe in Exhibit II the LEA's specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures ("LEA Plan ") in a manner that is consistent with the Preliminary Scope of Work (Exhibit I) and with the State Plan; and
- 5) Will comply with all of the terms of the Grant, the State's subgrant, and all applicable Federal and State 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, 85, 86, 97, 98 and 99).

**IV. MODIFICATIONS**

This Memorandum of Understanding may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the parties involved, and in consultation with ED.

**V. DURATION/TERMINATION**

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

**VI. SIGNATURES**

**LEA Superintendent** (or equivalent authorized signatory) - required:

---

Signature/Date

---

Print Name/Title

**President of Local School Board** (or equivalent, if applicable):

---

Signature/Date

---

Print Name/Title

**Local Teachers' Union Leader** (if applicable):

---

Signature/Date

---

Print Name/Title

**Authorized State Official** - required:

By its signature below, the State hereby accepts the LEA as a Participating LEA.

---

Signature/Date

---

Print Name/Title

**A. EXHIBIT I – PRELIMINARY SCOPE OF WORK**

LEA hereby agrees to participate in implementing the State Plan in each of the areas identified below.

Elements of State Reform Plans	LEA Participation (Y/N)	Comments from LEA (optional)
<b>B. Standards and Assessments</b>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments		
<b>C. Data Systems to Support Instruction</b>		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:		
(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems		
(ii) Professional development on use of data		
(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers		
<b>D. Great Teachers and Leaders</b>		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:		
(i) Measure student growth		
(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems		
(iii) Conduct annual evaluations		
(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development		
(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion, and retention		
(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification		
(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal		
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:		
(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools		
(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas		
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:		
(i) Quality professional development		
(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development		
<b>E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools</b>		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools		

**For the Participating LEA**

**For the State**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Authorized LEA Signature/Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Authorized State Signature/Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Print Name/Title**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Print Name/Title**

---

# Race to the Top Application

December 5, 2009

# Overview of Race to the Top

- \$4.35B competitive grant to encourage and reward states implementing comprehensive reforms across four key areas:
  - Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace;
  - Building data systems that measure student success and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
  - Recruiting, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals; and
  - Turning around our lowest-achieving schools.
- With an overarching goal of:
  - Driving substantial gains in student achievement
  - Improving high school graduation and college enrollment
  - Narrowing achievement gaps

# Fact Sheet

## Application Dates

Phase 1: January 19, 2010

Phase 2: June 1, 2010

## Award Dates

Phase 1: April 2010

Phase 2: September 2010

Potential Award: \$175M to be spent over 4 years

# Handouts

1. Executive Summary of Race to the Top Program
2. Outline of State Reform Plan
3. Statewide RTTT Allocations based on Title I Allocation Formula for 2009
4. Sample MOU

# Fund Distribution

Distribution of Funds:

50% of Funds to “Participating” Districts, based on the LEAs relative share of Title I, Part A allocations for 2009

50% of Funds to State Activities and Support for “Involved” Districts

# Who are the “Participating” Districts?

- *Participating Districts:* Participating districts are LEAS that choose to work with the State to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top reform plan, as specified in the LEA’s agreement with the state. Each participating LEA that receives funding under Title I, Part A, will receive a share of the 50 percent of a State’s grant award that the State must subgrant to LEAs based on the LEA’s relative share of the title I, Part A allocation in the most recent year, in accordance with section 1400 (c) of the ARRA. Any participating LEA that does not receive funding under Title I, Part A (as well as one that does) may receive funding from the State’s other 50 percent of the grant award, in accordance with the State’s Plan.

# What are the “Involved” Districts?

- *Involved Districts*: Involved Districts are those that choose to work with the State to implement those specific portions of the State’s plan that necessitate full or nearly-full statewide implementation (e.g., Common Standards and Assessments). Involved districts **do not** receive a share of the 50 percent of the State’s grant award that it must subgrant to LEAS in accordance with section 1400 (c) of the ARRA, but States may provide other funding to involve to involve LEAs under the State’s Race to the Top grant, in a manner consistent with the State application.

# Participating District Requirements

1. Participating districts must implement all or significant portions of the State's RTTT Plan, as specified in each LEAs agreement with the State.
2. Participating districts are accountable for meeting the goals, timelines, budgets and annual targets delineated in the State Reform Plan.
3. Participating districts must sign an MOU agreeing to 1 and 2 above, as well as complete a preliminary scope of work; if the State is awarded a RTTT grant, the participating LEAs will have 90 days to submit their detailed work plans that are consistent with their preliminary scope of work and the State's application.
4. Districts that do not choose to participate will **NOT** jeopardize future Title I funding.

# Budget Example

“Participating” Districts

\$87.5M\*

Year 1 (2010-2011)

\$21.875M

Year 2 (2011-2012)

\$21.875M

Year 3 (2012-2013)

\$21.875M

Year 4 (2013-2014)

\$21.875M

State Activities and “Involved” Districts:

\$87.5M \*\*

“Involved” Districts:

\$12M

State Supported Collaborating Districts:

\$40M

Statewide Activities:

\$25.5M

\* See Title I Allocation Table for Four-Year Period

\*\* See Other 50% Funding Example

# Other 50% Funding Example

## “Involved” District Funds: \$12M

- Common Standards and Assessments
- CALI Training
- Secondary School Reform: Staffing, PD
- English Language Learning PD

## State Activities Funds: \$25.5M

- SDE Staffing
- Model Curricula Development
- Statewide and RESC-Sponsored Professional Development
- Institute for the Teaching of English Language Learners
- STEM Leader Regional Teacher Exchange
- Charter Oak Master Teacher Program
- Drop-Out Prevention
- Local Charter School Expansions
- AP Course Expansion
- Signing Bonus Matching Funds

## Collaborating Districts: \$40M

- District Staffing and Support

# Submitting the MOU

- Participating districts, at a minimum must have the signature of the superintendent (or equivalent)
- State receives more credit if the local school board chairperson and union president (or equivalents) also sign the MOU.
- Signature indicates agreement with the State Plan, goals, objectives, and expectations
- MOUs are due to the State by **January 10, 2010**

# Key Application Dates

- First Draft of Application: December 21, 2009
- All MOUs submitted to SDE: January 11, 2010
- Final Draft of Application to USDOE: January 19, 2010

# Key Workshop Dates

	<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Location</u>
EASTCONN	12/10	9:00 a.m.	Hampton Office
HASA	12/10	11:00 a.m.	Hartford Club
CES	12/18	2:30 p.m.	40 Lindeman Dr, Trumbull
LEARN	12/21	3:30 p.m.	Central Office
ACES	TBD		
Ed Connection	TBD		



# Key Dates for Conference Calls

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Call-in Number</u>	<u>Passcode</u>
12/22/09	9:30 a.m.	1-888-390-1272	56011
1/7/10	2:30 p.m.	1-888-390-1272	56011

# **Race to the Top**

Questions and Discussion

The background of the slide features several thick, light gray, wavy lines that flow from the bottom left towards the top right, creating a sense of movement and depth.

# Next Steps

Please visit the following for more information and the process for signing the MOU:

[www.RacetothetopCT.org](http://www.RacetothetopCT.org)

# Race to the Top Program Executive Summary



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

November 2009

“It's time to stop just talking about education reform and start actually doing it.  
It's time to make education America's national mission.”  
– President Barack Obama, November 4, 2009

## **BACKGROUND**

On February 17, 2009, President Obama signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), historic legislation designed to stimulate the economy, support job creation, and invest in critical sectors, including education. The ARRA lays the foundation for education reform by supporting investments in innovative strategies that are most likely to lead to improved results for students, long-term gains in school and school system capacity, and increased productivity and effectiveness.

The ARRA provides \$4.35 billion for the Race to the Top Fund, a competitive grant program designed to encourage and reward States that are creating the conditions for education innovation and reform; achieving significant improvement in student outcomes, including making substantial gains in student achievement, closing achievement gaps, improving high school graduation rates, and ensuring student preparation for success in college and careers; and implementing ambitious plans in four core education reform areas:

- Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;
- Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
- Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and
- Turning around our lowest-achieving schools.

Race to the Top will reward States that have demonstrated success in raising student achievement and have the best plans to accelerate their reforms in the future. These States will offer models for others to follow and will spread the best reform ideas across their States, and across the country.

## **KEY TIMING**

The Department plans to make Race to the Top grants in two phases. States that are ready to apply now may do so in Phase 1; States that need more time may apply in Phase 2. States that apply in Phase 1 but are not awarded grants may reapply for funding in Phase 2, together with States that are applying for the first time in Phase 2. Phase 1 grantees may not apply for additional funding in Phase 2.

Notices Published:	November 2009
Technical Assistance:	
Informational Conference Calls:	November and December 2009
Technical Assistance Workshops:	December 3 in Denver, CO; December 10 in Washington, D.C.
Other Events	TBD
Applications:	
Phase 1 Applications Due:	January 19, 2010
Phase 1 Awards Announced:	April 2010
Phase 2 Applications Due:	June 1, 2010
Phase 2 Awards Announced:	September 2010

## OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM AND POINTS

### Selection Criteria

#### **A. State Success Factors** (125 points)

- (A)(1) Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it (65 points)
- (A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans (30 points)
- (A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps (30 points)

#### **B. Standards and Assessments** (70 points)

- (B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards (40 points)
- (B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (10 points)
- (B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments (20 points)

#### **C. Data Systems to Support Instruction** (47 points)

- (C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points)
- (C)(2) Accessing and using State data (5 points)
- (C)(3) Using data to improve instruction (18 points)

#### **D. Great Teachers and Leaders** (138 points)

- (D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 points)
- (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)
- (D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 points)
- (D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)
- (D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals (20 points)

#### **E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools** (50 points)

- (E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 points)
- (E)(2) Turning around the lowest- achieving schools (40 points)

#### **F. General Selection Criteria** (55 points)

- (F)(1) Making education funding a priority (10 points)
- (F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charters and other innovative schools (40 points)
- (F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions (5 points)

### Priorities

Priority 1: Absolute Priority – Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform


Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority – Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) (15 points, all or nothing)

Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems

Priority 5: Invitational Priority – P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment

Priority 6: Invitational Priority – School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning



## ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

A State must meet the following requirements in order to be eligible to receive funds under this program.

(a) The State's applications for funding under Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program must be approved by the Department prior to the State being awarded a Race to the Top grant.

(b) At the time the State submits its application, there must not be any legal, statutory, or regulatory barriers at the State level to linking data on student achievement (as defined in this notice) or student growth (as defined in this notice) to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation.

## PRIORITIES

### **Priority 1: Absolute Priority -- Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

To meet this priority, the State's application must comprehensively and coherently address all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that the State and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The State must demonstrate in its application sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans; and it must describe how the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

### **Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority -- Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). (15 points, all or nothing)**

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

### **Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes.**

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications that include practices, strategies, or programs to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (pre-kindergarten through third grade) by enhancing the quality of preschool programs. Of particular interest are proposals that support practices that (i) improve school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive); and (ii) improve the transition between preschool and kindergarten.

### **Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems.**

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State plans to expand statewide longitudinal data systems to include or integrate data from special education programs, English language learner programs,<sup>1</sup> early childhood programs, at-risk and dropout prevention programs, and school climate and culture programs, as well as information on student mobility, human resources (*i.e.*, information on teachers, principals, and other staff), school finance, student health, postsecondary education, and other

---

<sup>1</sup> The term English language learner, as used in this notice, is synonymous with the term limited English proficient, as defined in section 9101 of the ESEA.

relevant areas, with the purpose of connecting and coordinating all parts of the system to allow important questions related to policy, practice, or overall effectiveness to be asked, answered, and incorporated into effective continuous improvement practices.

The Secretary is also particularly interested in applications in which States propose working together to adapt one State's statewide longitudinal data system so that it may be used, in whole or in part, by one or more other States, rather than having each State build or continue building such systems independently.

**Priority 5: Invitational Priority -- P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment.**

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State plans to address how early childhood programs, K-12 schools, postsecondary institutions, workforce development organizations, and other State agencies and community partners (*e.g.*, child welfare, juvenile justice, and criminal justice agencies) will coordinate to improve all parts of the education system and create a more seamless preschool-through-graduate school (P-20) route for students. Vertical alignment across P-20 is particularly critical at each point where a transition occurs (*e.g.*, between early childhood and K-12, or between K-12 and postsecondary/careers) to ensure that students exiting one level are prepared for success, without remediation, in the next. Horizontal alignment, that is, coordination of services across schools, State agencies, and community partners, is also important in ensuring that high-need students (as defined in this notice) have access to the broad array of opportunities and services they need and that are beyond the capacity of a school itself to provide.

**Priority 6: Invitational Priority -- School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning.**

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State's participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) seek to create the conditions for reform and innovation as well as the conditions for learning by providing schools with flexibility and autonomy in such areas as--

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

## SELECTION CRITERIA

### A. State Success Factors (125 points)

#### (A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs' participation in it (65 points)

The extent to which—

- (i) The State has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcomes statewide, establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application; (5 points)
- (ii) The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State's plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (as set forth in Appendix D)<sup>2</sup> or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include— (45 points)
  - (a) Terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State's plans;
  - (b) Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State's Race to the Top plans; and
  - (c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers' union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice); and
- (iii) The LEAs that are participating in the State's Race to the Top plans (including considerations of the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty) will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its ambitious yet achievable goals, overall and by student subgroup, for— (15 points)
  - (a) Increasing student achievement in (at a minimum) reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;
  - (b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;
  - (c) Increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice); and
  - (d) Increasing college enrollment (as defined in this notice) and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education.

#### (A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans (30 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality overall plan to—

- (i) Ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by— (20 points)
  - (a) Providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans the State has proposed;
  - (b) Supporting participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices, evaluating these practices' effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and replicating the effective practices statewide, holding participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary;
  - (c) Providing effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its Race to the Top grant in such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement;

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix D for more on participating LEA MOUs and for a model MOU.

(d) Using the funds for this grant, as described in the State's budget and accompanying budget narrative, to accomplish the State's plans and meet its targets, including, where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other Federal, State, and local sources so that they align with the State's Race to the Top goals; and

(e) Using the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State to continue, after the period of funding has ended, those reforms funded under the grant for which there is evidence of success; and

(ii) Use support from a broad group of stakeholders to better implement its plans, as evidenced by the strength of statements or actions of support from— (10 points)

(a) The State's teachers and principals, which include the State's teachers' unions or statewide teacher associations; and

(b) Other critical stakeholders, such as the State's legislative leadership; charter school authorizers and State charter school membership associations (if applicable); other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, civil rights, and education association leaders); Tribal schools; parent, student, and community organizations (e.g., parent-teacher associations, nonprofit organizations, local education foundations, and community-based organizations); and institutions of higher education.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps (30 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its ability to—

(i) Make progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms; (5 points)

(ii) Improve student outcomes overall and by student subgroup since at least 2003, and explain the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed to— (25 points)

(a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA;

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; and

(c) Increasing high school graduation rates.

**B. Standards and Assessments** (70 points)

*State Reform Conditions Criteria*

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards (40 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B)—

(i) The State's participation in a consortium of States that— (20 points)

(a) Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and

(b) Includes a significant number of States; and

(ii) (20 points)

(a) For Phase 1 applications, the State's high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or

(b) For Phase 2 applications, the State's adoption of a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State in a high-quality plan toward which the State has made significant progress, and its commitment to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Phase 2 applicants addressing selection criterion (B)(1)(ii) may amend their June 1, 2010 application submission through August 2, 2010 by submitting evidence of adopting common standards after June 1, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (10 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State’s participation in a consortium of States that—

- (i) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium’s common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice); and
- (ii) Includes a significant number of States.

*Reform Plan Criteria*

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments (20 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for supporting a statewide transition to and implementation of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation, and high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) tied to these standards. State or LEA activities might, for example, include: developing a rollout plan for the standards together with all of their supporting components; in cooperation with the State’s institutions of higher education, aligning high school exit criteria and college entrance requirements with the new standards and assessments; developing or acquiring, disseminating, and implementing high-quality instructional materials and assessments (including, for example, formative and interim assessments (both as defined in this notice)); developing or acquiring and delivering high-quality professional development to support the transition to new standards and assessments; and engaging in other strategies that translate the standards and information from assessments into classroom practice for all students, including high-need students (as defined in this notice).

**C. Data Systems to Support Instruction** (47 points)

*State Reform Conditions Criteria*

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points)

The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

*Reform Plan Criteria*

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data (5 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan to ensure that data from the State’s statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage, as appropriate, key stakeholders (e.g., parents, students, teachers, principals, LEA leaders, community members, unions, researchers, and policymakers); and that the data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of efforts in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness.<sup>4</sup>

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction (18 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan to—

- (i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;
- (ii) Support participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development to teachers,

---

<sup>4</sup> Successful applicants that receive Race to the Top grant awards will need to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), including 34 CFR Part 99, as well as State and local requirements regarding privacy.

principals, and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and

(iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (*e.g.*, students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).

#### **D. Great Teachers and Leaders (138 points)**

##### *State Reform Conditions Criteria*

##### **(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 points)**

The extent to which the State has—

(i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;

(ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and

(iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

##### *Reform Plan Criteria*

##### **(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)**

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding— (28 points)

(a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

(c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

(d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

##### **(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 points)**

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in

this notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students; and (15 points)

(ii) Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA. (10 points)

Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.

**(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)**

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

**(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals (20 points)**

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to—

(i) Provide effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high-need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes; and

(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice).

**E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (50 points)**

*State Reform Conditions Criteria*

**(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 points)**

The extent to which the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

*Reform Plan Criteria*

**(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools (40 points)**

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and (5 points)

(ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). (35 points)

## **F. General (55 points)**

### *State Reform Conditions Criteria*

#### (F)(1) Making education funding a priority (10 points)

The extent to which—

- (i) The percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008; and
- (ii) The State's policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.

#### (F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools (40 points)

The extent to which—

- (i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;
- (ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;
- (iii) The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;
- (iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and
- (v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

#### (F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions (5 points)

The extent to which the State, in addition to information provided under other State Reform Conditions Criteria, has created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.

## **DEFINITIONS**

Alternative routes to certification means pathways to certification that are authorized under the State's laws or regulations, that allow the establishment and operation of teacher and administrator preparation programs in the State, and that have the following characteristics (in addition to standard features such as demonstration of subject-matter mastery, and high-quality instruction in pedagogy and in addressing the needs of all students in the classroom including English language learners and student with disabilities): (a) can be provided by various types of qualified providers, including both institutions of higher education and other providers operating independently from institutions of higher education; (b) are selective in accepting candidates; (c) provide supervised, school-based experiences and ongoing support such as effective

mentoring and coaching; (d) significantly limit the amount of coursework required or have options to test out of courses; and (e) upon completion, award the same level of certification that traditional preparation programs award upon completion.

College enrollment refers to the enrollment of students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1) and who enroll in an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act, P.L. 105-244, 20 U.S.C. 1001) within 16 months of graduation.

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

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

Effective teacher means a teacher whose students achieve acceptable rates (*e.g.*, at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

High-need students means students at risk of educational failure or otherwise in need of special assistance and support, such as students who are living in poverty, who attend high-minority schools (as defined in 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 language learners.

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

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

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

Increased learning time means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, including English; reading or language arts; mathematics; science; foreign languages; civics and government; economics; arts; history; and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.<sup>5</sup>

Innovative, autonomous public schools means open enrollment public schools that, in return for increased accountability for student achievement (as defined in this notice), have the flexibility and authority to define their instructional models and associated curriculum; select and replace staff; implement new structures and formats for the school day or year; and control their budgets.

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

Interim assessment means an assessment that is given at regular and specified intervals throughout the school year, is designed to evaluate students' knowledge and skills relative to a specific set of academic

---

<sup>5</sup> Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year. (See Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. "The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School." *Child Development*. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-497 and research done by Mass2020.) Extending learning into before- and after-school hours can be difficult to implement effectively, but is permissible under this definition with encouragement to closely integrate and coordinate academic work between in-school and out-of school. (See James-Burdumy, Susanne; Dynarski, Mark; Deke, John. "When Elementary Schools Stay Open Late: Results from The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." <[http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/redirect\\_PubsDB.asp?strSite=http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/296](http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/redirect_PubsDB.asp?strSite=http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/296)> Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol. 29 (4), December 2007, Document No. PP07-121.)

standards, and produces results that can be aggregated (*e.g.*, by course, grade level, school, or LEA) in order to inform teachers and administrators at the student, classroom, school, and LEA levels.

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

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

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

Participating LEAs means LEAs that choose to work with the State to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top plan, as specified in each LEA’s agreement with the State. Each participating LEA that receives funding under Title I, Part A will receive a share of the 50 percent of a State’s grant award that the State must subgrant to LEAs, based on the LEA’s relative share of Title I, Part A allocations in the most recent year, in accordance with section 14006(c) of the ARRA. Any participating LEA that does not receive funding under Title I, Part A (as well as one that does) may receive funding from the State’s other 50 percent of the grant award, in accordance with the State’s plan.

Persistently lowest-achieving schools means, as determined by the State: (i) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that (a) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or (b) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and (ii) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that (a) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or (b) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

To identify the lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both (i) The academic achievement of the “all students” group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and (ii) The school’s lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the “all students” group.

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

Student achievement means—

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

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

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

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

America COMPETES Act elements means (as specified in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of that Act): (1) a unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the

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

# BLOOMFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS CALENDAR 2010-2011 (PROPOSED)

**August (0 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

**September (21 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
			1*	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

**October (19 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

**November (18 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

**December (17 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

**January (20 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

**February (18 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28					

**March (22 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

**April (16 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

**May (20 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

**June (9 days)**

Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13**	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

**Note: School must be in session 180 days. The first day of school for students will be September 1, 2010.**

**If no school days are cancelled, the last day of the school year will be June 13, 2011.**

- \* Start of School Year
- ◻ No School
- Professional Day - No School
- ▽ Parent Conference/Early Dismissal (K-8)
- \*\* Early Dismissal (No lunch served)

## Connecticut Association of Boards of Education

Vincent A. Mustaro, Senior Staff Associate for Policy Service

### Presents

## Policy Highlights

**Curriculum Committees Required/Clarified:** The Connecticut General Assembly through P.A. 08-153, "An Act Concerning Minor Changes to the Education Statutes," enacted C.G.S. §10-220(e), which provides: "(e) Each local and regional board of education shall establish a school district curriculum committee. The committee shall recommend, develop, review and approve all curriculum for the local or regional school district." It would appear that this law shifts the ultimate responsibility for the curriculum from boards of education to such committees. The legislation itself does not provide any specific guidance.

This topic recently has raised considerable controversy because the statute is very broadly written, as stated above. It is my opinion that the language does not indicate whether the school district curriculum committee should be a board-level committee or a staff-level curriculum committee, nor does it speak to the composition of the committee. Guidance is not provided by the wording of the statute. The board of education should not develop curriculum. That is viewed as the responsibility of the instructional staff. However, curriculum developed by the instructional staff should be subject to the approval of the board of education.

This issue has been reviewed by Patrice McCarthy, CABA General Counsel, in consultation with attorney Tom Mooney. The conclusion has been reached that a board of education is in compliance with the statute if they establish a committee which provides an approved curriculum to the board of education, with the board of education having final approval. In short, the board could only adopt curriculum that has been approved by the curriculum committee.

Tom Mooney has suggested the following motion to be used by boards of education:

*MOVED: That in accordance with the Connecticut General Statutes, Section 10-220(e), the Board appoints \_\_\_\_\_ to act as the school district curriculum committee, and*

*MOVED FURTHER that the charge of this committee is to recommend, develop, review and approve all school district curricula, with the understanding that curricula approved by the committee shall be submitted to the Board for final review and approval.*

**Policy Implications:** At the time of the passage of this legislation, policy #6140, "Curriculum," was revised to include the following language:

"The curriculum development/revision process will be conducted by a District Curriculum Committee that has the responsibility to recommend, develop, review, and approve all curriculum for the District and said curriculum shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Education.

The Board of Education reserves the responsibility for establishing and approving curricula for the school district. (*Alternative language: The Board of Education has responsibility and authority for the district's curriculum, subject to any limits specified by the State.*)"