Race to the Top
Application for Phase 2 Funding
CFDA Number: 84.395A

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0697
Expiration Date: 06/30/2010
Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0697. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 681 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Race to the Top, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3E108, Washington, D.C. 20202-3118

APPLICATION FOR INITIAL FUNDING UNDER RACE TO THE TOP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. APPLICATION INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS 3

II. DEFINITIONS 7

III. RACE TO THE TOP APPLICATION ASSURANCES 12

IV. ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, REPORTING AND OTHER ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS 14

V. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS 17

VI. SELECTION CRITERIA: PROGRESS AND PLANS IN THE FOUR EDUCATION REFORM AREAS 18

VII. COMPETITION PRIORITIES 129

VIII. BUDGET 137

IX. PARTICIPATING LEA MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (Appendix D in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; and in the Notice Inviting Applications) 171

X. SCHOOL INTERVENTION MODELS (Appendix C in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; and in the Notice Inviting Applications) 177

XI. SCORING RUBRIC (Appendix B in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; and in the Notice Inviting Applications) 181

XII. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS 198

XIII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS 200

XIV. OTHER REQUIREMENTS 201

XV. CONTRACTING FOR SERVICES 203

XVI. APPLICATION SUBMISSION PROCEDURES 204

XVII. APPLICATION CHECKLIST 206

XVIII. APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS 208

Dear Colleague:

On July 24, President Obama and I released the proposed priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria for the $4.35 billion Race to the Top Fund. That announcement precipitated a vigorous national dialogue about how to best reform our schools and educate our Nation's children. With your assistance, that dialogue is beginning to generate far-reaching reforms that will help America boost student learning, narrow achievement gaps, and increase college and career readiness. Today, the U.S. Department of Education is releasing the final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria, along with the application for the Race to the Top competition.

Race to the Top provides an unprecedented opportunity to reform our schools and challenge an educational status quo that is failing too many children. President Obama and Congress have provided more money for school reform than ever before in history. This is a once-in-a-lifetime chance to change our schools and accelerate student achievement. And everyone committed to education reform can be partners in promoting the success of our children.

Through Race to the Top, we are asking States to advance reforms around four specific 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.

Awards in Race to the Top will go to States that are leading the way with ambitious yet achievable plans for implementing coherent, compelling, and comprehensive education reform. Race to the Top winners will help trail-blaze effective reforms and provide examples for States and local school districts throughout the country to follow as they too are hard at work on reforms that can transform our schools for decades to come.

The momentum for reform is already building. Some 1,161 commenters submitted thousands of unique comments, ranging from one paragraph to 67 pages. Educators and members of the public from every State and the District of Columbia submitted comments, and the commenters included parents, teachers, principals, superintendents, school board members, chief state school officers, and governors. This outpouring of thoughtful input prompted the Department to make numerous changes and improvements to the final application. But just as important, the overwhelming volume of comments demonstrates the potential for Race to the Top to propel the transformational changes that students and teachers need.

I hope this process becomes a model – one where transparent and candid dialogue informs our policies and your work, enabling all stakeholders to act in the best interests of children. I am heartened by and grateful for your participation to date. And I invite you to continue that conversation as we move forward in the effort to build an education system that our students deserve, one that ensures that our country is ready to compete in the global economy of the 21st Century.

Sincerely,

/s/

Arne Duncan

I. APPLICATION INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS

Introduction

Race to the Top is authorized under section 14006 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The purpose of the Race to the Top Fund, a competitive grant program, is 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.

General Instructions

The Department encourages all potential applicants to read through the entire application package – including the notice inviting applications; the notice of final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria; and this application – before beginning to prepare the application proposal.

This application includes sections that require response or action by the State, as well as several sections of background information that are directly relevant to the program. For example, Section II includes definitions that are used throughout the application.

Page Length Recommendation

The Department recommends a page length for the State's response to each selection criterion; these are indicated in the application next to each criterion. We recommend that States limit their total page count (that is, the narrative responses to all selection criteria in Section VI) to no more than 100 pages of State-authored text, and that they limit their appendices to no more than 250 pages. For all responses, we request that the following standards be used:

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

The Secretary strongly requests that applicants follow the recommended page limits, although the Secretary will consider applications of greater length.

Instructions for Responding to Selection Criteria

The application provides space for the State to address the selection criteria, including performance measures and supporting evidence. As required by the Absolute Priority (explained in more detail below), the State must address all education reform areas. It need not address every individual selection criterion. However, a State will not earn points for selection criteria that it does not address. There are two types of selection criteria – State Reform Conditions Criteria and Reform Plan Criteria—to which the State may respond.

State Reform Conditions Criteria are used to assess a State's progress and its success in creating conditions for reform in specific areas related to the four ARRA education reform areas. The State must provide, for each State Reform Conditions Criterion addressed, a description of the State's current status in meeting that criterion, and at a minimum, the information requested as supporting evidence that the State has met the criterion. The State may also submit additional information that it believes will be helpful to reviewers in judging the criterion.

Reform Plan Criteria are used to assess a State's plan for future efforts in the four ARRA education reform areas. The State must provide, for each Reform Plan Criterion that the State chooses to address, a detailed plan for use of grant funds that includes, but need not be limited to—

- The key goals;
- The key activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, which should include why the specific activities are thought to bring about the change envisioned and how these activities are linked to the desired goals;
- The timeline for implementing the activities;
- The party or parties responsible for implementing the activities;
- The State's annual targets for this plan, where applicable, with respect to the performance measures, if any. Where the State proposes plans for reform efforts not covered by a specified performance measure, the State may propose performance measures and annual targets for those efforts; and
- The information requested as supporting evidence, if any, for the criterion, together with any additional information the State believes will be helpful to reviewers in judging the credibility of the State's plan.

Responding to Selection Criteria: For each criterion, there are up to three parts: the narrative, the performance measures, and the evidence.

- **Narrative:** For each criterion the State addresses, the State writes its narrative response in the text box below the selection criterion (in the space marked, "Enter text here"). In this space, the State describes how it has addressed or will address that criterion. Response lengths are indicated in the directions.

- **Performance Measures:** For several selection criteria, the State is asked to provide goals and annual targets, baseline data, and other information; these are indicated in the application. In addition, the State may provide additional performance measures, baseline data, and targets for any criterion it chooses. Reviewers will consider, as part of their evaluations of the State's application, the extent to which the State has set ambitious yet achievable annual targets for the performance measures in support of the State's plan.

Tables for all of the performance measures are provided in the application. For criteria to which a State is responding, the State must complete the tables or provide an attachment in the Appendix responding to the performance measures. If there are data the State does not have, the State should indicate that the data are not available and explain why.

Some data elements may require States to collect information from participating LEAs. It may be helpful to begin gathering this information as early as possible (see especially criteria (A)(1), (D)(2), and (D)(3)).

To minimize burden, performance measures have been requested only where the Department intends to report nationally on them and for measures that lend themselves to objective and comparable data gathering. In the future, the Department may require grantees to submit additional performance data as part of an annual report, program evaluation, or other mechanism.

For optional performance measures, no submission of the measures is required; however if the State wishes to include performance measures in these optional cases, it may use the templates provided in the application or it may submit attachments.

- **Evidence:** Some selection criteria require the State to provide specific evidence; this is indicated in the application. In addition, the State may provide additional evidence for any criterion it chooses.

  The State must provide the evidence in the narrative text below each selection criterion or provide an attachment in the Appendix.

Appendix: The Appendix must include a complete Table of Contents. Each attachment in the Appendix must be described in the narrative text of the relevant selection criterion, with a rationale for how its inclusion supports the narrative and a notation of its location in the Appendix.

Competition Priorities: The Race to the Top competition includes absolute, competitive, and invitational priorities. The competition priorities can be found in Section VII of this application. The absolute priority will be addressed under State Success Factors, section A, and through the State's comprehensive approach to addressing the four education reform areas, selection criteria sections B, C, D and E. A State that is responding to the competitive preference priority should address it throughout the application, as appropriate, and provide a summary of its approach to addressing the priority in the text box below the priority in Section VII. Applicants responding to the invitational priorities may address them throughout their applications or in the text boxes below each priorities in Section VII. Responding to the competitive and invitational priorities is optional.

Competition Description and Scoring Rubric

For information on the competition review and selection process, see (a) the section entitled, Review and Selection Process, in the notice inviting applications; and (b) Section XI, Scoring Rubric (Appendix B in the notice). In addition, point values have been included throughout the application.

Technical Assistance Planning Workshops

To assist States in preparing the application and to respond to questions, the Department will host a Technical Assistance Planning Workshop for potential Phase 2 applicants on April 21, 2010, in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The purpose of the workshop is for Department staff to review the selection criteria, requirements, and priorities with teams of participants responsible for drafting State applications; for Department staff to answer technical questions about the Race to the Top program; and for potential Phase 2 applicants to hear from and ask questions of successful Phase 1 applicants. For more information about the workshop please visit http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase2-tech-assistance-workshop.html; updates about all events will be available at the Race to the Top website www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop. Attendance at the workshop is strongly encouraged. For those who cannot attend, transcripts of the meeting will be available on our website. Announcements of any other conference calls or webinars and Frequently Asked Questions will also be available on the Race to the Top website www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop.

Frequently Asked Questions

The Department has also prepared frequently asked questions in order to assist States in completing an application. Frequently Asked Questions are available at www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop.

II. 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[1] 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).

[1] 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

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.[2]

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 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.

---

[2] 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> Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol. 29 (4), December 2007, Document No. PP07-121.)

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.

III. RACE TO THE TOP APPLICATION ASSURANCES
(CFDA No. 84.395A)

Legal Name of Applicant (Office of the Governor):	Applicant's Mailing Address:
John E. Baldacci Governor, State of Maine	Office of the Governor 1 State House Station Augusta, Me 04333-0001
Employer Identification Number: 016000001	Organizational DUNS: 809045545
State Race to the Top Contact Name: (Single point of contact for communication) Angela Faherty	Contact Position and Office: Acting Commissioner Maine Department of Education
Contact Telephone: (207) 624-6620	Contact E-mail Address: angela.faherty@maine.gov

Required Applicant Signatures:

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct.

I further certify that I have read the application, am fully committed to it, and will support its implementation:

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name):	Telephone:
John E. Baldacci, Governor	(207) 287-3531
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor:	Date:
John Baldacci	5/27/10
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Angela Faherty	207-624-6620
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:	Date:
Angela Faherty	5/27/2010
President of the State Board of Education (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Ann Weisleder	207-624-6616
Signature of the President of the State Board of Education:	Date:
Ann Weisleder	5/27/2010

State Attorney General Certification

I certify that the State's description of, and statements and conclusions concerning, State law, statute, and regulation in its application are complete, accurate, and constitute a reasonable interpretation of State law, statute, and regulation.
(See especially Eligibility Requirement (b), Selection Criteria (B)(1), (D)(1), (E)(1), (F)(2), (F)(3).)

I certify that the State does not have 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.

State Attorney General or Authorized Representative (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Janet T. Mills	207 626-8599
Signature of the State Attorney General or Authorized Representative:	Date:
Janet T Mills Attorney General	5/27/10

IV. ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, REPORTING AND OTHER ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

Accountability, Transparency and Reporting Assurances

The Governor or his/her authorized representative assures that the State will comply with all of the accountability, transparency, and reporting requirements that apply to the Race to the Top program, including the following:

- For each year of the program, the State will submit a report to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, that describes:
    - the uses of funds within the State;
    - how the State distributed the funds it received;
    - the number of jobs that the Governor estimates were saved or created with the funds;
    - the State's progress in reducing inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers, implementing a State longitudinal data system, and developing and implementing valid and reliable assessments for limited English proficient students and students with disabilities; and
    - if applicable, a description of each modernization, renovation, or repair project approved in the State application and funded, including the amounts awarded and project costs (ARRA Division A, Section 14008)

- The State will cooperate with any U.S. Comptroller General evaluation of the uses of funds and the impact of funding on the progress made toward closing achievement gaps (ARRA Division A, Section 14009)

- If the State uses funds for any infrastructure investment, the State will certify that the investment received the full review and vetting required by law and that the chief executive accepts responsibility that the investment is an appropriate use of taxpayer funds. This certification will include a description of the investment, the estimated total cost, and the amount of covered funds to be used. The certification will be posted on the State's website and linked to www.Recovery.gov. A State or local agency may not use funds under the ARRA for infrastructure investment funding unless this certification is made and posted. (ARRA Division A, Section 1511)

- The State will submit reports, within 10 days after the end of each calendar quarter, that contain the information required under section 1512(c) of the ARRA in accordance with any guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget or the Department. (ARRA Division A, Section 1512(c))

- The State will cooperate with any appropriate Federal Inspector General's examination of records under the program. (ARRA Division A, Section 1515)

Other Assurances and Certifications

The Governor or his/her authorized representative assures or certifies the following:

- The State will comply with all applicable assurances in OMB Standard Forms 424B (Assurances for Non-Construction Programs) and to the extent consistent with the State's application, OMB Standard Form 424D (Assurances for Construction Programs), including the assurances relating to the legal authority to apply for assistance; access to records; conflict of interest; merit systems; nondiscrimination; Hatch Act provisions; labor standards; flood hazards; historic preservation; protection of human subjects; animal welfare; lead-based paint; Single Audit Act; and the general agreement to comply with all applicable Federal laws, executive orders and regulations.

- With respect to the certification regarding lobbying in Department Form 80-0013, no Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making or renewal of Federal grants under this program; the State will complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," when required (34 C.F.R. Part 82, Appendix B); and the State will require the full certification, as set forth in 34 C.F.R. Part 82, Appendix A, in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers.

- The State will comply with all of the operational and administrative provisions in Title XV and XIV of the ARRA, including Buy American Requirements (ARRA Division A, Section 1605), Wage Rate Requirements (section 1606), and any applicable environmental impact requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 (NEPA), as amended, (42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.) (ARRA Division A, Section 1609). In using ARRA funds for infrastructure investment, recipients will comply with the requirement regarding Preferences for Quick Start Activities (ARRA Division A, Section 1602).

- Any local educational agency (LEA) receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State a set of assurances that meets the requirements of section 442 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (20 U.S.C. 1232e).

- Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State (through either its Stabilization Fiscal Stabilization Fund application or another U.S. Department of Education Federal grant) a description of how the LEA will comply with the requirements of section 427 of GEPA (20 U.S.C. 1228a). The description must include information on the steps the LEA proposes to take to permit students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries to overcome barriers (including barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability, and age) that impede access to, or participation in, the program.

- The State and other entities will comply with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including the following provisions as applicable: 34 CFR Part 74–Administration of Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; 34 CFR Part 75–Direct Grant Programs; 34 CFR Part 77– Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations; 34 CFR Part

80– Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, including the procurement provisions; 34 CFR Part 81– General Education Provisions Act–Enforcement; 34 CFR Part 82– New Restrictions on Lobbying; 34 CFR Part 84–Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Financial Assistance); 34 CFR Part 85–Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement).

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name):	
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor: John E. Baldacci, Governor	Date: 5/27/10

V. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

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

Eligibility Requirement (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.

The Department will determine eligibility under this requirement before making a grant award.

Eligibility Requirement (b)

At the time the State submits its application, there are no 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.

The certification of the Attorney General addresses this requirement. The applicant may provide explanatory information, if necessary. The Department will determine eligibility under this requirement.

(Enter text here.)

VI. SELECTION CRITERIA: PROGRESS AND PLANS IN THE FOUR EDUCATION REFORM AREAS

(A) State Success Factors (125 total 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)[3] 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

[3] See Appendix D for more on participating LEA MOUs and for a model MOU.

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.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion, as well as projected goals as described in (A)(1)(iii). The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii):

- An example of the State's standard Participating LEA MOU, and description of variations used, if any.
- The completed summary table indicating which specific portions of the State's plan each LEA is committed to implementing, and relevant summary statistics (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(b), below).
- The completed summary table indicating which LEA leadership signatures have been obtained (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(c), below).

Evidence for (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed summary table indicating the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(iii), below).
- Tables and graphs that show the State's goals, overall and by subgroup, requested in the criterion, together with the supporting narrative. In addition, describe what the goals would look like were the State not to receive an award under this program.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed detailed table, by LEA, that includes the information requested in the criterion (see Detailed Table for (A)(1), below).

Recommended maximum response length: Ten pages (excluding tables)

(A)(1)(i)

Maine has a vision "Maine's people will be among the best educated in the world." We will realize this vision by focusing on the mission of Maine's educational system that *all students graduating from high school must be prepared for post-secondary education, careers and citizenship. (MR 20-A 6201)* Maine is committed to ensuring that all students receive a world-class education in order to participate in the global economy and contribute to the democratic ideals of the nation, while reflecting the values of local communities regardless of where they live and attend school. Maine is making progress toward this vision and goals through education reform over the past decade. Recognized for rigorous teaching and learning standards that are propelled by innovations in instructional practices, Maine educators are ready to take reform to a deeper and higher level for student growth. The shift has already begun as Maine reconfigures its mission with students at the center and their performance as evidence for sustainable and transferable learning. We are committed to establishing conditions for learning wherein every student in relationships with other students and adults acquires and demonstrates skills, attitudes, and dispositions essential for their attainment of school, work and life success. No longer restricted by time or place, Maine students and their educators are engaged in anytime, anywhere learning. Maine classrooms have been reconfigured to expand beyond the walls to a world-wide connectivity with ideas, content and processes for creative and critical thinking. Pedagogical content knowledge has been released from the university classrooms and methods courses to expand how teachers and principals are prepared for today's learners. Continuous learning for educators is now possible through these

expanded networks of connectivity and in concert with their students. Leadership and access to knowledge have been redistributed. We have shifted "locus of control" to locus of learning by generating data on each and every individual student. Our recent award for the continuation of the IES Longitudinal Data Systems Grant strengthens our ability to develop and implement data systems that allows us to examine student progress from early childhood into career, including matching teachers to students, while protecting student privacy and confidentiality. Each student has a place in our data system wherein their personal journey of growth and progress is honored, recorded and adds value to their life goals.

What does the transformational system focused on the individual student look like? Each student is supported by a system comprised of five interrelated elements: (1) personalized learning; (2) performance-based learning; (3) systems of learning support; (4) great teachers and leaders; and (5) data used to guide teaching and learning. There must be transparency as the system redesign takes place. The system must be open, visible, and responsive to all stakeholders from students to teachers, to principals to district leaders, to parents and the general public. The principle of high-quality lifelong learning recognizes that learning is continuous across the lifespan; it does not just happen in a classroom. The system's success will be driven by great teachers and leaders in all of our schools equipped with data and technology to guide teaching and learning. It is evident that the four ARRA assurance areas are integral to, and consistent with, our transformed educational system, as described in more detail below.

Standards and Assessment

(1) Personalized learning is a key element of our transformed educational system. It encompasses early education through the transition to post-secondary education/careers. The individual student is at the center of an educational system that is personally relevant, challenging, and responsive to his/her unique interests and abilities. When students are clear about what they are expected to know and be able to do and are given the freedom and responsibility to play an integral role in meeting those expectations, they become more engaged, are more likely to identify when they are hitting obstacles and seek help in overcoming them, and are more likely to be successful in reaching those expectations In a system where learning is personalized, students develop post-secondary education and career goals, advocate for their needs, reflect on their progress, assume responsibility for their own learning, and

develop as life-long learners. Personalized learning puts the needs and interests of the student at the center of a data-driven framework for setting goals, assessing progress, and ensuring that students receive the academic and developmental supports and opportunities that each needs. Personalized learning is performance-based learning. It is not about acquiring credit simply through seat time and course taking. It is about meeting state and local standards through the demonstration of mastery of standards through various means. It is about a delivery and support system that changes and adapts based on the student's aspirations and learning progress, indeed, it involves the other elements of the system. Teachers are facilitators, mentors ad leaders in this system. This we believe will lead to increased engagement for students and increased ownership over their own education, resulting in increased achievement and an improved graduation rate, setting more students on a path to post-secondary education.

Schools and districts, as well as the State itself, have undertaken initiatives or reforms with the goal to personalize learning for students. Some examples include: schools organized into smaller learning communities; multiple pathways for students to achieve the standards; and schools implementing performance-based systems. Legislation enacted in 2009 requires that students be able to demonstrate achievement of state and local standards through multiple pathways and given support through a system of interventions to do so (Appendix A-1). The Maine Course Pathways system allows the student and the parent, collaborating with school personnel, to select courses that electronically track the standards and inform the students if the path of courses will address all the standards in the content area (Appendix A-2). This allows the student to design a four year personal plan, or more if begun in middle school, that will provide the student with access to and the opportunity to demonstrate achievement of the standards.

Maine's statewide laptop initiative in grades 7 and 8 has provided a quantum leap in student engagement and ownership of their own learning at a critical time in their learning development. Evidence shows that students write and edit their writing more, with resulting improved writing achievement as measured by statewide assessments. By engaging creatively in multi-media, research, online flash cards and self-quizzes, and a host of other resources, students are taking control of their learning and in many cases shape the path of course curricula. At the annual statewide student conference on learning technology, more than 1,000 students and teachers

gather for workshops and seminars, mostly run by students themselves, offering creative ideas to be brought back to classrooms around the state. The Maine Learning Technology Initiative has been clear in its approach from the start and has educated the teaching community, policy makers and the public that the focus is not on the machinery or software, but rather on using it to enhance learning and teaching. Through recent efforts, more than half of Maine's high schools now also provide laptops to all students; many school systems have expanded on their own to lower grades, some starting as early as the third grade.

We propose to use RTTT funds to expand several on-going state initiatives as well as to implement new initiatives that will support the goal of personalized learning. These include, but are not limited to:

- Expand Maine Course Pathways, a system of reviewed syllabi that provide a tool for implementing multiple pathways and ensuring opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement of standards.
- Develop Next Generation Innovative Schools and Innovation Lab Schools (NXGL) (Appendix A-3) to pilot new approaches to teaching and learning that embody the five key elements of this plan and implement the new Common Core Standards and new Common Cross State Performance Assessments.
- Expand the Maine Learning Technology Initiative in ways to support personalized learning and lifelong learning opportunities by providing virtual learning opportunities for students and teachers.

(2) Performance-based learning will be central to our developing accountability system and is tied closely to personalized learning. The focus of our developing accountability system will be on student-by-student achievement along a progression of learning continuum. Currently, Maine's instructional system is dependent on local curriculum development and local interpretation of the State's standards, with uneven implementation and expectations across the State. In the developing system, students advance based on their demonstration of content knowledge and skills and are given opportunities to learn that enhances and maintains student motivation to do their personal best. We will work with our districts to develop and implement a curriculum that is performance-based

and modular, so that students can enter and exit when they demonstrate proficiency. Assessments are embedded throughout the curriculum as part of learning progressions. Instructional strategies are based on authentic, extended inquiry into complex problems. Performances are based on the ability to apply learning in real world context of careers and civic/social responsibilities. Integrated with Race to the Top priorities, our focus in this area will be participation in, adoption and implementation of the Common Core State Standards (Appendix A-4) and SMARTER Balanced common assessments (Appendix A-5), and performance assessments developed with the NXGL Partnership (Appendix A-3), including formative, benchmark, interim, and summative assessments. We will use Race to the Top funds to support performance-based learning in the following ways:

- Performance-based learning in all areas, including cross-cutting in STEM areas.
- The implementation of industry based standards and performance-based assessments in Career and Technical Education, in consortium with other states.
- Develop and provide professional development for teachers and leaders to support and implement performance based learning, common standards and common assessments.

(3) Systems of Learning Support are integral to our transformed educational system. To achieve our vision, the system requires safety nets for students throughout the learning progression from Pre-kindergarten through high school diploma. Systems of learning support are tiered and weave together the resources of the state, school, home, and community to provide a full array of services that follow the learner. Rather than simply being school-based, the system includes early childhood and early learning support to ensure that each student can achieve his/her full potential as a next generation learner. Learning supports, using data from interim, formative, and benchmark assessments, learning plans, and performance based assessment systems, are designed for all students, not just a few. Learning services and supports need to reach students in unique placements and circumstances. A cohesive, coherent system of supports enables all students to have an equal opportunity for success by removing barriers to learning, including location, thereby increasing engagement, and re-engaging disconnected youth. Systems of support for learning designed for improving specifically address the gaps in achievement and success among student subgroups.

The implementation of comprehensive systems of support is integral to our transformed educational system but they are also integral with the overarching goals of Race to the Top: raising achievement, reducing achievement gaps, decreasing the dropout rate, and increasing post-secondary enrollment and attainment. Maine is actively coordinating the development of systems of support in our schools. By 2012, all school districts are required to develop and implement a system of interventions for grades K-12 that provides each student who is not progressing toward meeting the State's standards with different learning experiences or assistance to achieve the standards (Appendix A-1). The interventions must be specific, timely and based upon ongoing formative assessments that continuously monitor student progress. Maine has supported public preschool programs for four-year olds to improve school readiness and provide early intervention when necessary. Maine has also supported, along with private foundations, the development and implementation of an Educare early childhood and development center, where one of the goals is to ultimately reduce special education services and costs in public schools by addressing development issues through early intervention. We have partnered with a statewide non-profit organization called Jobs for Maine's Graduates (Appendix A-6) to identify and serve students at-risk for dropping out. Students served by Jobs for Maine's Graduates are much more likely to graduate and continue to postsecondary education or training than similar at-risk students. We are also collaborating with our tow Job Corps Centers to meet student's needs. With Race to the Top funding, we propose to:

- To support high quality professional development in early childhood.
- Expand the operation of Jobs for Maine's Graduates in the lowest performing high schools to help more students at risk of disengaging or dropping out to succeed in higher education and the workforce.
- Support professional development for teachers and leaders to effectively implement interventions.

Great Teachers and Leaders

(1)Great Teachers and Leaders are essential as we proceed with our transformational work. The Maine Department of Education, herein referred to as the Department, cannot simply mandate reforms and initiatives and expect success. Lessons learned from our long history of reform suggest that to enact significant reform and lasting change, all educational stakeholders must work together.

That is why we believe that the success of our transformed educational system is dependent upon great teachers and leaders. Research suggests that teachers and principals are two key inputs to student success (Leitwhood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). It is essential that current teachers and leaders entering the profession are trained to facilitate and lead learning. In order to do so, working with its educational stakeholders, including communities, parent groups, unions, and professional associations, Maine will implement human capital development and evaluation systems that are also performance based, informed by and driven by student outcome data.

Central to the success of this element is the state's focus on improving teacher and principal effectiveness. With Race to the Top funds, the state will:

- Develop, implement, and fine-tune a rigorous and multifaceted educator evaluation system. The Maine Professional Accountability System (MPAS) will evaluate teachers and school leaders in part based on the growth and achievement of the individual students they teach and lead and will use these evaluations in making personnel decisions.
- Work with the Stakeholder Group (Appendix A-7) to identify and approve additional models for teacher and leader evaluation to provide choice to districts in selecting models.
- Support comprehensive new teacher induction programs.
- Use distance technology to make rigorous courses with highly-qualified teachers available to all students in the state, regardless of where they reside.
- Provide ongoing support and coaching to teachers and leaders to turnaround the lowest performing schools with Turnaround Teams that assist with school transformation.
- Provide effective professional development to teachers and leaders to enable them to successfully implement and lead

personalized and performance-based learning.

- Work with teacher preparation programs to integrate skills and knowledge of innovative practices.

Using Data

(1) Data used to guide teaching and learning The system is dependent upon a robust and comprehensive data system that is longitudinal, provides several access points for teachers, leaders, learners, and others, and links data to provide information about performance of students, teachers, and schools, as well as that can be used for accountability and policy purposes. Maine has just been notified that it will receive a Student Longitudinal Data System Grant. Race to the Top funding will further support the use of data for measuring school and district effectiveness through the development of Balanced Scorecards that will measure school, program, and district performance on specific measures to compare to performance targets. Balanced Scorecards will be especially useful to schools in turnaround status because they will have so many initiatives going on, the Scorecard will help them measure progress along the way.

From our vision and plan, it is evident that Race to the Top funds will be put to good use, laying the ground work for long-lasting change that supports increased achievement for *all* students; increased teacher and leader effectiveness; improved data systems and the use of data to inform teaching, learning and policy decisions; and fast turnaround of our lowest performing schools.

(A)(1)(ii)

Education communities across the state have indicated their support for the State's Race to the Top plan. School districts across the state understand the state's framework for transforming education in Maine to ensure the success of all students and want to be at the forefront of innovation and bring as many opportunities for success to their students as possible. Maine's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Scope of Work (Appendix A-8) include very specific requirements linked directly to elements in the

State's reform plan. Our LEA/SEA Memorandum of Understanding is explicit on the goals and commitments required of participating districts and the State as a result of the one-time investment in our schools through Race to the Top funds. The state plan and MOU present clear goals for the participating districts and the state while recognizing the extent of local control in our districts, giving districts some flexibility in how they will reach those goals with their unique settings, challenges and opportunities.

Maine's Race to the Top MOU consists primarily of required components and several optional components. LEAs will agree to implement significant portions of the State's Race to the Top plan. Only 12 of 46 components are optional. The state will support the scaling up and expansion of current innovative programs/practices to help LEAs implement systems that are known to improve student achievement. LEAs are required to implement all items in the column "Participating SAUs will…" that are in boldface font and not indicated as optional.

We have received signatures from a significant portion of the leadership in these districts: 82 LEA superintendents, and 64 of the chairs of the local school boards/committees of these 82 LEAs. We have also received signatures from 24 of the leaders of the local teachers unions in these districts.

(A)(1)(iii)

The 82 participating LEAs that have signaled a commitment to the State's Race to the Top plan represent 70% of *all* K-12 students across the state and 59% of all students in poverty in the state. The large percentage of students—and students in poverty—who will be reached by their LEA's participation will result in significant sustained impact in educational transformation across the state. The reach of the State's plan will extend far into the state, allowing us to achieve our goals of raising student achievement, decreasing the achievement gaps, increasing the graduation rate, and increasing college enrollment and attainment.

Maine has a relatively high level of student achievement as measured by its state test and the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP). Maine has consistently had a higher percentage of its students meeting or exceeding proficiency on the

NAEP than the nation overall, but can do better. Maine also has had persistent, though closing, achievement gaps in English Language Arts and Mathematics that we are working toward eliminating. Maine graduation rate is 80% but the state wants it much higher. Maine's students tend to pursue postsecondary enrollment at rates slightly below other New England states. We will do better in all of these areas to ensure a viable future in Maine for all our citizens. To this end we have been working diligently with our constituencies to implement practices that we will continue to support and expand, as well as introduce new ones, to meet our goals. We are working with our entire department staff, including our Career and Technical Education, Adult Education, Special Education and all ESEA program staff, as well as across State agencies, for example with Health and Human Services, to achieve our goals in all content areas. Our state goals are as follows:

National Assessment of Education Progress

		2009 NAEP Scores	2011/2012	2013/2014
Percentage of students proficient on NAEP Reading	Grade 4	36%	37%	40%
Percentage of students proficient on NAEP Reading	Grade 8	35%	36%	39%
Percentage of students proficient on NAEP Mathematics	Grade 4	45%	46%	49%
Percentage of students proficient on NAEP Mathematics	Grade 8	35%	36%	39%

The above chart was created from the following goal: Students scoring *at or above proficient level,* in NAEP reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8 will increase by two (2) percentage points in the 2011 and 2013 assessment years. Maine's annual NAEP goal: Students in the FRL and SD subgroups scoring *at or above proficient level* will increase an average of 3 percentage points in 2011 and 2013, on the NAEP reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8. A more rapid rate of improvement as well as during the period under review, will serve to decrease the achievement gaps between subgroups.

New England Common Assessment Program Results

		2009 NECAP Scores	2011/2012	2013/2014
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Reading	Grade 3	73%	75%	77%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Reading	Grade 4	67%	69%	71%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Reading	Grade 5	72%	74%	76%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Reading	Grade 6	69%	71%	73%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Reading	Grade 7	68%	70%	72%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Reading	Grade 8	69%	71%	73%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Mathematics	Grade 3	62%	64%	66%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Mathematics	Grade 4	62%	64%	66%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Mathematics	Grade 5	64%	66%	68%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Mathematics	Grade 6	63%	65%	67%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Mathematics	Grade 7	60%	62%	64%
Percentage of Students Proficient on NECAP- Mathematics	Grade 8	59%	61%	63%

The above chart was created from the following goal: Students scoring *at or above proficient level* on NECAP annual assessments

in reading and mathematics will increase by one (1) percentage point annually. Maine's annual NECAP Goal: Students in the FRL and SD subgroups, scoring *at or above proficient* on NECAP annual assessments in reading and mathematics, will increase by one (1.5) percentage points annually. By the end of the period under review (2014), on the average, students scoring *at or above proficient* will gain 6 percentage points. This will serve as well to close the achievement gap by 2014.

Maine made a powerful move to increase post-secondary aspirations and college enrollment by requiring all students in 10th and 11th grade, as noted in Section (B). Maine declared a stronger commitment when the SAT became our State assessment and multiple alignment studies were done with out State standards for USED Peer Review. Reports from the universities and community colleges show that admission applications had significantly increased. The contract with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) will provide us with valuable data. All of our public and private institutions participate in the NSC. Our goal is that 90% of our students will pursue, and be successful in post-secondary education by 2020.

Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(b)

Elements of State Reform Plans	Number of LEAs Participating (#)	Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)
B. Standards and Assessments		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	82	100
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:		
(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems	80	98
(ii) Professional development on use of data	81	99
(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers	76	93
D. Great Teachers and Leaders		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:		

(i) Measure student growth	77	94
(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems	70	85
(iii) Conduct annual evaluations	70	85
(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development	77	94
(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention	55	67
(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification	61	74
(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal	68	83
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:		
(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools	66	80
(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	69	84
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:		
(i) Quality professional development	80	98
(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development	79	93
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	62	76

Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(c)

Signatures acquired from participating LEAs:			
Number of Participating LEAs with all applicable signatures			
	Number of Signatures Obtained (#)	**Number of Signatures Applicable (#)**	**Percentage (%)** (Obtained / Applicable)
LEA Superintendent (or equivalent)	82	82	100
President of Local School Board (or equivalent, if applicable)	64	82	78
Local Teachers' Union Leader (if applicable)	24	82	30

Summary Table for (A)(1)(iii)

	Participating LEAs (#)	**Statewide (#)**	**Percentage of Total Statewide (%)** (Participating LEAs / Statewide)
LEAs	82	216	38

Schools	412	653	63
K-12 Students	131,562	188,812	70
Students in poverty	51,938	87,372	59

Detailed Table for (A)(1)

This table provides detailed information on the participation of each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). States should use this table to complete the Summary Tables above. (Note: If the State has a large number of participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), it may move this table to an appendix. States should provide in their narrative a clear reference to the appendix that contains the table.)

	LEA Demographics			Signatures on MOUs			MOU Terms	Preliminary Scope of Work – Participation in each applicable Plan Criterion														
Participating LEAs	# of Schools	# of K-12 Students	# of K-12 Students in Poverty	LEA Supt. (or equivalent)	President of local school board (if applicable)	President of Local Teachers Union (if applicable)	Uses Standard Terms & Conditions?	(B)(3)	(C)(3)(i)	(C)(3)(ii)	(C)(3)(iii)	(D)(2)(i)	(D)(2)(ii)	(D)(2)(iii)	(D)(2)(iv)(a)	(D)(2)(iv)(b)	(D)(2)(iv)(c)	(D)(2)(iv)(d)	(D)(3)(i)	(D)(3)(ii)	(D)(5)(i)	(D)(5)(ii)	(E)(2)
Name of LEA here				Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Yes/ No	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA
Auburn School Department	8	3569	1804	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Augusta School Department	6	2247	1263	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Baileyville School Department	2	263	203	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bangor School Department	10	3702	1758	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA
Biddeford School Department	6	2664	1259	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cape Elizabeth School Department	3	1704	98	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
East Millinocket School Department	2	259	197	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Falmouth School Department	4	2139	103	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Five Town CSD	1	660	151	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Georgetown School Department	1	118	24	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gorham School Department	5	2614	508	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lisbon School Department	3	1284	559	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maine Indian Education	3	448	356	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maine Vocational Region 8	1			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maine Vocational Region 10	1			Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Medway School Department	1	197	96	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Milford School Department	1	414	159	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Millinocket School Department	3	521	327	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Portland Public Schools	17	6880	3410	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Princeton School Department	1	133	73	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Scarborough School Department	6	3363	532	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Aroostook CSD	1	426	337	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA
South Portland School Department	8	3119	1106	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wells-Ogunquit CSD	3	1392	322	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Westbrook School Department	7	2428	1297	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Woodville School Department	0	42		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Yarmouth School Department	4	1384	123	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
York School Department	4	1901	272	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
AOS # 91	9	1569	416	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	NA

AOS # 94	7	1099	810	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 3	9	1484	1046	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
MSAD 6	11	3994	1655	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 8	1	176	74	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 11	7	2164	887	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 15	5	1917	566	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 19	1	128	103	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 22	7	2167	617	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 28	3	741	182	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 29	5	1318	742	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 31	3	554	346	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 33	3	282	136	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 35	5	2472	304	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 41	4	676	544	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
MSAD 44	5	774	475	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 45	2	387	196	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 49	6	2437	1340	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 51	5	2153	200	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
MSAD 52	6	2057	732	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA
MSAD 53	4	1052	399	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 55	6	1220	675	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA
MSAD 59	5	1024	656	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y
MSAD 60	6	3115	1277	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
MSAD 64	7	1220	645	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
MSAD 72	4	1244	390	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA
MSAD 75	8	2718	872	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSU 1	8	2161	822	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 2	10	2247	916	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 4	4	1567	702	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 5	6	1848	363	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA
RSU 9	8	2289	1217	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

RSU 12	8	2066	674	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 14	6	3442	1021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 16	5	1678	675	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 18	8	3290	1167	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 19	9	2400	1577	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y
RSU 20	13	2606	1419	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 21	6	2784	483	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 23	8	4137	1216	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 25	5	1176	554	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSU 26	5	1494	402	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 34	5	1303	713	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSU 36	3	917	579	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 37	5	728	473	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 57	7	3455	1395	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 67	4	1135	794	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSU 68	3	996	336	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 80 (MSAD 4)	4	684	454	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 86 (MSAD 20)	2	555	351	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSU 87 (MSAD 23)	3	940	310	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
RSU 88 (MSAD 24)	4	349	215	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Boothbay-Boothbay Harbor CSD/School Union 49	4	829	334	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
School Union 69	3	473	154	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

(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;

(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 the 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.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. The State's response to (A)(2)(i)(d) will be addressed in the budget section (Section VIII of the application). Attachments,

such as letters of support or commitment, should be summarized in the text box below and organized with a summary table in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(2)(i)(d):

- The State's budget, as completed in Section VIII of the application. The narrative that accompanies and explains the budget and how it connects to the State's plan, as completed in Section VIII of the application.

Evidence for (A)(2)(ii):

- A summary in the narrative of the statements or actions and inclusion of key statements or actions in the Appendix.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages (excluding budget and budget narrative)

(A)(2)(i) (a)-(e)

Leadership and implementation

Maine possesses the capacity and capability to oversee successful implementation of its Race to the Top reform plan. The Maine Department of Education's reorganization in 2007 is in many ways aligned with the Race to the Top assurance areas and priorities. During reorganization, the Department merged the Career and Technical Education Team with the PK-20 team to ensure the coordination of all curriculum efforts. In 2009, further integration occurred when the PK-20 Team and the Adult Education, Guidance and Counseling, and ESEA team became one team, the PK-20/Adult Ed and Federal Programs (See Appendix A-9). This reorganization has allowed for schools and LEAs to work with one integrated team from the Department and it has broken down the silos that frequently divide state departments. The Department's current organizational structure provides an articulated system for students that begins before they enter school and continues through higher education and different pathways with a common thread of the content standards.

In addition, Maine's Department of Education has a long tradition of working across state agencies to serve the needs of learners across the lifespan. For example, the Children's Cabinet is made up of the commissioners from all agencies working with children and chaired by the First Lady. It is fully staffed, demonstrating the commitment the current and past governor(s) have for

state agencies to work together to support Maine's children. The Children's Cabinet provides coordination of programs for Early Childhood and Youth in Transition 9-20. The legislative support for alternative education and multiple pathways brings together Department of Labor, Job Corps as well as other agencies to support students.

The Department's plan for implementing and overseeing the Race to the Top grant is built around sustaining the momentum and institutionalizing reform while ensuring continuous improvement in the efforts undertaken by the state and participating LEAs. An intra- and inter-agency Race to the Top Team, including department leadership, leadership from other involved agencies, Maine Higher Education Commission, and others as appropriate, will work together to implement the Race to the Top. The Commissioner will coordinate and oversee the state's complete Race to the Top efforts and, through the Governor's Cabinet, include Commissioners from all state agencies.

Experts within the Department will provide the implementation leadership and day-to-day oversight for the state's plan. The Leadership Team of the Department is made up of the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, the Chief of Staff, the Team Leaders from the PK-20/Adult Education and Federal Programs, Special Education, Maine Learning and Technology, School Finance and Data Systems, and the Legislative Liaison. Meeting weekly, this group will oversee the actual work of the Department and guarantee that all efforts are coordinated within the agency and outside of the agency. These staff members understand how the State's Race to the Top plan is connected to all areas of agency work and other federal requirements. Race to the Top efforts will be integrated in the Department's work rather than "added on". On the ground work in each of the assurance areas and other related priorities and projects would be coordinated and led by small, dedicated, but overlapping area teams. For example, the School Improvement Team is led by the department's Title 1 Coordinator and includes staff representing the Great Teachers and Leaders area, Standards and Assessments, STEM, Special Education and Early Childhood and others related to supporting struggling schools meet regularly to be sure all efforts are coordinated and meet the requirements of each of the programs. Much of the work of the Department is operationalized on a regional level with State staff assigned to regions to work with LEAs, CTE Centers and service providers. These teams will work together to support local implementation of the State plan.

Given the goal of long-term sustainability and capacity building, the state will not use Race to the Top funds to hire limited duration or "project" department staff. We are building and using capacity within current department staff. As needed, we will contract with experts and leaders for short term or extended terms to meet the needs of this grant but more importantly to meet the needs of our schools and students. Rather staff roles and responsibilities will be reexamined to ensure thoughtful consideration of the reform work. Funds will be used strategically, for example to build on existing relationships with experts and expert organizations throughout the region and country to build the capacity of state staff and leaders throughout the districts for this work.

Supporting LEAs and holding them accountable

The State will provide implementation support to participating LEAs in a number of ways. Two primary ways are by providing the leadership and dedicated teams to support on-the-ground administration of the state's plan and by providing financial resources. When a LEA includes in their final scope of work components of the state plan, support through dedicated teams and expert consultants will work directly with the staff at a school, district or regional level, depending on the needs of the LEA. LEAs will receive allocations based on the Title 1 formula, as required. The balance of the funds will directly support the implementation of the state's initiatives and provide additional financial support to districts implementing the programs. The funds from the statewide portion will provide the professional development, and if a LEA's budget is not sufficient, the state will provide additional funds to support complete and sufficient implementation. To further sustain the initiatives and build capacity for supporting reform, the state will leverage existing regional professional development centers in each of our nine superintendent areas that cover the state. Key areas of the professional development efforts will be coordinated and delivered through these existing centers. These centers have built a strong and effective relationship with the communities and school professionals in the regions. These centers have several years of experience and are directly tied to the University of Maine System (UMS) and will allow us to quickly reach educators throughout the state. The State will also support the implementation and approval of online courses to address the equitable distribution of effective teachers. Meeting the needs of rural schools, the online system will provide all students with equitable access to high level courses, such as: AP and courses/instruction where content teacher are not available

The State will further support implementation through continuous evaluation of state and LEA programs to identify promising practices, evaluating their effectiveness, and disseminating and replicating effective practices. Data from evaluations, conducted externally and internally, will support program improvement and the cessation of ineffective programs. Maine has a practice of using internal or external evaluators for its grant funded projects, for example, with the external evaluation of the Maine Learning Technology Initiative. Similarly, Maine will require that participating districts conduct evaluations of the implementation and effectiveness of their initiatives and as part of statewide initiatives, that districts and schools agree to participate in evaluation activities for effectiveness and performance measurement purposes. As an indicator of the Department's commitment to continuous improvement through evaluation for Race to the Top projects, we are requiring the external evaluation of the impact of our state-developed leadership academy (See Section (D)(5) for more information on the development plans).

Budget and fiscal management

The State of Maine possesses an effective and efficient grants management and fiscal oversight procedures that will be used for the Race to the Tops grant. The Department, with the assistance of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services (DAFS), will have all project financial and accounting responsibility. The Commissioner of DAFS and the Commissioner of Education, supported by the Leadership Team will be responsible to administer all project funds and will be accountable for the expenditure of funds to meet the requirements of the grant. All funds expended will be paid according to the final negotiated grant budget and based on the policies, salary schedules and fringe benefits of participating districts and subcontracts. All expenditures will follow the State of Maine procurement procedures and must be approved by the Director of Purchases. As part of this process there is an extensive review by the Office of Purchasing to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations. Additional expenditures will require the completion of standard travel forms, requisition forms and purchase orders which must be approved by the Finance and/or Purchasing Department. The Project Director will also maintain regular contact with the federal program officer and federal project fiscal officer.

Using the process established for monitoring ARRA funds, RTTT funds will also be under close scrutiny. The State has created an ARRA oversight committee within DAFS comprised of senior managers from the State Budget Office, the Chief Information Officer, State Controller's Office and the Service Centers. This committee developed guidance with regards to financial controls and reporting procedures for ARRA programs. In addition, meetings are held weekly to discuss ARRA activities and part of these discussions include a status report of the grants. Questions and concerns regarding the accounting, reporting or administration of these funds are addressed at this time. The RTTT grant will be added to this committee's responsibilities. Additionally, representatives from the Budget Office and the Controller's Office would be involved with oversight for the RTTT grant, which provides an added level of review to ensure funds are being managed in accordance with the federal regulations.

The proposed budget and narrative are included in Budget Part I and Budget Part II beginning on page 139. The budget reflects our priorities in this application and future plans. The reforms included in this proposal are components of a larger effort on the part of the Department to redesign our school system to meet the needs of our students in the 21st Century. The Race to the Top funding will provide our LEAs and State with the opportunity to scale up these systems level reforms. The work that is occurring now is intended to be a systems level, not an add on, but a deep systems change. We will continue to use our federal and state funds to move this agenda forward. Because we find a direct match between the Race to the Top components, our State Statutes and our state level work, we believe the assignments of staff will continue to support the work begun and expanded under RTTT. We also believe this is necessary in preparation for the reauthorization of ESEA based on the USED blueprint.

(A)(2)(ii)

Maine has assembled support for its Race to the Top plan from a wide array of stakeholders including higher education, Maine Legislative leadership, the business community, education partners, and US Congressional delegates (Appendix A-10). Over 30 letters or statements of support have been received so far. In addition, other organizations have expressed support for Race to the Top initiatives, the Maine Principals' Association adopted resolutions at its April 2010 Conference supporting the work of the

Department in implementing a standards based diploma (Appendix A-11). The governing body of the Maine Education Association, the umbrella organization for most of the state's local teacher associations, voted not to support Maine's application. However, its two representatives – the president and executive director – to the Stakeholder Group on removing barriers to linking student data to teacher and principal evaluations both were part of the unanimous vote in support of the first model approved by the group. In addition, 24 local teacher association leaders signed their LEA's MOU; that represents 30 percent of the participating LEAs. This is reflective of a growing sentiment of support among local associations.

(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.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(3)(ii):

- NAEP and ESEA results since at least 2003. Include in the Appendix all the data requested in the criterion as a resource for peer reviewers for each year in which a test was given or data was collected. Note that this data will be used for reference only and can be in raw format. In the narrative, provide the analysis of this data and any tables or graphs that best support the narrative.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages

(A)(3)(i)

Over the past 13 years, the Department and its partner organizations in the state has undertaken a variety of reform efforts that address the four Race to the Top assurance areas, some of which were pursued with state, federal, Gates Foundation, and National Governors' Association funding. Maine began its reform efforts in 1997 with the Maine *Learning Results*, the development of the state's content standards. The standards were reviewed and updated in 2007. Maine also began its Comprehensive Assessment System in 1995 that included the beginning of performance-based assessments. The Department's focus on standards and assessment has driven education reform and educational achievement in the state. Maine's most recent school transformation efforts have focused on personalizing learning for students, moving from a traditional time-based system to a performance-based education system, expanding the availability of rigorous learning support for all students, expanding the use technology, improving and expanding STEM education, and more. Our reform efforts have been effective. Maine has traditionally been one of the higher achieving states in the nation, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), discussed below.

As a world leader in innovative and effective use of technology in the classroom, Maine has turned the notion of distribution of effective teachers on its head, using online courses and distance education, early college courses and dual enrollment (high school and college) to bring rigorous learning opportunities and the most qualified and effective teachers to rural schools, schools with lower teacher wages and other areas where distribution of highly effective teachers has lagged.

Maine has had a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) since 2007. This grant has enabled us to begin the design of a PK-Adult data system. Working with the Department of Labor, the Department was able to pass legislation allowing the use of

student social security numbers. While it includes an "opt-out" provision for parents. There is a strong beginning to tracking our students through school into post-secondary and the labor force. The state has also had a contract for two years with the National Student Clearinghouse to begin to monitor college attendance and retention past the first year.

Our efforts to turn around the lowest performing schools will build on our current model that has been successfully used for Title I School Improvement. This improvement has resulted from identification of school needs and targeted support. This foundation of this model utilizes a cadre of school improvement consultants who are assigned to work directly with identified schools. This cadre of consultants includes former principals and superintendents who have direct expertise in working with school improvement initiatives, and, a clear understanding of the elements of a school system and what leverage points can result in change to impact and sustain practices to improve student achievement outcomes.

(A)(3)(ii)

State Assessments

State assessment data show a picture of dramatic improvements in student achievement on the 4th and 8th grade Reading and Mathematics assessments of the Maine Comprehensive Assessment System over time. These increases have coincided with a period of remarkable innovation and reform in the Maine education system, from the introduction of standards to the introduction of learning technology. During this time, teachers and leaders at the local and state levels worked tirelessly to align curriculum to standards. Maine's overall high levels of achievement over time are even more remarkable given that Maine has among the highest proficiency standards in the US. In 2007, a study mapping state proficiency standards onto 2007 NAEP standards, ranked Maine 10th in the nation for reading and 6th for mathematics (Bandeira deMello, Blankenship, and McLaughlin, 2009).

From 1995 through the 2008-2009 school years, the state assessment was known as the Maine Comprehensive Assessment System and the Maine Educational Assessment (MEA). The Table in Appendix 12 shows MEA scores since the 2002 school year, however, standards were reset in 2007 and data prior to that time are not directly comparable. Since 2006, reading achievement

increased in 4th and 8th grade and increased but to a lesser extent, in 11th. At the 4th and 8th grade, 71% of students overall scored at the proficient or higher level, representing an increase of about 11-12 percentage between 2006 and 2009. However, at all grade levels, significant achievement gaps persist between students with disabilities, Free and Reduced Price Lunch eligible, and minority students and students overall. A lower percentage of students with disabilities score proficient than students overall in all grade levels and over time, as did lower percentages of low income, American Indian, and Black or African American students. A lower percentage of male and Hispanic or Latino students reach proficiency compared to students overall, but this gap is smaller than that of students with disabilities, low-income students, and other racial minority students (Appendix A-13). We see that most subgroups are closing the achievement gap in reading, slowly, by having a higher rate of change in the percentage of students achieving proficiency compared to White students or even students overall (Appendix A-14).

Mathematics achievement, as measured by the MEA, is more variable than reading. Overall, about 66% of 4th grade, 53% of 8th graders, and 42% of 11th graders score proficient or higher on the 2008-09 MEA. Again, due to resetting of standards, data from years prior to 2006-07 are not directly comparable. The percentage of students scoring proficient or higher in 4th and 8th grade has increased since 2006. Math achievement for 11th graders has remained steady over the years, with 40% meeting or exceeding proficiency in 2006-07 to 42% in 2008-09, but this is lower than the 47% proficient in 2005-06. Large achievement gaps exist at all grade levels for all subgroups, except for gender and Asian. These achievement gaps have persisted over time but are slowly closing with the rate of change in proficiency attainment higher for subgroups than for students overall.

NAEP

Maine's students do well on the NAEP assessments in all grades for mathematics and reading (Appendix A-15). Indeed, in both grade levels and in both subject areas, Maine students consistently achieve higher average scale scores than the nation overall. The average achievement is relatively high in both Reading and Mathematics. The state's Mathematics scores have increased slightly over time but with gaps between certain subgroups of students remain. Reading scores have been relatively flat over time. Indeed, the flatness of the scores have not gone unnoticed but have motivated renewed efforts to focus on personalization and the

standards at the state and local level.

NAEP assessments in Mathematics show a slow, but steady increase in scale scores over time. Maine's 4th grade students had average scale scores of 238 in 2003, which increased each year by 2-3 points, reaching an average scale score of 244 in 2009. Eight graders in Maine had a similar increase in scale scores over time. The average scale score in Mathematics in 2003 was 282. The average scale increased to 286 in 2007, where it remained for 2009. Students with disabilities have a lower average scale score than those without disabilities, and students eligible for Free and Reduced Price Lunch have lower average scores than students who are not eligible. The gaps between these groups are large (almost 40 scale points for disability status and over 20 scale points for low-income students) and unacceptable.

Maine's NAEP Reading scores present a more mixed picture. While Maine's average scale scores for both 4th and 8th grade Reading exceed the national public school average, but the scores have been relatively flat over time. The 4th grade reading score in 2003 was 224, after two years of one scale score point increases, the 2009 average scale score was back to 224. Similarly in 8th grade, the 2003 scale score of 268 was 8 points higher than the national average, but after two years of slightly higher average scores, the 2009 average scale score was back to 268. Large achievement gaps exist between students with disabilities compared to those without disabilities (average 34 scale points) and between students who are and are not eligible for Free and Reduced Price Lunch (average of 20 scale points). These gaps have remained steady over time.

Graduation Rate

Maine's graduation rate has fluctuated over time, going from 87.2% in the 2002-03 school year to 80.09% in 2008-2009. This appears to be a significant drop in graduation rate but the fluctuations are a result of improved data analysis and improvements in the quality of data that has been received from schools. In 2010, Department staff contacted every district after receiving the data and asked the superintendent to "certify" the data. In addition, for the 2009 graduation data, the state reported the four year cohort using the NCLB procedures. This was a change from the previous process. The state also submitted for peer review our graduation rate process and the US Education Department given us full approval, one of the few in the country. We will continue to report five

year completion in a separate report for in state use. Maine recognizes that the graduation rate is not where we want it. The 2010 Maine Legislature passed LD 1658 which requires districts to reach a 90% graduation rate by the 2015-2016 school year (Appendix A-16). If a district has not reached 80% graduation rate by 2012 the district is required to submit a corrective action plan to the Department. As part of our support for struggling schools outlined in Section E, we will provide an intervention team to the school as well to help implement the corrective action plan. The legislation also requires the Department to bring together stakeholders and address the issues surrounding dropouts.

Recent initiatives are beginning to take root that directly address the dropout challenge, with several showing promise. For example, recent initiatives, such as Maine Course Pathways and the expansion of Jobs for Maine's Graduates, focus attention and support on students at-risk for dropping out and provide alternative ways for students to meet standards in efforts to keep them engaged in school, earning credits/meeting standards and staying on track to graduate.

	SY 2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Graduation Rate	87.20%	87.54%	87.22%	84.25%	81.33%	82.85%	80.09%

(B) Standards and Assessments (70 total 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.[4]

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (B)(1)(i):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a standards consortium.
- A copy of the final standards or, if the standards are not yet final, a copy of the draft standards and anticipated date for completing the standards.
- Documentation that the standards are or will be internationally benchmarked and that, when well-implemented, will help to ensure that students are prepared for college and careers.
- The number of States participating in the standards consortium and the list of these States.

Evidence for (B)(1)(ii):

For Phase 1 applicants:

[4] 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.

- A description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards, and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.

For Phase 2 applicants:

- Evidence that the State has adopted the standards. Or, if the State has not yet adopted the standards, a description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(B)(1)(i)

Maine is currently a member of multiple consortia that are working on the development and implementation of the State's standards and the Common Core Standards. We believe that working with other states increases the quality of the work and implementation of State's content standards and the Common Core. While Maine has developed its own standards, assessments and curriculum in the past, there is ample evidence to show that collaborations with other states is more cost efficient and effective, and more importantly, results in higher quality programs. Maine has prior participation experience with standards consortia. In 2009, the Department adopted the New England Comprehensive Assessment System (Appendix B-1), earlier adopted by New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont, in order to conduct the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) statewide assessment required under No Child Left Behind in grades 3-8, in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Maine had participated with the states in the very early formation stage. This collaboration has resulted in higher quality assessments, additional writing assessment options and a significant savings to Maine. It has also resulted in savings to the NECAP other states; since all four sharing the costs of development.

Maine was one of the first states to have the Governor and the Commissioner of Education sign to adopt the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI), hereafter referred to as the Common Core (Appendix A-4 and B-2). As a result, Maine is very committed to and has been involved in the process since the beginning. Governors and Commissioners of forty-eight states, 2 territories and the District of Columbia signed the Memorandum of Understanding to adopt the Common Core. At each stage of the

development of the Common Core standards, Maine state specialists and educators, Pre-K through the university level, have been extensively involved in the review and comment period for the standards.

Evidence presented in the development process assures us that the Common Core Standards are internationally benchmarked and are college and career readiness standards. As a member of the American Diploma Project, made up of 35 states, we have worked together with other states to align our standards with international expectations. Achieve, Inc. is conducting an alignment study of our current content standards and the new Common Core standards.

Maine is a partner in several other consortia that will adopt the Common Standards and will work on the development in other areas. The work to develop common Science standards across states has begun. Maine is a partner and has agreed to be a lead state in this work, as well as with any other development of standards at the national level. In addition, Maine is a member of the Career-Technical Education Consortium of States (Appendix B-3) in which fourteen states share development and costs of instructional resources, identification of industry based standards and assessments. Students leave high school education programs ready for careers, gain college credit for their secondary work, and are ready to enter the workforce prepared. For the past three years, Maine has been working with New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and most recently Connecticut to redesign high schools. The New England Secondary School Consortium, facilitated by the Great Schools Partnership is focusing on 21st Century Skills and Knowledge. School level readiness to implement internationally benchmarked practices, and communications, across New England.

In our newest initiative, The Next Generation Learning partnership (NxGL), there are six lab states, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, West Virginia and Wisconsin. The partnership's work is aligned with the work and goals of Race To The Top. States and participating districts will work to adopt practices aligned with the Common Core in each of the lab sites. SAU #15 (Gray/New Gloucester) and the State are embarking on system transformation at the state, district, and local levels. The emphasis is on the next generation of education not the current generation. Key is the implementation of educational systems that center on the student

experience with measures of progress. To be selected, out of 25 applications, we had to demonstrate with concrete evidence, through a self assessment, that Maine was prepared to implement innovative practices. The self assessment is attached as Appendix B-4.

(B)(1)(ii)

Maine will adopt the Common Core during the summer of 2010. We will begin the adoption process in late June and should be complete by August. In April 2010, the legislature approved LD 1800 and the Governor signed it into law, giving the Commissioner of Education the authority to adopt the Common Core through emergency rule making. As the dates for adoption are finalized, we will submit an amendment to this section as required in the application. The Common Core is required to be formally adopted by the Legislature, which will take place during the 2011 legislative session by the Emergency Rulemaking Process (Appendix B-5 and B-6).

(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.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (B)(2):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a consortium that intends to develop high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards; or documentation that the State's consortium has applied, or intends to apply, for a grant through the separate Race to the Top Assessment Program (to be described in a subsequent notice); or other evidence of the State's plan to develop and adopt common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice).
- The number of States participating in the assessment consortium and the list of these States.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

(B)(2)(i) and (B)(2)(ii)

Currently, Maine is part of the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP). Using rigorous standards to assess students in grades 3-8, four states work together to develop and share a common assessment system that has been recognized by the USED as an excellent example of a consortium of states developing and implementing a rigorous assessment, as reflected by the USED's Fully Approved status.

In addition, Maine is a "Governing State" with the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium. As of May 26, 2010, the consortium is made up of 13 governing states and 20 advisory states. The consortium is using Common Core standards to develop achievement standards for a large scale, adaptive, online assessment. A copy of the MOU and list of participating states is included as Appendix A-5 and B-7, respectively. The consortium is working together, along with national and industry experts, to build an assessment system that is balanced and includes formative, interim, benchmark and summative assessments and practices as opposed to a single assessment. The consortium is committed to having the assessments be internationally benchmarked, provide students and educators with immediate and valuable feedback to guide learning (both student and teacher) and teaching, as well as to provide a program level look using summative data. This consortium aligns with our belief, statutes and rules that there must be multiple measures to assess students' learning and for teacher and principal evaluation. Thus, we have signed the agreement as a 'Governing State" fully committing to the complete implementation of the system. The Department's Team Leader for PK-Adult is Co-chair of the Governing and Finance Committee and the Assessment and Standards Director is on the Professional Development Committee, as well as both serving on the Steering Committee. At this time the consortium is developing the application in

response to the NIA and will submit by June 22, 2010.

Maine also is a member of the State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) (Appendix B-8), supporting assessment and accountability work through CCSSO. Our memberships demonstrate a willingness and commitment to work with other states to improve assessment and accountability for a better educational system for our students as well as a commitment of the participating states to work together to adopt and implement the standards and assessments. Specifically, Maine is a member of:

1. Accountability and Systems Reporting (ASR): Facilitates communication between states around changes in required accountability systems.
2. Career and Technical Assessment Consortium (CTAC): A relatively new state collaborative project that works to assist states to develop and improve career and technical assessment programs. It believes that assessment has a major role in meeting this goal.
3. Science Education Assessment (SCIENCE): The SCASS maintains a Science Item Bank of over 1400 items to assist member states in developing their own formative, end-of-course and statewide science assessments. The items are electronically accessible and customizable to assist member SEAs and their LEAs in developing science assessments and supporting professional development.

The six states working as NxGL Partnership will work the CCSSO and the Stupski Foundation to design and implement performance based assessments that measure achievement of the Common Core (Appendix A-3).

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).

The State shall provide its plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

(B)(3)

Implementation of the Common Core Standards affords Maine the opportunity to bring together many of its performance-based and innovative initiatives, and provides a timely opportunity to undertake a coherent system of reforms to build an education system to support personalized learning though strategies beginning in Maine.

The Department is well organized to support the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. As noted earlier, the Maine legislature adopted the goal that all of Maine's students would "graduate from our high schools prepared for post-secondary education, careers and citizenship". In order to be post-secondary ready, a student will leave high school with the cognitive strategies to enter a postsecondary institution, not be enrolled in a remedial or developmental course and have the habits to support the successful completion of the program. A career ready student is a student who leaves high school with the technical skills and knowledge needed for successful performance in the career area, the habits and disposition for success in the work place and the knowledge and skills to pursue further training AND post-secondary education. We believe all students must be prepared for

both post-secondary education and careers. The state's content standards, as do the Common Core standards, support Maine's Guiding Principles (Appendix B-9). The 21st Century Partnership and the Education Policy Improvement Center (EPIC) have reviewed and affirmed that our standards are truly the 21st century skills and knowledge that our students need to be successful for post-secondary education, careers and citizenship. For the past several years, the Department has focused our work on ensuring that this promise made to our students and our citizens will be realized. The partnerships we have formed with other states ensure our implementation will not be insular, but will present opportunities to share development and strategies for high quality assessment for and of learning. The implementation of the Common Core in literacy and mathematics will move forward as part of this overarching vision for our State.

Maine will work with our educators to implement the Common Core standards through continuing and new initiatives, including:

- Developing a plan to incorporate the Common Core standards into the rollout of the current state's standards in all eight content areas.
    - Specifically, within one month of the state's adoption of the final standards, the state will develop documentation of the similarities and differences between the new Common Core and Maine's current standards, the Maine Revised Learning Results, for example with crosswalk documents;
    - Beginning in the Fall of 2010 and continuing through 2014, the state will develop and provide:
        - Electronic professional development that is live and recorded, and archived on the state's website and through the state of Maine's iTunesU site;
        - Information sessions for parents, students, and the general public;
        - Statewide professional development for all levels of educators that is geared toward the implementation of the standards;
        - Support for the development of model syllabi, instructional material, and classroom based assessments

- Support for participating LEAs to purchase or use computer-based adaptive assessment systems that measure achievement of Common Core standards (in 2014-2015 the state assessment will be online computer adaptive system); and,
- Support for regional collaboratives.

- Collaborate with states in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium, the NxGL Partnerships, and CCSSO to unpack the Common Core standards and develop aligned assessments,
- Support the adoption and implementation of performance-based assessment systems of multiple measures;
- Participate in the multistate effort to develop internationally benchmarked content standards in science, the arts and others as they develop;
- Develop and implement rubrics/scoring guides within instructional units for all content areas as the standards are validated as college and career ready;
- Support the expansion of the Maine Learning Technology Initiative (MLTI) to provide virtual learning opportunities for students and teachers;
- Implement a Board Examination system, such as the Cambridge International Examination's International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) and their AICE program, the College Board's Advanced Placement (AP) program, the International Baccalaureate (IB)Diploma program, ACT's Quality Core or Pearson/Edexcel's IGCSE and A-level programs;
- State designed STEM assessments using enhanced technology, simulations and gaming strategies;

- Increase participation and access to Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses, including through expansion of the AP4ALL program of AP courses for low income students,;
- Maine Course Pathways (Appendix A-2), a system of reviewed syllabi that provide a tool for implementing multiple pathways and ensuring opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement of standards;
- Support the development of systems of interventions for PK-12 that are timely, as required by statute (Appendix A-1);
- Expand the operation of Jobs for Maine Graduate's (Appendix A-6) in the lowest achieving high schools; and,
- Implement early learning standards/guidelines for universal, inclusive early learning programs (Appendix B-10).

Maine will build on the success from the Advanced Placement Incentive Program/NGA AP grants. Because of these efforts we increased the number of AP teachers from 300 to over 800 in nine years. The number of exams taken by Maine students increased from 5,466 in 2001 to 12,483 in 2009. But we are proudest of our efforts that resulted in the number of AP exams taken by low income students increased from 348 in 2002 to 1,471 in 2009. As part of the NGA AP Honor States, we showed the largest increase of participation in all of the project states (Appendix B-11). Over the next four years, we will include as part of the rollout of Maine's content standards, data and information from our AP courses to identify specific content topics that students are struggling with on the exams. Each content program area – PK-12 and connecting with higher education and CTE– is developing a specific plan for the implementation of the state's standards and identifying where the standards in one area cross over and can be demonstrated in a different content area. The Maine Course Pathways facilitates this at the high school level. We are committed to sharing this tool with other states as it is a first in the nation. Further description of this initiative is included in Appendix A-2.

Activities	Timeline	Responsible Party
Incorporate CCSSI Standards into Maine Learning Results (state content standards)		
• Align the CCSSI with the state standards	September 2010	Achieve as part of American Diploma Project
• Conduct rule making process to adopt the CCSSI	July – September 2010	Standards and Assessment Director
• Conduct regional meetings to inform the public and educators about the CCSSI	August 2010 - September, 2011	Pk-20/Adult and Federal Programs Team
• Develop on-line and in-person professional development materials to support teachers and educators in implementing the CCSSI standards	August 2010 ongoing	Pk-20/Adult and Federal Programs Team
• Conduct on-line and in-person professional develop to		
• Develop multiple pathways for all students	August 2010 ongoing	All MDOE staff in program areas – Pk-20/Adult Ed Leadership team
Implement newly developed common assessments aligned with CCSSI		
• Participate in SMARTER Balanced Consortium as Governing State	2010 –2015	Pk-20/Adult Ed Team Leader and Standards and Assessment Director
• Provide technical assistance to educators based on the plan within SMARTER Balanced Consortium	January 2011 - June 2015	Standards and Assessment Director
Support adoption and implementation of performance based assessment systems		
• Create rubrics for all standards in the Maine content standards and the Common Core within the context of exemplars and instructional units	June 2010 - September 2013	PK-20/Adult Team, Standards and Assessment Director
• Work with SMARTER Balanced Consortium to develop and implement performance assessment system with formative, interim and benchmark assessments	September 2010 – September 2015	Standards and Assessment team
Expansion of Maine Learning Technology Initiative (MLTI)		
• Develop and/or identify virtual and expanded learning opportunities for students • Create rubrics for all standards in the Maine content standards and the Common Core within the context of exemplars and instructional units	May 2010 ongoing	Team Leader for Maine Learning Technology Initiative
Expand AP and IB courses		
• Provide teachers with opportunities to become certified to teach AP and IB courses	Current/Ongoing	PK-20 Team – AP Staff
• Provide schools with incentives to add AP and IP	Ongoing	AP Team

• Expand AP4ALL to 25 courses for PreAP and AP	2010 – 2014 +	
Scale-up Maine Course Pathways		
• Provide professional development to teachers on developing quality syllabi (Develop online training modules)	June 2010 ongoing	PK-20/Adult Ed Team
• Provide models of quality syllabi	September 2010 - June 2011	Pk-20/ EPIC
• Evaluate syllabi against the Common Core and the state standards	ongoing	EPIC
Support the Implementation Intervention Systems		
• Provide professional development in intervention systems	Ongoing	MDOE RTI team
• Work with SAUs to establish PK-12 LEA Intervention Systems as required by statute	Current – 2012	LEAs with MDOE support
Increase statewide support for students in STEM instruction and preparation for careers in STEM		
• Develop landscape plan for all of STEM efforts in Maine	Current	Statewide STEM Collaborative
• Implement specialized programs in STEM	Ongoing	MDOE STEM team with Collaborative and UMS
• Implement Math in CTE	Current with expansion of two CTE programs each year	MDOE CTE and Math specialists
• Provide professional development for teachers on content in STEM • Implement Project Lead The Way in two sites each year	Current with additional scale-up with grants	MDOE STEM Team, UMS faculty and STEM Collaborative
Design State STEM assessments		
• Design assessments that are performance based in traditional academic courses and CTE programs	January 2011 ongoing	MDOE STEM Team
Support adoption and implementation of performance based assessment systems		
• Develop model performance based assessment tasks	October 2010 - September 2015	SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium, Standards and Assessment Team
• Provide professional development on scoring performance tasks • Develop online training modules	January 2011 ongoing	Standards and Assessment team/ SMARTER Balanced
Implement a Board Examination System		
• Identify LEAs to participate	June 2010	NCEE and MDOE
• Provide professional development for LEAs	October 2010 - June 2014	NCEE and MDOE
Implement Jobs for Maine's Graduates		

• Work with districts to implement JMG programs for high risk students	October 2010 - June 2014	JMG/School Improvement Team	
Implement early learning standards/guidelines			
• Provide professional development to early childhood education providers	Current and expanded	Special Services/Early Childhood team	
• Develop performance measures for teachers to use to measure readiness	October 2010 ongoing	Early Childhood Specialist	
• Monitor the implementation and progress of early learning standards	Ongoing	Early Childhood Specialist	

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

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system *(24 points – 2 points per America COMPETES element)*

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).

In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.

Evidence:

- Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(C)(1)

Each year the Data Quality Campaign (DQC) surveys all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico to assess states' progress towards and future plans for implementing DQC's 10 Essential Elements of a longitudinal data system. Data Quality Campaign's (DQC, 2009) annual survey identified Maine as having a majority of all ten Elements implemented. The expansion under the newly awarded SLDS Grant is attached as Appendix C-1.

Elements of America COMPETES Act	SLDS Status
Element 1: A unique student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system.	*Existing Capabilities:* All students enrolled in publically funded Pre-K through 12 programs are assigned unique identifiers.
Element 2: Student level enrollment demographic and program participation information.	*Existing Capabilities:* All student-level information including demographics and program participation.
Element 3: Student level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out or complete P-16 education programs.	*Existing Capabilities:* Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete PreK-12 education programs.
Element 4: The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems.	*Existing Capabilities:* A pilot program using common transcript data is a 2007 SLDS grant component.
Element 5: State data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability.	*Existing Capabilities:* Data validation is built into the staging systems and verification and cleansing routines are part of the data warehouse architecture.
Element 6: Yearly test records of individual students with respects to assessments under section 1111(b) of the ESEA of 1965.	*Existing Capabilities:* Individual statewide assessment data are collected in the State system.
Element 7: Information on students not tested, by grade and subject.	*Existing Capabilities:* Information is collected on students who are not administered the statewide exams.
Element 8: A teacher identification system with the ability to match teachers to students.	*Existing Capabilities:* All teachers are assigned unique identifiers. Any barriers to matching teachers with students were removed with the recently passed Public Law, Chapter 646.
Element 9: Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned.	*Existing Capabilities:* The statewide SIS produces student-level "official" transcripts for transmission to postsecondary institutions as well as the ability to electronically move student records between schools within and

	outside the State.
Element 10: Student-level college readiness test scores.	*Existing Capabilities:* All Maine students take the SAT in 11th gr. and the PSAT twice in 10th grade.
Element 11: Data that provide information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework.	*Existing Capabilities:* Data received from National Student Clearinghouse.
Element 12: Data that provide other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.	

Maine is proud of this accomplishment, along with the recently awarded contract to develop a Data Warehouse (DW) and Decision Support System (DSS). These assets will enable Maine to move rapidly towards the data integration and infrastructure investment our state seeks to ensure every child is taught by an effective teacher. The Department believes the DSS divided into the Educator Improvement System (EIS) and Family Information System (FIS) will allow end-users a customized experience that will better meet their needs. The Department is committed to further expanding and refining the data included in its statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) to keep on the leading edge of data collection, while building capacity at the local level. When fully implemented, Maine's SLDS, DW, and DSS will comprise the technology infrastructure necessary to provide needed data to stakeholder, while concurrently linking the Department's reform goals with the State's key performance indicators (KPIs). These KPIs will provide stakeholders, including parents and students, with readily available information about student achievement, postsecondary education and career-readiness, and teacher effectiveness, while providing critical information to feed into the Department's proposed Educator Improvement System (EIS) (described in section C2) and the Family Information System (described below and in section D2). Race to the Top funds and 2010 SLDS grant just awarded to Maine will not only allow the Department to increase access to these data, but also increase the type of data that are collected.

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.[5]

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(C)(2)

The Data Management Team (DMT) is focused on the interface with and impact of the Department's data systems on the data collection activities at the SAU/RSU, school, and community levels. Collaboration efforts with the SAUs/RSUs on the SLDS longitudinal data system has (and continues to) included (a) Focus groups with local functional and technical staff to help determine and review the features and requirements for each of the components in the system; (b) Regular meetings with SAUs/RSUs superintendents to discuss the implications and benefits of the longitudinal data system; (c) Pilot testing the system components, including user interface design, SIF data transmission, coordination with local student information vendors, and providing feedback on the system's reporting capabilities. Other activities used to include end-users are: (a) Designing data cubes for SAU/RSU analysis and research of longitudinal data from the DW; (b) Creating data elements needed for supporting local decisions and the timeliness of the data; and, (c) Selecting query tools for ad hoc report creation. A great deal of public data will also be available for

[5] 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.

community access. Governance of the technical components and overall security of the longitudinal data system is the responsibility of the Office of Information Technology (OIT) under the direction of the Maine's Chief Information Officer funded by the Department's 2007 SLDS grant. OIT maintains, supports, and evaluates the technical infrastructure, including data security, accessibility, application maintenance, and network services.

Accessing Post Secondary Data Sources

Gathering and using data on successful transitions from secondary to postsecondary education is consistent with the state's vision of having its students exit school college and career ready. Maine plans to participate in the National Student Clearinghouse's (NSC) Student Tracker Service. The NSC, the Department, and Maine's Postsecondary Institutions of Higher Education will study postsecondary enrollment and other outcomes of Maine's public high school graduates. By matching official graduate class data from the Department's DW to NSC's postsecondary enrollment records from public and private colleges and universities across the nation, the aforementioned groups will use NSC data to learn about graduates' college persistence and completion rates. Information acquired from these activities will drive additional efforts to prepare students for post-secondary education. Online professional development modules for Maine secondary educators will capture lessons learned and tools for differentiating instructional practices within high school classrooms. This web-driven Maine RTT approach provides the ability to scale the project nationally without exponential costs. Seamless access to robust and comprehensive data on high school student and teacher performance represents a foundational element for Maine's continued reform agenda. Longitudinal data across the PreK-20 "grades" is critical to ensure that the Department has appropriate information available to support core policy decisions and ongoing operational improvements, while driving the allocation (and reallocation) of scarce resources (time, people, material, and capital investments).

Accessing Student and Teacher Data Sources

The effectiveness of teachers matters because research suggests that among all school resources, teachers have the greatest

impact on student achievement (Goldhaber, 2006). Maine will create a seamless integration of student and teacher data from the DW into the DSS, including data from the planned formative assessment system (see C3) to provide essential elements in the use of data to assess and improve classroom instruction. Without timely, accurate and nuanced data that links students to the teachers who provide them instruction in each subject, assessment data cannot readily be used to target professional development and improvements in instructional practices for teachers.

The Department anticipates that the DSS will provide educators with objective data that can guide decisions regarding instruction, professional development, school improvement initiatives, and personal assignments. The statewide assessment results from the MeCAS and the future MeFAST is a key component of the larger Educator Improvement System (EIS). Specifically, the linking achievement with teachers and schools within the EIS web-based portal. This portal allows teachers and principals to verify that teacher-student links are accurate prior to the data being used in analyses examining achievement outcomes. Linked (teacher-to-student) achievement data elements, along with static reports, will be placed within the portal. The reports display, via a user code, a teacher's teacher-student achievement outcome for each content area and, if applicable, results for specific student groups (e.g., high-achieving, low-achieving, students with disabilities, English language learners). Personally Identifiable Information (PII) will be restricted to authorized individuals assigned a system generated password. Non-PII will be readily available to teachers, policy leaders, administrators, researcher, and the general public.

Stakeholder Training and Access

The long term success of the project will be measured more by the effective use of longitudinal data for data-driven decision making by stakeholders than by the ability of the project team to implement the technical components. The current 2007 SLDS training is divided into two levels. The level one training focuses on the procedural aspects of data entry and an understanding of data quality at the level of data steward. This system of training offers all educators in the State of Maine the ability to complete an online training module, with instructor-led classes as needed.

The second level of training goes beyond the procedural knowledge in level one, and helps stakeholders review, examine and interpret their data. The skills and decisions needed for this component of the training are more complex than in level one. The SLDS trainers ask educators to examine the quality of the information they have, form pertinent questions, and seek appropriate ways to answer those questions accurately and efficiently. Participants receive training on basic research methodology including the formation of a hypothesis, verifying data quality and choosing the right data to generate basic frequency charts and summary statistics for their schools.

With the expansion of the SLDS to a wider range of stakeholders new classes will be added using the 2010 SLDS ARRA grant funding. The new classes will include training on how to use data and reports generated from the SLDS data warehouse data marts:

- **Growth Models –** Performing analysis of student, school, school unit and State growth models for evaluation of student progress, programs and teacher effectiveness.
- **At-Risk Students** – Identifying at-risk students and selecting intervention and remediation programs to reduce drop-out rates and take preventative actions.
- **Balanced Scorecards** – Measuring school unit and program target objectives and comparing with actual performance.

Additional on-line training modules will be developed for access by the general public. This training will be posted on the public pages of the SLDS education portal. The initial goal is to provide public stakeholders with knowledge on how to access and interpret school unit and State NCLB report cards available through the education portal.

Goal: 1 Perform the preliminary tasks to plan out the data system. *Rationale: Cross-agency representation, a dedicated oversight group, and detailed designing and planning are critical elements to address needs and concerns of all parties.*		
Tasks	**Timeframe**	**Responsible**

		Party
ACTIVITY (1): Continue the MDOE's Data Management Teams (DMT) to oversee the policy and data implications of the DSS.	Dec 2009 – Apr 2015	SLDS Staff
ACTIVITY (2): Refine the group dedicated to the operations of the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS).	Dec 2009 – Feb2015	SLDS Staff
Goal: 2 Develop the core functionality of the P-20 Data System to be able to track student transitions between agencies. *Rationale: Current state of data collection system including inputs by all data holders and users must be aligned expanded to desired state.*		
ACTIVITY (3): Perform data audits of all agency systems to determine the data elements are currently collected and those required to implement Maine's improvement initiatives.	Apr 2011 – Sept 2011	External Contractor SLDS Staff
ACTIVITY (4): Develop a data schema to normalize both old and new data elements to be migrated into the DSS/DW	Nov. 2010 – Mar 2011	OIT SLDS Staff Vendor
ACTIVITY (5): Develop the extract, transformation, and loading (ETL) procedures required to link disparate agency systems into a "Data Depot"	Dec 2011 – Sept 2012	OIT Vendor SLDS Staff
ACTIVITY (6): Inform and train LEAs and schools on any changes to data collection process.	Jan 2011 – Aug 2014	SLDS Staff PD Team
ACTIVITY (7): Link the Data Depot to non-educational systems (e.g. Department of Labor) and non-state systems (e.g. National Student Clearinghouse)	Oct 2012 – Dec 2013	Vendor SLDS Staff

Goal: 3 Develop a data matching algorithm to properly identify students across schools, districts, and agencies. Rationale: Initial matching algorithm must be continuously modified to provide as accurate a match as possible.		
ACTIVITY (8): Develop first-pass of data matching algorithm. A match algorithm is required to track transient students across districts.	Jul 2011 – Jan 2012	OIT SLDS Staff
ACTIVITY (9): Develop additional data matching algorithm that incorporates new data elements (iterative process).	Jan – Oct 2012	OIT SLDS Staff
Goal: 4 Develop a decision support system for researchers, principals, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders. *Rationale: System must be designed and modified based on ongoing feedback from and needs of end-users, including FFRPA protections.*		
ACTIVITY (10): Create initial end-user dashboards and reports using data that are already captured.	Apr – Nov 2011	SLDS staff
ACTIVITY (11): Conduct user feedback sessions to determine new reporting needs.	Sep 2011 – Feb 2011	SLDS staff External Vendor
ACTIVITY (12): Evaluate BI, dashboard, and reporting tools and web-based presentation tools.	Mar 2011 – Jun 2012	External Contractor External Vendor

(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, 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).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note the location where the attachment can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages

(C)(3)(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;

Ensuring effective teachers in every classroom requires accurate and timely data for teachers. High quality data is invaluable at improving instruction and academic outcomes for students, while continually increasing teacher effectiveness. Although Maine's planned DW/ DSS will be a powerful tool to inform many areas of work statewide, the Department recognizes that it does not provide "real-time" data needed to inform instruction throughout the school year. Promoting effective teaching requires having data that helps them identify the academic needs of the students while monitoring student progress. Data from a DSS that provides "real-time" information about student achievement will facilitate teachers adjusting coursework to meet the specific needs of their students.

Research demonstrates the dual implementation of a benchmark assessment system and Response to Intervention (RTI) program increases teacher and leader effectiveness (Calendar, 2007). The Department is aware that across the state there is a lack of uniformity and quality among the formative assessments used by teachers to measure progress in learning the curriculum. The Department plans to develop an online formative assessment tool for use by teachers and principals. A key function will be to provide aligned benchmark items to both the Common Core and state standards. The state's goal is to design and deploy Maine's Formative Assessment System for Teachers (MeFAST) with unique functionality and cost saving that will suppress current community available products.

The rich formative assessment data collected through MeFAST, along with information from the DW, will feed into an overall improvement strategy that will provide teachers with on-demand access to data. Analyzing these data is perhaps the most difficult component of the data drawn decision models, which is why the MeFAST will include business intelligence (BI) tasks that uses technology to plot achievement trajectories, draws conclusions based upon trends, and recommends standard-centered interventions.

MeFAST is one component of the larger DSS (which also includes the MPAS) (described in Section D) to provide teachers with frequently-updated effectiveness information, allowing them to more readily identify areas of instructional weakness and opportunities for professional development. This interface will use technology to draw conclusions about teacher needs based on student achievement data and other data stored within the larger DSS. MeFAST will provide teachers with more data on their own effectiveness while allowing administrators the ability to access these data in evaluating a teacher's effectiveness.

The MeFAST will significantly enhance the ability of school, district, and state leaders to monitor student achievement and teacher effectiveness in individual classrooms and schools. This system will provide critical performance data to school improvement teams, school and district improvement teams will now have a powerful tool for monitoring progress and identifying the needs of the subpopulations of students and teachers. MeFAST would also allow state administrators to quickly access information relative to a

school's or LEA's progress toward the state's goals.

(C)(3)(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, principals and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and

The Department recognizes that establishing a professional culture focused on data analysis requires a substantial amount of human capital development. To accomplish this task, job-embedded professional development will be essential to the effective implementation of MeFAST. Participating SAUs will provide opportunities during the school day for teachers to examine student achievement data and collaborate to adjust and improve their instructional practices based on the data. To do this, the Department data coaches will train school and district personnel in the use of the MeFAST to improve instruction. This includes training SAUs on using MeFAST to drive Response to Intervention. The RTI model (a) provides high-quality instruction and interventions matched to student needs, (b) measures learning progress over time, and (c) reviews levels of performance to make important educational decisions.

(C)(3)(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).

The DSS with its MeFAST component Systems will have a transformative effect on Maine's educational system by providing

access to student, teacher, and leader data. Maine through the SLDS grant will have the ability to link student test data (both summative and formative) to individual teachers and leaders. The Department will continue to work collaboratively with researchers and other stakeholders to identify practices and policies that are most effective in educating all students, especially practices that are effective in closing the achievement gap.

C3

Goal: 1 Provide teachers and principals with an aligned formative assessment development system with an enhanced benchmark system that includes formative assessments.

Tasks	Timeframe	Responsible Party
ACTIVITY (1): Develop the Maine Formative Assessment System for Teachers (MeFAST) that includes benchmark assessment capabilities aligned to the NECAP and Common Core standards.	Jun 2011 – Feb 2014	MDOE Assessment staff External Vendor
ACTIVITY (2): Ensure items/ tasks/ prompts within the MeFAST are of high quality and follow a model curriculum developed by the MeFAST Steering Committee.	Jun 2011 – Feb 2014	MDOE Assessment staff External Vendor
Goal: 2 Building Educator Information System that utilizes technology to help teachers and leaders analyze student achievement data and make decisions to drive instruction.		
ACTIVITY (3): Build the EIS that integrates formative assessment data from the MeFAST and DSS tools in an integrated manner.	Jul 2011 – Aug 2015	External Vendor
Goal: 3 Integrating EIS with the MeFAST so that teachers and leaders clearly see the link between student achievement and teacher effectiveness.		
ACTIVITY (4): Provide training and on-site support for the implementation of RTI.	Jan 2011 – Dec 2012	MDOE Staff External Vendor

(D) Great Teachers and Leaders *(138 total 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.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (D)(1)(i), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents, including information on the elements of the State's alternative routes (as described in the alternative route to certification definition in this notice).

Evidence for (D)(1)(ii), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A list of the alternative certification programs operating in the State under the State's alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice), and for each:
  - The elements of the program (as described in the alternative routes to certification definition in this notice).
  - The number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each program in the previous academic year.
  - The total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous academic year.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(D)(1)(i) Alternate Routes to Certification

Maine has two options for the development of alternate routes to certification in Maine: (1) establish regulations and procedures which govern the approval of alternate route programs by various providers including consortia of school districts; and (2) establish an alternate route to certification managed by the state. Maine regulations currently permit Alternate Route Programs for teachers (Appendix D-1).

Alternate Pathways to Certification Program Proposal:

This proposal is a combination of D(1) Providing high quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals, and D(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals. High quality pathways will expand the number of effective teachers and principals and ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and leaders. With this in mind, alternate routes to certification should address four criteria:

(1) Alternate routes serve the statewide need for effective educators, particularly critical shortage areas. Districts would then have certification pathways available to serve those specific needs.

(2) Alternate route pathways can be delivered to the schools and communities where prospective teachers reside. The special education teacher recruitment and retention research is supportive of such a "grow your own" approach to producing certified teachers, particularly in rural areas. An example is in Chapter 115, Part 2 - Native Language Provision in Appendix D-2.

(3) Alternate route pathways delivered in schools and communities can tailor a robust curriculum with extensive clinical experiences and attention to Maine's Teaching Standards. The curriculum can integrate preparation for teaching students with and without disabilities and students who are English Language Learners.

(4) Alternate route pathways can be rooted in a performance based assessment system of candidate evaluation for the recommendation for initial teacher certification.

(D)(1)(ii)

There are no alternative route teacher programs currently operating in Maine that meet the definition set forth in this RFP. Currently all programs that service "non-traditional" route candidates are operated by Institutions of Higher Education. Therefore, Maine's State Board of Education has passed a resolution to open the regulations governing and defining alternate routes to certification programs. These regulations also contain the "Performance Indicators" for Maine's Teaching Standards. The Maine State Board of Education shall solicit public comment and stakeholder input for the purpose of updating and revising these regulations to enable a broader interpretation and implementation of alternate certification programs as described above.

(D)(1)(iii)

In Maine the determination of teacher shortage area designations is based on the most recent data available relating to the number of vacancies for teachers in the content areas as reported to the Department for the previous and current academic years. Other data concerning teachers having less than full credentials, as determined by the number of less than full certificates (transitional, conditional and targeted needs certificates) and waivers issued for teachers in the indicated subject areas are factored in, as well as the total number of FTEs of all classroom teachers in the State. Officials in all public and private districts/schools are contacted to seek input as to any additional content areas in which shortages may exist. These data are used to identify and provide technical assistance to "high need" schools under the auspices of the Department Teacher Quality and Equity Action Plans (Appendix D-3).

Currently, the underserved subject areas for Maine are: Teachers of English as a Second Language (ESL/ELL); World Languages; Science and Mathematics; Speech and Hearing Clinicians; Technology Education/Industrial Arts; Special Education

(Birth to five years and through grade 12); Gifted//Talented Students; and School Librarians. For the 2007-2008 school year, which is the most recent data, the total number of teachers in shortage areas was 6,016 representing 37.59% of the total FTE of all teachers which was 16,005.3. Of the 6,016 teachers teaching in shortage areas, 788 or 13.1% were serving under emergency certificates.

To help address critical shortage areas, Maine operates a loan forgiveness program. Under the **Educators for Maine (EFM) Loan Program**, which is administered by the Finance Authority of Maine (FAME), recipients may be eligible to have one year's loan forgiven for each year of return service in which the individual is a full-time teacher, speech pathologist or child care provider with appropriate credentials in an eligible Maine school or child care center. In addition, two year's worth of loan may be forgiven for each year that the individual is a full-time teacher in an eligible Maine school working in an underserved subject area. In addition, two year's worth of loan may be forgiven for each year that the individual is a full-time teacher in an eligible Maine school working in an underserved subject area (Appendix D-4).

As we require full implementation of the standards in all the content areas, it is critical that we look for creative ways to ensure every student in Maine has access to a full comprehensive curriculum taught by highly qualified and effective teachers. We have assembled a committee of teachers (K-12), higher education, administrators and students to address the serious shortage and to develop a plan to resolve teacher shortages in a coherent and coordinated manner. The STEM Collaborative is also working to identify possible solutions to the shortage and distribution of highly qualified teachers in the STEM areas. The Department will convene groups of teachers and teacher educators to develop a plan for increasing teachers in the shortage areas but also for teachers to teach advanced content courses such as Advanced Placement. Discussions have begun with the College Board and Deans of Education to explore ways that AP "summer institutes" can take place as part of the teacher preparation program.

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; *(10 points)* and

(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.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the

location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Ten pages

(D)(2)(i)

Maine has not implemented a growth model at this time. The Department is developing a model which will be ready for piloting by December, 2010 and fully operational by Fall 2012.

(D)(2) Overview – Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance

Maine proposes to design an evaluation system that is able to differentiate effective from ineffective teachers in collaboration with state teachers and principal associations. This system will be based on training, certifying and monitoring the results of teacher evaluations to ensure high quality, fairness, and consistency. Teachers will be observed through multiple evaluations each year by trained evaluators.

A Multi-faceted Professional Accountability System (MPAS) will link individual teachers and principals with student achievement data and provide student growth data for educator evaluations. There is evidence of promising practices in LEA's that will be built upon and expanded to include student achievement and growth data (Appendix A-7).

Maine expects to reach a number of milestones, which will translate into significant improvements in teacher and leader effectiveness. Specifically, Maine will implement a precise approach for measuring student growth by June of 2012 that can be used for teacher and principal evaluation along with multiple measures. Student growth, using multiple measures will be used to rate teachers and administrators as "effective" or "highly effective" beginning in the Fall of 2012. The Department will provide training to all administrators responsible for implementing the MPAS to ensure quality control and reliability. The State plans on accomplishing this task by developing and deploying professional accountability coaches for assuring that assessment measures are technically sound especially when using measures other than NECAP. These coaches will ensure that all LEAs will participate in

either the MPAS or a locally developed system deemed as equivalent in design, rigor, and focus. The ultimate goal of these efforts is to dramatically increase the effectiveness of Maine teachers and principals so that, by the end of the SY 2013-14, no less than 75% of all teachers and principals in the state will be rated as either "highly effective" or "effective". It is anticipated that less than 10% of all teachers evaluated will not meet the criteria of "effective" teacher and that this percentage will decrease annually. As with other components of this grant, coordination and collaboration with school improvement efforts will be essential for achieving the proposed outcomes. Data and other information acquired in our work with Great Teachers and Leaders will be shared with Turnaround Team members, and used as part of our ongoing strategic planning.

Multi-faceted Professional Accountability System Components

There are four key components to MPAS: (a) annual evaluations, (b) flexible regulations, (c) longitudinal data, and (d) training supports.

(1) Statewide teacher and administrator evaluation system: MPAS will be based on a modified Danielson method (Danielson & McGreal, 2000) with stakeholder involvement.

(2) Flexible regulations regarding MPAS evaluations: The MPAS will place additional emphasis on the student outcomes [Student Improvement] component of the original Danielson model. Under prior regulations, all the linking of teacher-student information was not allowable. New, more flexible, regulations make significant changes to the teacher evaluation system by making student growth appropriate for determining teacher and leader effectiveness. Rather than set a specific percentage that student growth must be weighed in the evaluation, the MPAS reduces the possibility a teacher could be rated as effective without showing satisfactory levels of student growth. The proposed system mandates that an educator cannot be rated *effective* or *highly effective* unless they have demonstrated satisfactory levels of student growth. In addition, no educator can receive the lowest rating if they show satisfactory levels of student growth. Additionally, Maine will formulate and refine regulations that specify how

student growth data on measures of achievement will be used appropriately. Specifically, one of the multiple measures will include student growth data as measured by the Maine Comprehensive Assessment System (MeCAS) as described in Section B. In addition, other rigorous and comparable measures from non-tested subjects will be used as appropriate.

Teachers are observed through multiple evaluations each year by trained evaluators. LD 1799, Public Law 646 (Appendix A-7) was amended to allow the linkage of student achievement data to teacher and principal evaluation systems used in the State of Maine if a model is approved by a stakeholders' group. An "Evaluation Model Stakeholder's Group" (Appendix A-7) was convened with the express purpose of reviewing and approving such models for use by LEAs in Maine. Because the language in the law says that a district must select from the approved models the Governor issued an Executive Order to have the stakeholders group begin meeting immediately and approve at least one model for teacher evaluation and one for principal evaluation. The stakeholders' group unanimously voted to approve two models that allow for the linkage of student achievement data to teacher and principal evaluations on May 12, 2010.

(3) Longitudinal Data: The Department's longitudinal data system will begin tracking student achievement in SY 2010-11 and will improve as the planned Data Warehouse (DW) becomes fully operational. The DW will assign specific student results to individual teachers and this data can be further linked to information on past student results. The DW provide the necessary data organized in an automated manner by which educators can received MPAS results once the assessment data are uploaded from the vendor. This will enable the State to establish a clear approach for measuring student growth.

Given the aforementioned limitations, the state will conduct a series of stakeholder meetings, consisting of educators and policy makers, convened to create a growth system that reflected Maine's goals for teachers and principals. The group will evaluate the technical considerations associated with different growth model designs, such as projection, percentile, or cumulative effects models. Currently, Maine's Comprehensive Assessment System (MeCAS) has measures of student achievement in grade 3-8 and high school. In grades 3-8, the state participates in the New England Common Assessment System (NECAP). The NECAP has

built into its metric a vertical scale; however, this scale is not linked to the high school assessment (College Board's SAT). Further, no statewide assessment exists in grade 9.

Another growth model the state will be evaluating is based on changes in student performance level. These performance level changes are based upon the academic achievement standards set by the state in all applicable grades. Maine will review models that assess growth for students scoring below *proficient* and movement above the Proficient category (*Proficient with Distinction*). The value table would split each performance level at a scale score point value that considered the standard errors associated with assessment at the particular cut point on the scale. This separation will allow more granular measures of student growth and allow the MPAS to assign credit for showing growth for these students.

Student growth will be a factor for determining teacher and leader effectiveness. The operational definition and measurement of student growth will be determined between September 2010 and July 2011. The definition and means for assessing student growth will represent a valid level of change in achievement data for an individual student between two points in time. Further, the Department must ensure all teachers are included within the MPAS or locally-developed model. How student achievement is assigned to teachers in subjects not measured by the state assessment systems along with teachers in grades outside of those assessed will be defined by the stakeholder group.

(4) Training Supports: The State will implement targeted training supports to take advantage of the MPAS activities. Three highlights of these trainings are plans to: (1) provide school leaders and Superintendents with development coaches to support the rigorous, transparent conduct of MPAS; (2) develop career pathways that link differentiated training to the evaluation results; and (3) require novice teachers to attend specialized training **AND** show satisfactory levels of student growth before receiving licensure and tenure protections. Again, coordination and collaboration with school improvement efforts are critical to our success. Data and other information acquired in our work with Great Teachers and Leaders will be shared with Turnaround team members, and used as part of our ongoing strategic planning.

(D)(2)(ii)- (iii) and (iv)

The Multi-faceted Professional Accountability Systems is anchored in legislation and processes that ensure collaboration with stakeholder groups representing the Maine Education Association; Maine Principals' Association; Maine School Boards Association; Maine School Superintendents Association; and Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities. The MPAS annual evaluation system makes possible the use of assessment data as part of teacher and principal evaluations. The models that have been approved at this time are: Framework for Teaching (Danielson model), with the inclusion of a student achievement and growth component and the VAL-ED model with a student achievement and growth component for adoption by local school districts in principal evaluation.

Recommended Schedule for Implementation:

While this schedule is based on the Race to the Top application, should the reauthorization of ESEA include a different timeline, Maine will meet the new requirements.

MPAS Program Timeline and Benchmarks			
Grant Year		**Program Component**	
2010 - 2011	Aug – Nov	Needs Assessment/Gap Analysis to determine PD/Infrastructure needed with measurable goals/timelines/benchmarks set. MPAS Design/Deployment Phase	Capacity Building for Implementing MEQEP
	Oct – Jan	State-wide and SAU Stakeholder's Groups design components of MPAS/MEQEP based on needs assessments at State and local level	
	Sept – June	"Accountability" and Specific Program Coaches selected, trained and deployed to provide PD in MEQEP Program Components, MPAS, and Evaluation Models	

2011 - 2012	March – Sept	Initial Implementation of Components with ongoing regular evaluation, indicated revisions, and progress monitoring/reporting	Implementation Phase
	Aug – June	Full Implementation of all MEQEP Components with formal evaluation/feedback/revision process and progress monitoring/reporting in place.	
	Aug – Dec	"Accountability/Program Coaches" continue to deliver follow-up PD, and "Recalibration" training based upon Program Evaluation data	
	Jan – March	Progress Data analyzed to determine further PD needs and/or program revisions needed. PD/program revisions implemented with measurable goals/timelines set.	
2012 – 2015		All Program Components/Evaluation/Progress Reporting continues with public reporting	Complete Implementation of all programs
2015		Final Evaluation Data submitted/analyzed and programs promulgated State-wide	

MPAS Project Goals	Measurable Objectives	Benchmarks	Timelines/Reporting
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	A. Review of State Regulations governing Alt. Rte. Programs and the federal definition. B. At least one High Quality Alt. Rte. Program approved and implemented.	A. Alt. Rte. Program definition reviewed and standards adopted. B. Stakeholder's Group meets to provide recommendations for revisions to Chapters 114 and 115 to design Alt. Rte. Programs' Approval process.	A. During School 2010 – 2011 school year, State Board of Education reviews standards and begins rule making process. B. First Alt. Rte. Program Approved and implemented during 2012.
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	A. Research and develop growth metric and performance standards by fall of 2012.	A. Implementation of high quality embedded professional development	A. – D. Quarterly Pilot Progress Reports A. MECAS Student

	B. Not less than 20% increase in student academic achievement from the baseline by end of grant. C. 75% of students with not less than one year academic growth measured using Measured Progress projections. D. Identify and quantify observable characteristics of teacher and principal "effectiveness" that support student learning goals. E. Reduction of teachers each year from the baseline toward the long-term goal of 10% (rated as non-effective). Reduction of principals each year from the baseline toward the long-term goal of 1% (rated as non-effective)	B. Implementation of teacher and principal evaluation and coaching cycles. C. Annual student achievement and performance data linked through SLDS/MPAS to schools, teachers and principals.	Data; other approved assessment measures	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	A. Increased equitable distribution of Highly Qualified and Effective Teachers and Principals in "High Need Schools" by 50% by end of grant	A. Full funding and implementation of research based strategies outlined in Maine's Teacher Quality & Equity Plan	A. Annual Performance Report Data increased equitable distribution of Highly Qualified and Effective Teachers and Principals in "High Need Schools". B. Quarterly Pilot	

			Progress Reports C. MECAS Student Data
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	A. Maine's SLDS Grant creates MPAS linking teacher preparation institutions to graduates' student achievement data. B. (See (D) (1) above)	A. Teacher preparation programs receive data on "effectiveness" of graduates. B. (See (D) (1) above)	A. Annual HEA SAHE Reports B. (See (D) (1) above)
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	A. 75% of students with at least one year academic growth measured using Measured Progress projections. B. 80% increase from the baseline year in the use of professional learning communities. C. 25% increased access to content specific professional activities providing the knowledge and skills to teach and lead an increasingly diverse student and teacher population by end of grant. D. 50% increase in the retention of new teachers. E. 95% of teachers demonstrate increased evaluation score by end of grant.	A. & B. Increased participation of staff in targeted, student learning & content-focused PD.	A. & B. Quarterly Pilot Progress Reports A. & B. MECAS Student Data; other approved assessment measures

Performance Measures Notes: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in this application package in Section II. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii).		Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Criteria	**General goals to be provided at time of application:**	**Baseline data and annual targets**				
(D)(2)(i)	Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).	N/A	0%	0%	80%	90%
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	N/A	5%	20%	30%	35%
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	N/A	5%	20%	30%	35%
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:					
(D)(2)(iv)(a)	• Developing teachers and principals.	N/A	50%	100%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Compensating teachers and principals.	N/A	0%	5%	10%	10%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Promoting teachers and principals.	N/A	0%	10%	15%	25%
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Retaining effective teachers and principals.	N/A	50%	100%	100%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	• Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.	N/A	0%	25%	50%	100%
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	• Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.	N/A	0%	0%	10%	20%
The Department does not currently collect this data.						
General data to be provided at time of application:						
Total number of participating LEAs.		82				

Total number of principals in participating LEAs.	400
Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.	11710

In Maine, School Unions consist of multiple LEAs operating under one administrative office; there are two such units counted in the total above (82) that filed only one MOU for the Union. For that reason, we may be reporting for 97 LEAs for RTTT purposes.

Criterion	**Data to be requested of grantees in the future:**
(D)(2)(ii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.
(D)(2)(iii)[6]	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.
(D)(2)(iii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year.
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year.
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year.
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.

(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.	[redacted]

(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; *(15 points)* and

(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.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (D)(3)(i):

- Definitions of high-minority and low-minority schools as defined by the State for the purposes of the State's Teacher Equity Plan.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

(D)(3)(i)

As background information through implementation of the Department Title IIA Teacher Quality and Equity Action Plans 2006-2010, Maine identified and delivered monetary and technical assistance to a number of "High-Need" schools/LEAs to increase the equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers, and decrease the number of under qualified and/or inexperienced teachers teaching in high poverty schools. 2007-2008 data show that there is a great shortage of highly qualified special education, alternative education, foreign/world languages, and English as Second Language teachers; thus, our technical assistance focused on these needs by offering professional development opportunities to address those areas. [The 2004-2009 data is publicly available on the Maine State Department of Education website]. These strategies aim at increasing the equitable distribution of teachers to identified "high need schools." Currently, Maine's Teacher Quality Equity Plan has been underfunded and understaffed due to the current state financial curtailments in state government. Plans are to use the Race To The Top funds to fully implement these research proven strategies to increase the equitable distribution of Highly Qualified and effective teachers and principals throughout these "high-need schools".

Definition: "High-Need School": a high-need school is defined as an LEA:

Category A "High Need" Schools

A. for which not less than 49.9 percent of the children served by the agency are from families that qualify for Title I eligibility, AND
B. which are 5 percentage points or more below the Maine State average for HQT (95.88%), and have been for three years or more;

Category B "High Need" Schools

A. for which not less than 49.9 percent of the children served by the agency are from families that qualify for Title I eligibility

AND,

B. with more than 12.8 inexperienced teachers (less than 3 years teaching) on staff (5 percentage points or more above the State average of 7.8%);

AND,

C. the SAU has not met its Annual Measurable Objective for HQT for three years or more, AND is 5 percentage points or more below the state average of 95.88%.

MPAS, as outlined in our implementation schedule and proposed components (see (D) (2) above), includes measures to promote equitable distribution of effective and experienced teachers and leaders. The inclusion of a career advancement component provides the opportunity for highly effective teachers to take on expanded roles and responsibilities without having to leave the classroom. Currently there is no provision for performance compensation for teachers or principals. This is an area that will be coordinated with applications for the Teacher Incentive Funds. Discussion and work with the Maine Education Association and the Maine Principals' Association will take place in this context to develop plans and determine directions to build on local and state systems. At present, teachers who are Nationally Board Certified do receive additional compensation per Maine statute. The State grants between $2000 and $3000 to these teachers (Appendix D-5).

As part of the process, the Department will look at how and what incentives for teachers will have a positive impact on the quality of teachers who stay in these hard to recruit schools. Different incentives draw teachers to rural areas.

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i) *Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.*	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	**Baseline data and annual targets**				
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	___	___	___	20	30
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	___	___	___	30	50
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	___	___	___	20	10
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	___	___	___	20	10
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	___	___	___	20	30
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	___	___	___	30	50
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	___	___	___	20	15
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	___	___	___	20	10
Maine will have a growth model in place no later than Fall 2010.					
General data to be provided at time of application:					
Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	159				
Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	159				

Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	3292
Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	5099
Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	157
Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	157
Data to be requested of grantees in the future:	
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.	
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.	
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.	
Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.	

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii) *Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.*	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	**Baseline data and annual targets**				
Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	___	___	___	40	50

Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	___	___	___	60	75
Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	___	___	___	67	72
Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	___	___	___	70	75

General data to be provided at time of application:	
Total number of mathematics teachers.	1350
Total number of science teachers.	1237
Total number of special education teachers.	2372
Total number of teachers in language instruction educational programs.	773/ 143 ESL
Teacher positions counted as if a teacher works at three schools they are included three times.	

Data to be requested of grantees in the future:
Number of mathematics teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.
Number of science teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.
Number of special education teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.
Number of teachers in language instruction educational programs in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.

(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).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

(D)(4)(i)

Maine is presently in the process of transforming PreK-20 education. Many of Maine's public and private educator preparation programs have agreed in a "Statement of Purpose" to transition to a system based on Maine's 10 Initial Teacher Certification Standards linked to NCATE/TEAC/ISSLC standards, and Maine's content standards and using in a true standards-based assessment system. This clearly indicates the Department's commitment to transition to a truly standards-based educational system from Pre-Kindergarten through our teacher preparation programs.

Maine's newly designed Student Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) is designed to link student performance and growth information with individual teachers and leaders in the field as well as to educator preparation programs throughout the state. Using data from the SLDS, the MPAS will provide data on teacher and principal effectiveness that would be linked to educator preparation programs. These data will assist the Department, IHE, and others in determining which programs are best preparing educators.

(D)(4)(ii)

The move of many of Maine's educator preparation programs to a standards-based system of assessing their students and graduates will contribute to the effectiveness of new educators. Using data on effectiveness, including student achievement and

growth, successful educator preparation programs will be identified. Teachers and leaders in these programs will have their internship placements with other effective teachers and leaders. In addition, the state's higher education specialist in the Department is working with college deans to discuss changes in their programs. These changes will enhance their effectiveness in preparing educators to teach and lead in support of innovative schools and in support of 21st century skills and knowledge (Appendix D-6). This work is supported through a newly awarded competitive grant from the CCSSO, supported by the Stupski Foundation, for the Partnership for Next Generation Learning, Innovation Lab Schools.

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	**Baseline data and annual targets**				
Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0	25%	50%	75%	100%
Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0	25%	50%	75%	100%
General data to be provided at time of application:					
Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the State.	16				
Total number of principal credentialing programs in the State.	8				
Total number of teachers in the State.	26,786*				
Total number of principals in the State.	1,400**				

Maine has 6 teacher credentialing programs offered at public institutions of higher education and 10 programs offered through private institutions.

Maine has 8 programs that lead to principal credentialing.

*This figure includes both conditional and targeted need teachers; the number is 16,786 if these are not included.
**This figure includes both public and private school principals.

Data to be requested of grantees in the future:	
Number of teacher credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	[redacted]
Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of principal credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of principals prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of teachers in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs.	
Number of principals in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs.	

(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).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages

(D)(5)(i)

The driving emphasis on standards, accountability and tangible student outcomes has imposed new expectations on school administrators. Principals are the "instructional leaders" in their schools. Strong effective instructional leaders are at the core of schools that have shifted to become centers of learning for students and adults. Maine has developed clear priorities and a plan for professional development that is aligned to its primary objective of preparing, developing, and mentoring teachers and leaders. The Department plans for all participating LEAs to select models of leadership and teacher development that are research and standards-based and focused on student achievement data. Professional development provide in depth learning modules on performance-based learning, the use of data, implementation of initiatives (e.g., Common Core Standards and common assessments), curriculum pathways, mentoring and induction systems, and whole school improvement. In the initial six-months after grant award, the Department, with stakeholders, will evaluate and vet comprehensive models of teacher and leader development for districts to select and implement.

A number of models will be vetted and customized as necessary to align with, support, and be informed by the new evaluation systems discussed in (D)(2) above.

In the state funding formula, each district is allocated $57 per student for professional development. Therefore, the Department

plans to use the Race to the Top grant funds to fully implement a full teacher induction system by: providing additional training to increase the state's capacity; providing LEAs funds for mentoring and induction activities and related evaluation activities; and offering technical assistance in support of implementation.

Leadership Development: Leadership development is an essential component of the state's overall strategy to promote school improvement and innovation. The Department will develop and provide educator leadership academies (Academies) for current and aspiring leaders. With RTTT funding, the Department will organize and conduct a series of ongoing state-wide cohort-based leadership academies that support up to 30 sites each year to develop the critical knowledge and skills needed for leading change and turning around underperforming schools. The Academies will be based on models such as the successful Governor's Academy in Maine organized by the Maine Mathematics and Science Alliance, and on the national leadership models. These models provide in-depth learning for teams of educators from districts, including central office staff, principals, and teacher leaders coupled with ongoing implementation of improvement plans in the local sites.

The planned curriculum for the Maine Leadership Academy includes the following content:

- **Leadership for High Performing Schools:** An overarching goal of the Maine Leadership Academy is to develop a common understanding of effective research based instructional leadership as well as standards-based instruction in each of the content areas. Leaders will apply these leadership skills and support teachers to use standards based instruction through ongoing feedback, classroom observations, the effective use of data, coaching and mentoring.

- **Leadership for Local Accountability and Commitment to Learning:** Leaders will engage in a process to create and implement research-based standards, ongoing classroom assessment, and interventions for a comprehensive accountability system. This system allows educators to tailor curriculum to quickly and effectively boost performance - ensuring that all students meet state and federal requirements. It will help principals and teachers focus on essential standards and develop a

coherent curriculum delivery and intervention calendar to boost performance. Leaders will be trained as data coaches and lead school based data teams to use data to investigate student learning problems and intervene to improve outcomes.

- **Professional Learning Communities:** Continuous collective learning for all adults is a necessary ingredient to promote growth and heightened achievement of all students in schools. The Maine Leadership Academy model draws on work in the areas of teacher collaboration, professional learning communities and effective organizational culture to build leader's capacity to enable all teachers to collaborate on learning, use data effectively, intervene when students do not learn, and continuously deepen their own knowledge and skills as expert teachers.

- **Collaborative Coaching to Strengthen Teachers' Practice and Retention in the Profession:** This course within the Academy is designed to help principals and other leaders understand the roles of effective mentors; understand the needs of new teachers and implications for a mentor's role; engage with research-informed practices and critical elements of effective mentoring and coaching; enhance understanding and ability to apply essential mentoring skills in schools, and promote the growth and effectiveness of new and experienced teachers.

- **Promoting Teacher Leadership to Strengthen School Culture that Supports Student Learning:** Specific and content focused courses will support teachers who are ready to contribute as leaders in their buildings to clarify their roles and develop the mentoring, professional development and other skills they can use to work with their peers to improve teaching and learning.

These major focus areas for the Academy will be augmented by other specific programs that address the following content:

- Specific school/ turnaround leadership skills including engaging the public and stakeholders, investigating innovative models for effective learning (e.g., personalization)
- Conducting classroom observation and other data collection to inform continuous improvement of instruction

- Implementing new teacher evaluation systems
- Achieving equity and cultural competence: Strategies for closing achievement gaps
- Differentiation, including establishing effective models for intervention and the effective instruction of English language learners and students with disabilities
- Bridging general and special education through professional development in the area of Response to Intervention offered to school teams including general and special education teachers and leaders
- Using models and tools for leading change (e.g., using the Concerns-based Adoption Model, simulations)

The Department will operate the Leadership Academy regionally, drawing on state and regional experts and other resources, as needed, to establish and sustain the program. By situating the Maine Leadership Academies regionally, the state will build the capacity needed among people in the state to continue the Academies once they are developed and operating. Cohorts of leaders from each of the participating districts will attend over 200 hours of leadership development sessions over two years. In addition, the Academy staff will offer support through consultation, provision of resources, and professional development, as appropriate, to support transformation and build the capacity of highly effective instructional leaders across the State.

Leadership Academy Goals and Timeline

Leadership Academy Goals:

- Increase the number of effective leaders practicing in schools across the State of Maine but especially in the lowest performing schools;
- Complement other state initiatives for school turnaround and school improvement; and
- Ongoing improvement of the Leadership Institute's effectiveness through formative and summative evaluation.

	Year 1		**Year 2**		**Year 3**		**Year 4**	
	Summer 2011	Winter/ Spring	Summer 2012	Winter/ Spring	Summer 2013	Winter/ Spring	Summer 2014	Winter/ Spring 2015

		2012		2013		2014		
Cohort 1 30 participants	Session 1	Session 2	Session 3	Session 4				
Cohort 2 30 participants			Session 1	Session 2	Session 3	Session 4		
Cohort 3 30					Session 1	Session 2	Session 3	Session 4

(D)(5)(ii)

Any quality professional development system must have a plan for continuous evaluation and improvement. The Department and participating LEAs will ensure professional development meets the highest standards by designing high quality professional development, mentoring and coaching activities that are informed by the National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development, and include:

- The use of disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement. (Data-Driven)
- The use of multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Evaluation)
- The use of applied research to prepare educators in decision making.

The Standards include building evaluation of effectiveness into the professional development. To ensure evaluations are used for continuous improvement, professional development, mentoring, and coaching programs will have evaluation built into

them. Evaluation designs will be informed by desired outcomes and evidence/data needed to make continuous improvement decisions. To assist in the development and execution of evaluating RTTT funded professional development, mentoring and coaching programs, an external firm or consultants will be engaged.

Performance Measures Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Professional development quality and effectiveness survey (developed)	No data				
Number of teachers and principals participating in Leadership Academies	0				
Number of contact hours provided to teachers by approved professional development providers	0				

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

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(1):

- A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

(E)(1)

The State of Maine's current statutory and regulatory language to support intervention provides for multiple junctures at which the State may intervene directly in the state's lowest performing schools. The power of the Commissioner to intervene in low performing schools comes from the Department of Education, Chapter 125, Section 13 and 14 (Appendix E-1)

Specifically, Section 13.02 states, *"The Commissioner will initiate a comprehensive review of a school administrative unit when student performance in a school indicates that a review is warranted, in accordance with Me. Dept. of Ed. Reg. 127. The purpose of the review shall be to determine how to improve student performance on the content standards of the system of Learning Results."*

In addition, Section 13.03 provides parents, registered voters, school board members and superintendents with the option to petition the Commissioner to, *"inspect a school administrative unit." "The Commissioner may inspect any of the areas governed by school approval provisions of this rule in addition to the items in the petition or request."*

Rule 13.03 was utilized in 2003 and 2005 to review SAUs, school and district operation and create a plan for improvement.

Other statutes addressing legal authority follow:

(1) Maine Revised Statute 20-A Chapter 222 §4502: *"Elementary and secondary schools and school administrative units... shall meet all requirements of the system of learning results as established in section 6209 as well as other requirements of this Title and other statutory requirements applicable to the public schools and basic school approval standards. Each school administrative unit shall prepare and implement a comprehensive education plan that is aligned with the system of learning results, focused on the learning of all students and oriented to continuous improvement."* (Appendix E-2)

(2) Maine Revised Statute 20-A Chapter 206 §4504: *"The commissioner shall determine which schools and school units are in compliance with the basic school approval standards, in accordance with the procedures of the basic school approval rules and the provisions of this Title...The commissioner shall conduct a comprehensive review of a school administrative unit in accordance with the school assistance process established in section 6210, based on a review of the school administrative unit's comprehensive education plan and student achievement data, or as part of an inspection in accordance with section 258-A."* (Appendix E-3)

(3) Maine Revised Statute 20-A Chapter 222 §6209-A: *"The commissioner shall validate each school administrative unit's comprehensive education plan..."* and *"The commissioner shall annually report ...on the status of each school administrative unit in implementing the comprehensive education plan."* (Appendix E-4)

(4) Chapter 127 § 9.01 "When student performance in a school indicates that assistance is needed, the Commissioner shall provide assistance to the school administrative unit..." (Appendix E-5)

(5) And finally, Chapter 222 §6210 requires that "*the commissioner shall provide assistance to a school administrative unit when student performance in a school in the school administrative unit, or when a review of the comprehensive education plan conducted under section 4504, subsection 2, indicates that assistance is needed. This may include assignment of an assistance team by the commissioner to work with the school administrative unit over a period of not less than one year."* (Appendix E-6)

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)*

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(2) (please fill in table below):

- The State's historic performance on school turnaround, as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) that States or LEAs attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and lessons learned to date.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

(E)(2)(i)

Maine defines "persistently lowest-achieving schools" as those schools ranking lowest based on a three year average of proficiency in Reading and Math combined from 2007-2009, and also demonstrating a level of progress less than the median rate of progress of all schools ranked. The level of progress is determined by calculating the change in the yearly averages for proficiency in Reading and Math from 2007 to 2008, 2008 to 2009. This definition was used to generate a list schools identified as Tier I or Tier II schools eligible for school improvement funding through the Title I School Improvement Grants (SIG) program authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Schools will be considered for eligibility under two categories, designated as Tier I and Tier II as follows:

Tier I schools are defined as any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that —

(i) 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

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over the last three years;

In 2009-2010, Maine identified 5 schools in Tier I.

Tier II schools are defined as any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

(i) 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

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years. In 2009-2010, Maine has 5 schools in Tier II.

In addition to the two tiers outlined above, Maine will identify an additional group of secondary schools not currently eligible for Title I funds. Schools in this group are defined as any secondary school not receiving or eligible for Title I funds that —

(i) is among the lowest-achieving five percent of in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over of the past three years;

Please see Appendix E-6 which provides the sequence of steps used to identify the Tier I and Tier II schools.

(E)(2)(ii)

Our efforts to turnaround the lowest performing schools will build on our current model that has been successfully used for Title I School Improvement. In the last 5 years we have seen sustained improvement in 20 of 34 low performing schools that have received support from our intervention teams. This improvement has resulted from identification of school needs and targeted support. The foundation of this model utilizes a cadre of school improvement consultants who are assigned to work directly with identified schools. This cadre of consultants includes former principals and superintendents who have direct expertise in working with school improvement initiatives, and, a clear understanding of the elements of a school system and what leverage points can result in change to impact and sustain practices to improve student achievement outcomes. We have found it successful to match the unique skills of consultants with the identified challenges of underperforming schools. This match of the skill sets, e.g. former high school administrators to high schools or expertise in Math with low performance on math scores, former rural school administrators to small

rural schools, has helped build appreciation and targeted expertise to the process. In their role, consultants provide guidance and support to school improvement teams and guide the school improvement planning and implementation process, regularly checking to make sure the plan is followed. This enables them to assist school improvement teams in addressing challenges that surface and help administrators find alternative strategies. In addition, these consultants work as liaisons to the Department, regularly consulting with other department personnel and planning strategically to determine what additional actions or resources could best support the schools they work with.

Since implementation of NCLB through 2008-09, Maine has identified 34 Title I CIPS (Continuous Improvement Priority) schools. Twenty of these schools have exited CIPS using the 'intervention model'. While this is a very positive outcome, one of the biggest lessons we have learned is that changes in systemic practices aligned to student achieve goals is necessary and requires even greater supports for those schools still struggling to meet achievement targets.

Maine will support participating LEAs in turning around our lowest and low-performing schools by utilizing a multi-leveled approach that includes the following strategies:

(1) We will support the efforts of the 15 schools identified in (E)(2)(i) through the support of the state "Turnaround Team" that will initially assist these identified lowest performing schools in their implementation of one of the intervention models; Turnaround, Closure or Transformational, as outlined in the regulations for Title I School Improvement Grants, 34 CFR Subtitle B, Chapter II School Improvement Grants; Final Rule Federal Register.

As mentioned earlier, our current support system for underperforming schools has utilized expert consultants whose interactions have resulted in positive changes. We anticipate that instituting even greater sustainable change in our lowest performing schools will require additional resources and even more intensive support then what we have previously provided.

Our lowest performing schools will be supported by a new structure of "Turnaround Team" specialists who will provide more comprehensive and resource supported efforts to address the systemic root causes leading to repeated poor performance.

(2) The 15 identified lowest achieving schools will be required to participate in an "Improvement Network" with other identified schools and the state Turnaround Team. This partnership will focus on implementing programs and strategies described below.

(3) We will expand our effective 'intervention' model currently used for school improvement to other schools demonstrating low levels of student achievement on state assessments. For all schools identified as having a 3 year average of proficiency in Reading and Math that *is 30% or less*, and demonstrates a rate of progress that is less than the median rate of change for all Maine schools, we will continue to use the intervention model that will assist these schools in developing an improvement plan and instituting strategic changes in practice.

Consultants will be utilized to meet the individual needs of identified schools. These schools will agree to review, establish and act upon recommendations received from the state's cadre of intervention consultants. They will develop a corrective action plan for submission to the Department for review and agree to participate in state level training opportunities, such as those relating to the use of data, performance-based initiatives, and personalized learning. In addition, they will participate in 'Improvement Network' activities and communicate ways to improve the network.

The state Turnaround Team will provide targeted, intensive support and effective interventions to our lowest performing schools by targeting high needs SAUs on multiple fronts to improve education for all students, particularly underrepresented youth, youth in poverty and females. This will occur through a combination of teacher professional development focused on: implementing performance-based curricula; implementing initiatives to personalize learning; student after school and summer programming; and programming to include integrated STEM instructional activities annually from grades 3-8 and high school in high needs SAUs. In addition, the team will provide state level training and professional development modules in key areas, i.e. school improvement process (Lazotte), assessment literacy etc. that allows on demand access, scalability, and cost sustainability.

The state will create and support an "Improvement Network" to support the principals and other educational leaders in schools working with the Turnaround Teams and the intervention consultants by:

- utilizing technology to communicate and disseminate knowledge, tools, and practices shown to have positive impact on school improvement efforts,
- using longitudinal data systems in developing growth models to inform improvement plan strategies,
- using data systems to inform instruction,
- assisting the development of assessment and intervention practices through research, consultation and training,
- identifying and sharing expertise relative to the alignment of fiscal resources and professional development services to identified improvement goals, and
- the development of leadership engagements and activities to increase both state and regional opportunities for principals, teachers and others engage in improvement efforts to develop skills for deepening and sustaining school improvement efforts.

This network would support targeted professional development after reviewing data and identifying needs that improvement schools could address collectively.

Due to the rural nature of many of our targeted schools, our Turnaround Team and Improvement Network will utilize technology and a variety of supports that will enable delivery of research, training and consultation in a timely manner when those supports would be most beneficial to school improvement plan activities and goals. By building a targeted on-line system supported by expert staff from the Turnaround Team, our improvement schools will receive individualized and timely assistance to maximize their improvement efforts.

Specifically, support from the Turnaround Team members and the Improvement Network will provide information on:

- Support the use of adaptive computerized assessments,
- Provide comprehensive training on data use,
- Provide professional development on the use of STEM assessments, and
- Provide professional development on the adoption of a Board Examination System, such as the Cambridge International Examination's International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) and their AICE program, the College Board's Advanced Placement (AP) program, the International Baccalaureate (IB)Diploma program, ACT's Quality Core or Pearson/Edexcel's IGCSE and A-level programs.

To support the identification and dissemination of support structures that enables all students to achieve standards. The team will;

- Validate practices where students can demonstrate meeting the standards,
- Identify exemplary practices to be included in a system of intervention,
- Identify open source virtual personalized learning systems (PLS),
- Secure funding for dual enrollment/early college programs,
- Develop innovation labs that can serve as models for other schools, and
- Provide technical assistance to SAUs developing and implementing innovative schools.

In addition, a critical element for success within identified schools will be to support new leaders responsible for implementing school improvement plans through cohort-based leadership institutes for current and aspiring leaders in participating SAUs, as described in Section (D)(5) of this application. Information will be provided to assist with analysis, selection (or adaptation) and implementation of models of performance-based leadership development rooted in adult learning theory. Some of this support will be provided through online learning opportunities.

Our Turnaround Team will be lead by a cadre of our most experienced School Consultants, often former administrators, who will be supported by a variety of experts identified for their ability to successfully address 'root causes' of failure within learning systems. Following a review of data and identification of similar challenges, Turnaround Team members will work closely with regional improvement teams to review research, initiate changes in practice, and evaluate outcomes on a regular basis. This structure will support the development of regional expertise and capacity as well as identifying successful improvement practices to be shared throughout the state utilizing the online resource website. These regional improvement networks will not only benefit from access to consultants focused on common challenges but will also provide the opportunity to interact with peers, identifying which strategies are most helpful and under what circumstances.

Finally, for those schools identified due to low graduation rates, the team will provide research and intensive support on dropout prevention. An annual dropout conference will be the catalyst for continued work with local dropout prevention teams focused on reviewing data, analyzing cause, and researching strategies for implementation. Department experts able to address dropout related issues including homelessness, mobility, at risk families, ELL and Special Education concerns, will support work at the conference and with individual schools. They will be able to assist schools in addressing the unique challenges of disengaged youth in both urban and rural communities. In addition, support will come from the identification, implementation and expansion of successful and researched based programs such as 'Jobs for Graduates'.

- Jobs for Maine's Graduates (JMG) has been used in some of the lowest performing high schools. JMG is a partnership with schools, where students engage in a JMG class which is included in the course schedule for students. In this four credit course, which is provided to students who both apply or might be recruited for if identified for being at-risk, there is a full time JMG specialist who mentors and keeps track of each student, during, and one-full year past enrollment in the program. Currently there are 64 programs (classrooms) in the state. We would plan to add up to 20 more. Currently, JMG has a waiting list of 20 schools that would like to offer the program and partner with JMG. The JMG objective is to improve graduation rates and post

secondary enrollment, retention, and attainment, and improve student achievement.

- During the 2008-2009 SY 96% of seniors enrolled in JMG (students identified as at risk for failure to complete), graduated from high school. We have found that 47% of JMG graduates enroll in a two or four year college immediately after graduating.

Supported by the new data systems that we will be implementing, Turnaround Team and Intervention staff will regularly review school programs and models to insure that the schools are implementing and realizing the goals of their improvement plan. The ability to monitor improvement through access to new student achievement data systems, will provide Turnaround Team members and intervention consultants with timely information so that they are better able to assist in the creation and modification of action plans and identification of individual school supports to be utilized for the greatest immediate and effective impact.

As noted earlier, the state Turnaround Team will provide targeted, intensive support to our lowest performing schools by targeting low performing schools on multiple fronts. Turnaround team experts will focus on the following specific leverage points to build capacity, knowledge and success in improving educational outcomes:

(1)*Provide research, support and guidance on selection and implementation of intervention models and supports.*

The task of implementing new structural models required by intervention models will require the engagement and commitment from numerous stakeholders. To enable the most successful implementation of the models being implemented, Turnaround Team members will initially work closely with district boards, administrators, associations, school leaders, and parents to establish critical communication processes and commitment to new challenges and strategies.

(2)*Provide tools and assistance with initial investigations into root causes of underperformance and platforms to support the transparent presentation and monitoring of on-going implementation plans.*

Building community commitment and accountability for the development and implementation of turnaround efforts will necessitate a deep understanding of the failure of the current system to meet student needs. Turnaround team members(trained and supported by experts in root cause analysis) will have the primary responsibility to utilize tools and processes to help schools look

closely at multiple sources of data to identify the root causes for system failure. The process of working with all stakeholders and building the implementation plan addressing identified needs and system changes will be a first step in building the necessary foundation for improvement efforts going forward. Posting implementation plans publicly, so that all stakeholders see and monitor progress, will build commitment and accountability while also keeping the process open and transparent.

(3)*Assist with the process of identifying and implementing new Leadership and Teacher evaluation models to be utilized within participating lowest achieving schools.*

The implementation of new leadership and teacher evaluation models approved by the state stakeholder's groupwill be most successful if initiated with as much broad based local understanding and support as possible. The inclusion of student growth data as a component of some of these models has resulted in significant discussion and concern among various stakeholders. For this reason, Turnaround Team members will be supported in developing their expertise in understanding staff evaluation models and supporting research to facilitate local discussion and adoption efforts. Evaluation systems in themselves will not matter unless they are implemented effectively and consistently utilized. A critical role for Turnaround Team members will be to support and guide models that provide useful data and facilitate program adjustments leading to high quality instruction received by all students. This support will remain in place until participating schools reach AYP targets and evaluation/feedback systems are fully operational.

(4)*Support recruitment, Professional Development and Leadership engagements aligned to strategic implementation plans, dropout prevention and new expectations.*

Competent and knowledgeable staff able to support strategic plans and transition model implementation will require the support of on-going training, mentoring and recruitment efforts to develop and sustain positive outcomes. The task of leadership and staff development efforts for our participating lowest achieving schools will be coordinated by a team of two individuals on the state's Turnaround Team. These individuals will be responsible for the development and implementation of both regional and on-line engagements to develop the skills and practices of staff from our lowest achieving schools. Initially, this effort will focus on the

development of leadership engagements and activities to increase both state and regional opportunities for principals, teachers and others engage in improvement efforts to develop skills for deepening and sustaining school improvement efforts. Continued opportunities will focus on dropout prevention and other challenges raised during initial root cause analysis work. Working with the state's higher education institutions, Turnaround Team members will review the findings from the root cause analysis, and use this data to provide information relative to discussion, development and alignment of teacher preparation programs to the need for specific knowledge and skills necessary to provide leadership and teach successfully within low achieving schools.

(5)*Coordination of online supports and the web-based elements or our larger "Improvement Network" of schools.*

As stated earlier, the rural nature of some of our SAUs, makes communication and distribution of information on best practices challenging. One important aspect of the state's turnaround team will be the development of an "Improvement Network" online site where research links, resources, tools, practices and archives from professional development engagements can be accessible to network schools and districts 24 hours a day. This site, informed by the work of turnaround team members and low achieving schools, will support dissemination of knowledge, tools, and practices shown to have positive impact on school improvement efforts across the state.

Evidence

Approach Used	# of Schools Since SY2004-05	Results and Lessons Learned
Intervention Teams	20/34	The foundation of this model is teams of school improvement consultants who are assigned to work directly with identified schools. This cadre of consultants includes former principals and superintendents who have direct expertise in working with school improvement initiatives and a clear understanding of all of the aspects included in leading a school. The unique skills of the consultants are matched with the schools. These consultants not only provide guidance and support, but act as direct liaisons to the Department. Since implementation of NCLB through 2008-09, Maine has identified over 30 Title I CIPS schools. 20 of these schools have exited CIPS status and have continued to make AYP. Some of those remaining in CIPS have seen marked improvement in individual student progress.

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (described in Appendix E-5) will be initiated each year.	10 schools identified as Tier 1 and Tier 2 Schools (7 of ten accepted)	10	8	8	6

Schools identified as eligible for Title 1 School Improvement Grants this year and projections through the end of the grant period.

The following chart provides an overview of major activities, outcomes and timeframes supporting the initial work by state turnaround team members with our lowest achieving schools.

Chart #E-1: Turnaround Support Activities, Outcomes, Timelines and Responsibility

Goals, Activities and Outcomes	Time Period	Responsibility
Support 1: Intervention Model		
Turnaround Team will work with district staff to present intervention model information to various stakeholder groups. Assist lowest achieving schools in selecting model to be utilized.	September – December, 2010	Assigned Turnaround Team Staff.
Assist lowest achieving schools in selecting a turnaround model. **Outcome: Lowest achieving schools will have selected intervention model and begun process of implementation.**	January 2011	District and School leaders with input from stakeholders.
Support 2. Root Cause Analysis		
Provide training to Turnaround Team members in processes and tools that support school root cause analysis.	September - November 2010	State Team Leader(s) for Low Performing Schools.
Facilitate root cause analysis work with lowest achieving school leadership teams.	December 2010 – March 2011	Assigned Turnaround Team Staff.
Continued on-going analysis and intervention planning based on 'root cause' findings and additional implementation data informing effectiveness and necessary improvement plan adjustments.	Initial December – March 2011 and on-going data review cycle.	Turnaround Team Staff, district and school leaders.
Development of on-line system for posting initial and modified lowest-achieving school implementation plans. **Outcome: Stakeholders will see transparent plan for improvement efforts, evidence of effect and on-going plan adjustments modified due to additional data findings.**	June 2011	Longitudinal data team, assigned Turnaround Team members and district leaders.

(F) General *(55 total 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.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(1)(i):

- Financial data to show whether and to what extent expenditures, as a percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice), increased, decreased, or remained the same.

Evidence for (F)(1)(ii):

- Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

(F)(1)(i)

The percentage of total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for the FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to

support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008 (Appendix F-1).

(F)(1)(ii)(a)

Beginning in 2003-2004, Maine's school funding formula became an adequacy-based formula entitled Essential Programs and Services (EPS). Using a cost analysis, the State establishes the amount, level and cost of education components needed in each school to ensure all students have equitable opportunities to achieve proficiency in state learning standards. The essential programs and services allocation calculated for each depends upon student, staff and school characteristics, resulting in unique EPS foundation operating cost rates for each LEA.

The Essential Programs and Services funding model is designed to ensure that adequate and equitable resources are provided for all students and includes additional state and local allocations for specialized student populations of economically disadvantaged students, limited English proficient students, and EK-2 grade span students. These allocations are provided in addition to IDEA and Title I funds.

(F)(1)(ii)(b)

The State follows the ranking and distribution regulations outlined in ESEA/NCLB and does not have any additional policies leading to equitable funding for high-poverty 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.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(2)(i):

- A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- The number of charter schools allowed under State law and the percentage this represents of the total number of schools in the State.
- The number and types of charter schools currently operating in the State.

Evidence for (F)(2)(ii):

- A description of the State's approach to charter school accountability and authorization, and a description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- For each of the last five years:
    - The number of charter school applications made in the State.

- The number of charter school applications approved.
- The number of charter school applications denied and reasons for the denials (academic, financial, low enrollment, other).
- The number of charter schools closed (including charter schools that were not reauthorized to operate).

Evidence for (F)(2)(iii):

- A description of the State's applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- A description of the State's approach to charter school funding, the amount of funding passed through to charter schools per student, and how those amounts compare with traditional public school per-student funding allocations.

Evidence for (F)(2)(iv):

- A description of the State's applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- A description of the statewide facilities supports provided to charter schools, if any.

Evidence for (F)(2)(v):

- A description of how the State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages

(F)(2)(i-iv)

These are not applicable in Maine

(F)(2)(v)

Maine recently enacted a law to promote the development of "Innovative Schools" by LEAs across the state. (Appendix F-2).

The law gives any school administrative unit the authority to "establish and operate an innovative, autonomous public school" that:

- is open enrollment for all students in a district;
- has higher student accountability standards that do not conflict with the State's accountability and assessment system;
- has flexibility to innovate with instructional design, staff selection, school calendar, and methods for assessing progress that are not in conflict with applicable state statutory or regulatory requirements.

To further demonstrate the State's commitment to the idea of innovative schools, Maine has been selected to join the Council of Chief State School Officers latest initiative, the *Partnership for Next Generation Learning*, funded and supported with resources from the Stupski Foundation, through which the state commits to develop and create a system of learner-centered public education designed to "prepare every child for lifelong learning, meaningful work and informed citizenship" (Appendix A-3). Participating in this initiative dovetails with and advances the Department's vision, stated at the outset of this application: *All Students will Graduate from Maine High Schools Prepared for Post-Secondary Education, Careers and Citizenship.* Through this agreement, Maine will initially work with School Administrative District 15, Gray- New Gloucester as a lab at the state, local and school level to transform the entire education system. The goal of the Partnership is to create a personalized system of education that engages and motivates each student regardless of his or her circumstances to be prepared for life, meaningful work and citizenship. A perfect match to the goals of Maine. Using powerful diagnostic tools to inform educators as to how to precisely reach each and every student and make the most of all learning opportunities, this work will center on the student experience and measuring progress, the lab will address the areas of transformation needed to truly create a school system for the next generation. Through research, design, and dissemination (RDD), the labs of the multi-state partnership will learn from each other, utilize the expertise of national and international leaders in innovation, work together to develop performance assessments aligned to the Common Core standards, and design new models of learning at the district and state levels, and then scale these effective learner-centered approaches. In Maine, the work will center on the performance based system (SAD 15 is a pilot site for the RISC work), communication with the community (multiple stakeholder groups), a new paradigm for leadership (of students, teachers, and administrators), and Maine Course Pathways (SAD 15 is a pilot site for the MCP project through EPIC). In addition, the system will design and implement new data systems that will track student progress of the standards as the district and State move from Carnegie credits for graduation to awarding diplomas once students have demonstrated achievement of the State's standards.

While there will be one school supported for full participation, affiliate school districts will also be invited to participate in activities at varying levels (in the same way there will be affiliate states at the national level). We will plan to add one fully

participating school district each year, pending adequate funds and support.

In addition to Innovative Schools and Innovation Lab schools, Maine has the oldest operating local school choice program in the United States. Since 1873, many small, rural towns that do not operate their own high schools (or sometimes elementary schools) provide tuition payments to schools for parents who send their students to attend public schools in other towns and nonsectarian approved private schools, including out-of-state schools. Over 9,000 students exercised school choice in 2010.

Online Learning and AP4ALL

The popularity of online learning has never been greater, with a considerable number of students choosing to take advantage of the opportunity to learn in an online environment. Across the nation, the number of online enrollments in K-12 education is growing at a significant pace, with an estimated 25% of public schools offering online learning options, and 1,030,000 students engaged in online and blended courses in the 2007-08 school year

In addition to providing students with opportunities that they might not otherwise have access to because of where they live, online learning can be much more than a solution to equity issues caused by geography and shrinking budgets. Highly qualified teachers can reach and teach their students online, all the while free from the constraints of time and place. Innovative pedagogical approaches using a myriad of digital resources and instructional content can be used to support student learning. The proliferation of powerful and easy to use digital communication tools allows for a high level of interaction between students and teachers, students and students, and teachers and parents, irrespective of physical locations.

From 2007–2010, AP4ALL was a cooperative venture between the Department and the University of Maine that was established to provide equity of access solely to Advanced Placement coursework for low-income students in Maine, regardless of where they live and the resources available within their local school district. Many high schools in Maine have small enrollment figures, and

quite often they do not have the resources needed to offer Advanced Placement level coursework. Over the past three years AP4ALL addressed this inequity of access to demanding, college-level courses by using online technologies to help offer such courses to every student in Maine. Students who participated in AP4ALL were taught by Maine certified teachers who received extensive training not only in their specific AP content area, but also in the pedagogy of effective online teaching. AP4ALL provided teachers with significant support in the areas of integrating technology, effective online communication, and all aspects of teaching and learning related to an online course.

Mirroring national trends in the growth of online learning, enrollment in the AP4ALL program rose significantly from 2007-2008 when if offered 6 courses with 44 enrollments, to 11 courses in 2008-2009 with 100 enrollments, and an all-time high of 187 enrollments in 14 courses during the 2009-2010 school year. It was anticipated that this growth would continue in 2010-2011, with an estimated 20 courses being offered, and a total of 250 enrollments being accepted, but since AP4ALL was funded by a federal AP/IP grant that ends June 30, 2010, the program will be suspended at that time.

AP4ALL has clearly demonstrated a need for online learning opportunities to be made available to students in Maine, providing them with rigorous and challenging coursework that they would not otherwise have had access to. Due to the nature of funding, this project was specifically targeted towards Advanced Placement courses only. However, the potential to use online learning technologies to provide a wide range of choices for Maine students in all content areas – not merely Advanced Placement courses – is significant.

Regardless of grade level, and regardless of content area, online learning offers tremendous promise for allowing students to take advantage of a wider array of choices and learning environments – all free from the constraints of time and place. Students can participate in online learning to earn college credit, to be able to work at their own pace, to be able to take classes not offered at their school, to be able to complete HS requirements, to get extra help in a subject, to fit their schedule, and because it is easier for them

to learn in an online class.

For these reasons, although once seen as a methodology on the fringe, online learning has migrated into the mainstream of education, and for many it is seen as a potentially transformative educational option.

(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.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(3):

- A description of the State's other applicable key education laws, statutes, regulations, or relevant legal documents.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(F)(3)

Maine has undertaken several initiatives designed to raise the level of achievement of all its students through the overarching *Learning Results System*. All educational initiatives that the state undertakes must be related to the Learning Results. Two years ago a major initiative for secondary education began. *Promising Futures* is a relook at our high schools and a redesign that supports a secondary system that moves all students to higher standards through restructuring. The Department received a waiver from the USED to use all of its Obie-Porter funds to support whole school reform at the high school. In addition, the AP incentive program provides students in Maine's high schools with a high quality option to prepare for postsecondary education. It is critical that AP

classes be accessible and open to any student who wishes to meet the challenge and work hard. Maine has had success in increasing the number of students taking AP classes through the AP4ALL initiative which supports equitable access to high level courses. Many of the AP programs in Maine are supported with Gifted and Talented funds, but these classes are limited to students who have been identified as gifted and talented. This was of great concern to the Department where we are committed to making all classes available to all students. Thus the AP4ALL initiative significantly improved access to AP courses in Maine.

Other reform conditions include the adoption of a rigorous graduation rate, a focused statewide STEM plan, and a focus on early education:

- In 2010 the Legislature set a goal of 90% graduation by 2016 and the requirement for technical assistance plans for those not meeting 80% by 2012. Corrective action for high schools that fail to achieve acceptable graduation rates is required. Enforcement of this policy will lead to improved outcomes for the most at-risk and lowest performing students because schools and districts will be motivated to work with these students to prevent their dropping out.
- The state STEM plan targets high needs LEAs on multiple fronts to improve education for all students, particularly underrepresented youth, youth in poverty and women. This will be accomplished through combination of teacher professional development; student after school and summer programming and programming to include integrated STEM instructional activities annually from grades 3-8 and high school in high needs LEAs. In addition, the effective 1:1 laptop initiative will be expanded to all Maine students and teachers in grades 3-12, in these high-needs LEAs.
- Through a system of financial incentives, the state has supported the expansion of high quality public preschool for four-year olds in districts throughout the state. The state is working to develop early education standards and standards-based curricula for early childhood education. The state and private foundations have supported the development of an Educare Center in Waterville, ME, a high need district with high poverty rates and high rates of special education identification among students.

Maine has also enacted reforms in the structure of its public school system. In 2006, Maine had 290 school administrative units

(SAUs) which are essentially LEAs. An SAU may be a community or local school district or it may be a school administrative district that serves two or more communities. In addition, the SAUs are nested in 16 counties and 9 "superintendent regions." In June of 2007, enacted as part of the two-year state budget, the school administrative reorganization law (Appendix F-3) set forth policy to ensure that schools be organized as units in order to provide equitable educational opportunities, rigorous academic programs, uniformity in delivering programs, a greater uniformity in tax rates, more efficient and effective use of limited resources, preservation of school choice and maximum opportunity to deliver services in an efficient manner. The reorganization law has resulted in opportunities for students in districts that have reorganized, adding and expanding programs such as pre-kindergarten, world languages, music and arts, and Advanced Placement courses. The goals of equal opportunity, rigorous programming, sustainability, and more efficient use of funds are being achieved. Teachers are sharing resources and best practices with colleagues. They are implementing successful transitions, aligning curricula and developing cohesive visions for their new school units' educational futures. The evidence is clear and mounting that the reorganization law is meeting each of the objectives set out in the reorganization law. As a result of the reorganization law, Maine is better prepared to meet the current economic and educational transformation challenges facing our state. Because of the local planning required under the law, districts are better able to diversify and expand their educational programs, ensuring all of their students have equal opportunities for success.

VII. COMPETITION 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.

The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It is assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority.

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.

The competitive preference priority will be evaluated in the context of the State's entire application. Therefore, a State that is responding to this priority should address it throughout the application, as appropriate, and provide a summary of its approach to addressing the priority in the text box below. The reviewers will assess the priority as part of their review of a State's application and determine whether it has been met.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: One page

Maine has unique collection of human, educational, and natural resources. These resources include:

- the Maine STEM Collaborative (a collective of non-profit, government and business

interests committed to improving STEM learning),

- a unique one-to-one student and teacher laptop initiative, and
- a growing statewide business and community focus on sustainability that includes a $30 million dollar Sustainability Initiative.

Just miles off the coast of our rocky shores lay some of the richest wind resources in our country. Maine is poised for significant changes; changes that will be "fueled" by alternative energy and the development of green jobs. In this context, the success of STEM learning in our K-12 settings, our Career and Technical Centers and our institutions of higher education are tightly coupled to Maine's future economic productivity.

Over the last three years STEM partnerships across Maine have been strengthened and created. The Maine STEM Collaborative has funded and coordinated two STEM Statewide STEM Summits. The collaborative has also generated a working draft of a strategic plan and working with Maine EPSCoR, the REL, the Departments of Education and Labor and non-profits, efforts are well underway to deliver a STEM Landscape study. This study will focus on student achievement, teacher certification, and an evaluation of statewide STEM capacity. A partnership among the Departments of Education and Conservation, the Maine Environmental Education Association and Maine Audubon is developing an Environmental Literacy Plan that will blaze the way for the small army of agricultural, forestry, recreational and environmental education providers to work in more coordinated efforts to serve Maine's underrepresented youth and improve environmental literacy. The STEM community is working on and/or awaiting judgment on several collaborative STEM grants from USDOED,NSF and NASA and the Department of Education has outlined a plan for a Strategic Plan the builds on the work of our other partners in STEM. As a rural state with limited resources we have learned that we are both smarter and have the potential to be more effective if we work together.

We have made important strides but we are not yet at the tipping point. We must build a strong statewide network of support on this expectant foundation. Support through the Federal Race to the Top grant would give Maine the resources to continue to build, support and go to scale with the ideas and programs we have worked to envision and have begun to develop.

Goal 1: Increase overall student achievement in science and mathematics by decreasing the

combined overall percentage of students in the "Does Not Meet" and Partially Meets" categories by 15% within two testing cycles.

Goal 2: Increase overall student aspirations to pursue STEM related careers by 20% (from 33% to 53%) percent within four years, as reported on the PSAT and SAT student survey.

Goal 3: Increase teacher access to online training and resources to 100% of Maine's teachers and the use of Laptops to delivered STEM resource, professional development and classroom experiences to students and teachers.

Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes *(not scored)*

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 (prekindergarten 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.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

Maine has a long-standing commitment to early childhood education to support the development of school readiness and healthy outcomes for all children. This commitment is evident in the long-standing inter-agency Governor's Children's Cabinet, authorized in statute (1998) and currently chaired by the First Lady of Maine, with the Commissioners of Education, Health and Human Services, Public Safety, Corrections, and Labor serving as members, alongside the Governor's Senior Policy Advisor. The Cabinet coordinates approaches to service delivery, establishes administrative priorities across departments/agencies/bureaus, and operationalizes the Governor's commitment to better outcomes for all children and youth in Maine. Early Childhood Education is an established priority of the Children's Cabinet. In addition, the Maine Children's Growth Council, building on the established work of the Maternal

and Child Health Early Childhood Systems Initiative, was authorized by state statute in 2008 to look at and act upon the critical economic issue of early childhood. The Council was charged to achieve sustainable social and financial investments in the healthy development of Maine's young children and their families and is the governor's designated Early Childhood State Advisory Council as per the Head Start Reauthorization Act. The Council works with a diverse group of legislators, business leaders, providers, parents, researchers, community leaders and government officials to implement Invest Early In Maine: A Working Plan for Human Early Childhood Systems, Maine's plan for a unified, statewide early childhood services system. The Council reports to the Governor's Children's Cabinet. Building on this unified plan, the Department has three priorities to increase inclusive quality early education for all students, but especially for those with highest needs:

- Expand state-supported public preschool (4-year old) programs so that each district has at least one such program, with a goal of statewide, universal access in a diverse delivery system.
- Require public preschool program standards of practice based on state and national criteria of best practice for early learning.
- Fund the development of a comprehensive Birth-Five Early Learning hub which advances the philosophy and quality principles of Maine's Educare site.

Each of these priorities is described in more detail below.

Since 1982, Maine's school funding formula has included state support of public preschool programs for 4 year old children offered through school administrative units. At this time, there are 162 approved public 4-year old classrooms throughout Maine, representing 29% of universal capacity. Use of federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds made a significant increase in public preschool capacity, but start up costs remains a barrier to implementation for many districts. These programs also provide access to early learning opportunities for students with special needs in inclusive and least restrictive settings and support the smooth transition to kindergarten for children by the nature of their integration into school districts. Maine's community approach to public preschool encourages schools to work with

quality community programs for diverse delivery models to establish comprehensive community links. These programs become sustainable within the state's Essential Programs and Services (EPS) School Funding formula after a full year of operation.

The state is committed to using RTTT funds to improve the quality of public preschool programs The *Maine Early Childhood Learning Guidelines* are currently required by statute to guide curriculum practice and are intended to effect greater integration among sectors across all early childhood settings and the early grades. Increased quality standards of program practice based on national research combined with technical support for implementation will align public preschool programs with the Maine Department of Human Services research based Quality Rating System for early care and education programs (one of 21 nationwide,) further integrating a state professional development system and transitions for children across programs and into the elementary years.

Maine Educare is a public/private partnership for comprehensive, high quality early education that is designed to serve between 150 and 200 mostly low-income children from prior-to-birth to age 5. The goal is to measurably increase their school-readiness and significantly reduce unnecessary special education costs. Maine Educare will serve as a state-of-the-art professional development and resource center for early childhood professionals across the state, as well as a teaching lab for students seeking an early childhood degree in Maine. The program supports parents and caregivers with education and comprehensive supports to improve health, self-sufficiency and long-term parent and child well-being and success.

Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems *(not scored)*

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, early childhood programs, at-risk and dropout prevention programs, and school climate and culture programs, as well as information on student mobility, human resources (*i.e.*, information on teachers, principals, and other staff), school finance, student health, postsecondary education, and other relevant areas, with the purpose of connecting and coordinating all parts of the system to allow important questions related to policy, practice, or overall effectiveness to be asked, answered, and incorporated into effective continuous improvement practices.

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.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

The 2007 SLDS grant project TEAchME (Tools for Educational Achievement in Maine) established the core components of the Maine longitudinal data system and was designed to meet or exceed the Data Quality Campaign (DQC) Essential Elements for state longitudinal data systems, enable timely and accurate federal and State reporting, and provide training to stakeholders on collecting and reporting quality data and how to interpret data to make well-informed decisions for improving student achievement.

Maine recently received $7.3 million to expand this system by including linkages to early childhood, postsecondary and workforce data. Educators and policy makers and researchers will be able to conduct longitudinal studies and determine the effectiveness of early childhood programs, curriculum, teaching practices and other interventions throughout a person's life that impact education and workforce outcomes. The five following focus areas and key underlying components describe the system.

1) *Improve Teacher Effectiveness* through implementing a new web-based **Educator Credentialing System** and a new web-based **Teacher Quality Management System**.
2) Expand the SLDS Education Data Warehouse from a Pre-K through 12 to an Early Childhood through 20 system by **Linking to Early Childhood Programs; Linking with Postsecondary Data** from the University of Maine System; replacing the existing **Adult Education System** with a comprehensive centralized statewide system; and **Linking to Department of Labor Data Systems** to evaluate the relationships between employment earnings outcomes and entry into Maine growth industries.
3) Deliver ***Comprehensive Data Use Training Programs*** by expanding the current SLDS Data Quality Certification Program to a wide range of stakeholders including the general public.

4) Partner with the Maine Education Research Policy Institute (MEPRI) to conduct **Longitudinal Research Studies** utilizing the expanded TEAchME longitudinal data.

This expanded grant project is a coordinated effort among partners from the Maine Department of Education, the State Office of Information Technology, personnel from other State agencies, research organizations, contracted providers, local school administrative units, and public and private higher education institutions in Maine. Each component will add value to the existing longitudinal data system and address needs identified by stakeholders. Maine has the tools to meet or exceed the 2009 Recovery Act SLDS grant requirements. All new SLDS applications will be accessed through the education portal leveraging the State enterprise security model. We have the capabilities for direct linkage to the education data warehouse and decision support business intelligence application. Stakeholders will only need to sign-on to the portal to gain access to all the applications based on their roles and permissions.

Priority 5: Invitational Priority -- P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment *(not scored)*

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.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

On April 28, 2008 Governor John Elias Baldacci issued an executive order (12 FY 08/09) establishing a PK-Adult Council. The purpose of this Council is to ensure a coordinated and

seamless educational system that contributes to Maine's future economy and quality of life.

The Advisory Council is charged with recommending to the Governor a plan that

a. Furthers the goal of increasing the percentage of Maine's adults with four-year college degrees to 30% of adults;

b. Furthers the goal of raising Maine's high school-to-college rate from 55% to 70%;

c. Leverages Pre-K through Adult resources and technologies; and

d. Finds further efficiencies in education administration at all levels.

The Advisory Council shall promote consensus, collaboration, and efficiency in the use of public and private resources on behalf of pre-kindergarten through adult students.

Priority 6: Invitational Priority -- School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning *(not scored)*

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.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found. Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

VIII. BUDGET
(Budget Requirements and Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))

RACE TO THE TOP BUDGET REQUIREMENTS

For Phase 2 of the Fiscal Year 2010 competition, the State's budget must conform to the budget ranges below;[7] we will not consider a State's application if its request exceeds the maximum in its budget range. Most importantly, the State should develop a budget that is appropriate for and consistent with the plan it outlines in its application.

Category 1 – $350-700 million	California, Texas, New York, Florida
Category 2 – $200-400 million	Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Georgia, Michigan, North Carolina, New Jersey
Category 3 – $150-250 million	Virginia, Arizona, Indiana, Washington, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Missouri, Maryland, Wisconsin
Category 4 – $60-175 million	Minnesota, Colorado, Alabama, Louisiana, South Carolina, Puerto Rico, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Oregon, Connecticut, Utah, Mississippi, Iowa, Arkansas, Kansas, Nevada
Category 5 – $20-75 million	New Mexico, Nebraska, Idaho, West Virginia, New Hampshire, Maine, Hawaii, Rhode Island, Montana, Delaware, South Dakota, Alaska, North Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming, District of Columbia

Applicants should use their budgets and budget narratives to provide a detailed description of how they plan to use their Federal grant funds, and how they plan to leverage other Federal (*e.g.* School Improvement Grant, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant, Teacher Incentive Fund grant, Title I), State, and local funds to achieve their reform goals. The budget narrative should be of sufficient scope and detail for the Department to determine if the costs are necessary, reasonable, and allowable. For further guidance on Federal cost principles, an applicant may wish to consult OMB Circular A-87. (See www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars).

For the purpose of the budget, we expect that the State will link its proposed reform plans to projects that the State believes are necessary in order to implement its plans. Proving additional budget detail through a project-level table and narrative will allow the State to specifically describe how its budget aligns with its reform plans in all four areas and how its budget supports the achievement of the State's goals. Some projects might address one Reform Plan Criterion, while others might address several similarly-focused criteria as one group. For example, the State might choose to have one "management

project" focused on criterion (A)(2), Building Strong Statewide Capacity. It might have another "human capital project" that addresses criteria (D)(2) through (D)(5) in the Great Teachers and Leaders section.

To support the budgeting process, the following forms and instructions are included:

1. Budget Summary
    a. Budget Summary Table. This is the cover sheet for the budget. States should complete this table as the final step in their budgeting process, and include this table as the first page of the State's budget. (See Budget Part I: Budget Summary Table.)
    b. Budget Summary Narrative. A budget narrative that accompanies the Budget Summary Table should provide an overview of the projects that the State has included in its budget. The State should also describe how other Federal, State, and local funds will be leveraged to further support Race to the Top education reform plans. (See Budget Part I: Budget Summary Narrative.)

2. Project-Level Detail. This is the supporting, project-level detail required as back-up to the budget summary. For each project that the State is proposing in order to implement the plans described in its application, the State should complete the following:
    a. Project-Level Budget Table. This is the budget for each project, by budget category and for each year for which funding is requested. (See Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table.)
    b. Project-Level Budget Narrative. This is the narrative and backup detail associated with each budget category in the Project-Level Budget. (See Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Narrative.)

Budget Part I: Budget Summary Table

Instructions:
In the Budget Summary Table, the State should include the budget totals for each budget category and each year of the grant. These line items are derived by adding together the line items from each of the Project-Level Budget Tables.

Budget Part I: Summary Budget Table
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
4. Equipment	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
5. Supplies	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	200,000
6. Contractual	6,110,000	7,090,000	6,540,000	7,140,000	26,880,000
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	6,190,000	7,170,000	6,620,000	7,220,000	27,200,000
10. Indirect Costs*	532,340	616,620	569,320	620,920	2,339,200
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	1,067,660	1,483,380	2,530,680	2,879,080	7,960,800
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	7,790,000	9,270,000	9,670,000	10,720,000	37,500,000
14. Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (50% of Total Grant)	9,375,000	9,375,000	9,375,000	9,375,000	37,500,000
15. Total Budget (lines 13-14)	17,597,000	1,961,000	19,564,000	20,615,000	75,000,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

BUDGET PART I: BUDGET SUMMARY NARRATIVE

Instructions:
Describe, in an Appendix, the overall structure of the State's budget for a Race to the Top grant, including the list of projects for which there is a project-level budget, and a rationale for how these will be organized and managed.

The State should also describe how other Federal (*e.g.* School Improvement Grant, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant, Teacher Incentive Fund grant, Title I), State, and local funds will be leveraged to further support Race to the Top education reform plans.

The State must include, on Line 14 of the Budget Summary Table, the amount of funding to be subgranted to its participating LEAs based on their relative shares of funding under Part A of Title I of the ESEA for the most recent year (that is, FY 2009), as required under section 14006(c) of the ARRA. States are not required to provide budgets for how the participating LEAs would use their funds. However, the Department expects that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that participating LEAs spend these funds in accordance with the State's plan and the scope of work described in the agreement between the State and the participating LEA.

Budget Narrative:

Personnel: All personnel costs are part of the regular state budget

Salaries and Benefits

Travel: Travel costs are travel expenses processed through State of Maine for travel in state and out of state related to the RTTT work. Rates are at state approved rates for mileage and the federal rates for lodging and per diem.

Equipment: Equipment costs are for leases of equipment for contractual staff located onsite at the Department of Education. Generally this is a 50.00 per month technology charge and additional phone service (blackberry etc)

Supplies: These costs support the professional development activities, printing, mailing, workshop materials etc. As this work in RTTT is integral to our own state level work and other federally funded work, additional costs for supplies will be covered under other funds.

Contractual:

Standards Development and Implementation - $9,900,000

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Rubric Development	100,000	200,000	100,000	100,000	500,000
Professional Development on Rubric use including online delivery and development of modules	50,000	50,000	100,000	100,000	300,000
Standards Implementation Programs – state level/training: Standards based local implementation RISC Interdisciplinary performance assessments CTE program standards implementation (added funded to LEAs)	1,300,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	5,050,000

Maine Course Pathways and development of online professional development modules	1,00,0000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
Total	2,350,000	2,500,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	9,750,000

Student Support Systems:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Training on Interventions and Pilot projects	1,420,000	1,420,000	1,420,000	1,420,000	5,680,000
Jobs for Maine's Graduates to schools not under Section E	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	5,000,000
EduCare	250,000	250,000	250,000	250000	1,000,000
Total	2,920,000	2,920,000	2,920,000	2,920,000	11,680,000

Section C: All data costs are covered under other state and federal funding

Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Evaluation Models	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	400,000
Teacher Training in Content and Pedagogy, Mentoring programs within content	1,000,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	4,600,000
Principal Leadership Institutes	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	880,000
STEM	120,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	570,000

Professional Development, including CTE					
Total	1,440,000	1,670,000	1,670,000	1,670,000	6,330,000

Section E Turning Around Low Performing Schools

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Intervention Teams	500,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	2,500,000	5,500,000
Five Low Performing High Schools that are not eligible for Title 1	300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	3,300,000
Total	800,000	2,000,000	2,500,000	3,500,000	8,800,000

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the State should submit a Project-Level Budget Table that includes the budget for the project, for each budget category and each year of the grant.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table Project Name: Implementing a Standards based System – Re-Inventing Schools Coalition Associated with Criteria: Section B and Section D					
Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	750,064	750,064	750,064	750,064	3,000,256
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	750,064	750,064	750,064	750,064	3,000,256
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	750,064	750,064	750,064	750,064	3,000,256

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the Department strongly recommends that the State submits the following information for each budget category.

1) Personnel

Provide:

- The title of each position to be compensated under this project.
- The salary for each position under this project.
- The amount of time, such as hours or percentage of time, to be expended by each position under this project.
- Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:

- The importance of each position to the success of the project, and connections back to specific project plans. If curriculum vitae, an organizational chart, or other supporting information will be helpful to reviewers, attach in the Appendix and describe its location.

For example:

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
Project Director (1): Jane Doe will be responsible for the overall leadership and management of the Performance-Based Teacher and Principal Compensation Program. She is an expert in this area and has worked on this issue for six years. She will report to the Race to the Top project director and be responsible for negotiating details related to the performance-based programs proposed in the plan associated with (D)(2). Her qualifications are described in detail in the project management plan on page A-24 of the Appendix.	80%	$65,000	$52,000

2) Fringe Benefits

Provide:

- The fringe benefit percentages for all personnel in the project.
- The basis for cost estimates or computations.

3) Travel

Provide:

- An estimate of the number of trips.
- An estimate of transportation and/or subsistence costs for each trip.
- Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:

- The purpose of the travel, how it relates to project goals, and how it will contribute to project success.

For example:

Travel: Travel expenses include the average mile reimbursements of $100 each, in addition to an amount of per diem of $50.	# Trips	$ per Trip	Total
A kick-off conference will provide technical assistance to our participating 325 districts. The conference will last two full days. A more detailed justification for this trip is explained in the narrative for selection criterion (A)(2).	325x3 people (1 Project Dir. & 3 staff per district.)	$200	$195,000

4) Equipment

Provide:

- The type of equipment to be purchased.
- The estimated unit cost for each item to be purchased.
- The definition of equipment used by the State.
- Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:

- The justification of the need for the items of equipment to be purchased.

For example:

Equipment: Consistent with SEA policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $1,000 or more per unit.	Cost of Item	Item Description	Total
Desktop Computers (3): Three desktop computers will be needed to expand our current office and supply the needs of 3 new employees.	$1,500	Computer including monitor & printer	$4,500

5) Supplies

Provide:

- An estimate of materials and supplies needed for the project, by nature of expense or general category (*e.g.*, instructional materials, office supplies).
- The basis for cost estimates or computations.

6) Contractual

Provide:

- The products to be acquired and/or the professional services to be provided.
- The estimated cost per expected procurement.

- For professional services contracts, the amounts of time to be devoted to the project, including the costs to be charged to this proposed grant award.
- A brief statement that the State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.
- Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:

- The purpose and relation to the project.

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

7) Training Stipends

Note:

- The training stipend line item only pertains to costs associated with long-term training programs and college or university coursework, not workshops or short-term training supported by this program.
- Salary stipends paid to teachers and other school personnel for participating in short-term professional development should be reported in Personnel (line 1).

Provide:

- Descriptions of training stipends to be provided, consistent with the "note" above.
- The cost estimates and basis for these estimates.

Explain:

- The purpose of the training.

8) Other

Provide:

- Other items by major type or category (*e.g.*, communications, printing, postage, equipment rental).
- The cost per item (printing = $500, postage = $750).
- Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:

- The purpose of the expenditures.

9) Total Direct Costs

Provide:

- The sum of expenditures, across all budget categories in lines 1-8, for each year of the budget.

10) Indirect Costs

Provide:

- Identify and apply the indirect cost rate. (See the section that follows, Budget: Indirect Cost Information.)

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

Provide:

- The specific activities to be done by involved LEAs (as defined in this notice).
- The estimated cost of each activity.
- The approximate number of LEAs involved in each activity.
- The total cost of each activity (across all involved LEAs).
- Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:

- The purpose of each activity.

For example:

Activity	Purpose	Cost	# LEAs involved	Total
Stipends for teachers to participate in statewide professional development during summer 2011	Implementing new standards	$100 per teacher x 2,500 teachers (across all involved LEAs)	250	$250,000

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

a) For each of the specific activities to be done by selected participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), and for which the State is compensating the LEAs beyond their Title I shares under section 14006(c) of the ARRA:

Provide:

- The type of activity
- The estimated cost of each activity, and its cost basis.
- The approximate number of LEAs involved in each activity.

Explain:

- The purpose of the activity.

For example:

Activity	Purpose	Cost	Approx. # of LEAs	Total
Pay-for-performance pilot program	Fund the performance bonuses for 200	$5,000 per teacher x 100 teachers/LEA x 3 years	2	$3,000,000

	teachers			

b) For each participating LEA (as defined in this notice) whose Title I share is being supplemented by the State in order for the LEA to participate fully in the State's Race to the Top plans:

Provide:

- The name of the participating LEA whose share is being supplemented
- The amount of the supplement to the LEA's subgrant

Explain:

- The rationale for the supplement to the subgrant.

For example:

LEA	Rationale	Supplemental Subgrant Cost	Total
ABC District	Based on its Title I share, this LEA would receive $X of the State's Race to the Top grant; this subgrant from the State's 50% increases the LEA's funding to allow it to fully participate in all State plans	$100,000/year x 4 years	$400,000

13) Total Costs

Provide:

- The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the State should submit a Project-Level Budget Table that includes the budget for the project, for each budget category and each year of the grant.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table
Project Name: Professional Development on Rubrics and Performance Assessments
Associated with Criteria: Section B Standards and Assessment and Section C Teachers and Leaders
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	50,000	50,000	100,000	100,000	300,000
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	50,000	50,000	100,000	100,000	300,000
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	50,000	50,000	100,000	100,000	300,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the Department strongly recommends that the State submits the following information for each budget category.

EXPLANATION:
As we develop draft of the rubrics and performance assessments, the state will contract with the same developers or a separate professional development organization(s) to provide professional development statewide to all educators. We have budgeted the above amounts based on experiences and costs within Maine. We also have a strong network of Career and Technical Centers with Culinary Arts programs that have meeting facilities that we use extensively. We will use online and web based training that we have developed within our state costs under the MLTI program described in this application. We will also use other federal funds to support this work that is integral to the implementation of all of our standards.

Standards-Based Education Project Budget-RISC
Source: Race To The Top

Implementation and Sustainability

#	Task	Cost	Travel Units		Reg. Fee	Training Days
1	*Maine Summer RISC/DOE Institute*	$32,200.00	7	5 trainers for 4 days	$100.00	20
2	*Summer Beacon Educator Training*	$18,500.00	3	3 trainers for 4 days--75 participants	$100.00	12
3	*Summer Beacon Educator Follow-up*	$30,000.00	4	4 trainers for 5 days		20
4	*Fall Beacon Administrator Training*	$6,000.00	2	2 trainers for two days		4
6	*Cohort 1 Site Support*	$12,000.00	4	2 trainers for 2 days for 2 sites		8
7	*Cohort 2 Site Support*	$36,000.00	8	2 trainers for 3 days for 4 sites		24
8	*Fall Beacon Educator Training*	$18,500.00	3	3 trainers for 4 days--75 participants	$100.00	12
9	*Fall Beacon Educator Follow-up*	$30,000.00	4	4 trainers for 5 days		20
11	*Advanced Beacon Educator Training*	$9,500.00	2	2 trainers for 3 days		6
12	*Fall & Winter Symposiums*	$40,000.00	4	4 trainers for 6 days	$100.00	6
14	*Winter Beacon Educator Training*	$18,500.00	3	3 trainers for 4 days--75 participants	$100.00	12
15	*Winter Beacon Educator Follow-up*	$30,000.00	4	4 trainers for 5 days		20
16	*Winter Beacon Administrator Training*	$6,000.00	2	2 trainers for 2 days		4
17	*Spring Advanced Beacon Educator Training*	$9,500.00	2	2 trainers for 3 days		6
19	*Spring Beacon Educator Training*	$18,500.00	3	3 trainers for 4 days--75 participants	$100.00	12
20	*Spring Beacon Educator Follow-up*	$30,000.00	4	4 trainers for 5 days		20
21	*Cohort 1 Site Visits*	$18,000.00	3	3 trainers for 2 days for 2 sites		12
22	*Cohort 2 Site Visits*	$36,000.00	8	3 trainers for 2 days for 4 sites		24
23	*RIM Survey and Correlation Study*	$25,000.00	0			0
24	*Educate Software*	$30,000.00	0			0

25	*Implementation Site Staffing*		$23,000	0	0
					0
		Subtotal	**$477,200.00**	70	242
#	**Item**				
1	**Additional Services and Fees**		**Cost**		
1	*70 Travel units @ $2,750 per unit*		$192,500.00		
		Subtotal	**$192,500.00**		
		Subtotal 2	**$669,700.00**		
	Indirect Rate @ 12.00%		$80,364.00		
		$ Total	**$750,064.00**		

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Instructions:

For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the State should submit a Project-Level Budget Table that includes the budget for the project, for each budget category and each year of the grant.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table
Project Name: Maine Course Pathways
Associated with Criteria: Sections A, B, D, E

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

Maine Course Pathways

The Maine Department of Education contracts with the Educational Policy Improvement Center (EPIC) for the development of the Maine Course Pathways system. This is a web based system for teachers and administrators to electronically submit course syllabi to then be reviewed by content experts for the fair opportunity provided in the syllabus for students to achieve the Maine Learning Results.

The contract includes:

- Research: Research and analysis, project management, and general project support
- Client Support Center: CSC lead and representatives
- Information Technology: Programming, database, user interface, and technology support
- Finance and Operations Team: Fiscal, personnel, communications, events, and administrative support
- Document Reviews
- Scoring Guide Development (CED)
- Consultant cost for development of an electronic pathways selection system
- Teacher Training
- Teleconferences and Webex Meetings
- Office supplies and printing
- Telecommunications
- Technology, Equipment, Data recovery
- Facilities, rent and insurance
- Course Alignment System Licensing
- Subcontract for MDOE Administrative Assistant

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the State should submit a Project-Level Budget Table that includes the budget for the project, for each budget category and each year of the grant.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table
Project Name; Student Support Systems - PK-12 Systems of Interventions

Associated with Criteria: Sections B, D and E

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	910,000	910,000	910,000	910,000	3,640,000
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	910,000	910,000	910,000	910,000	3,640,000
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	1,600,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,310,000	1,310,000	1,310,000	1,310,000	5,240,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

PK-12 Systems of Interventions

This work will be done via a contractual agreement. The contract will be awarded using the State's procurement process. The estimated costs are:

Project Director ----------$85,000.00

Five regional coordinators---at $85000.00 each----------$425,000.00

Professional development/coaching@ $1000.00 per teacher (300)----------$300,000.00

TOTAL Contractual----------$810,000.00

Additional LEA portions to be distributed:

Stipends for master teachers/coaches @$3000.00 per teacher (100 teachers) $300,000.00

Substitutes @ $100 daily for 1,000 days----------$100,000.00

TOTAL ----------$400,000.00

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the State should submit a Project-Level Budget Table that includes the budget for the project, for each budget category and each year of the grant.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table
Project Name: Jobs for Maine's Graduates
Associated with Criteria: Section B, D, E

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	5,000,000
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	5,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	5,000,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

The project proposal submitted by the Jobs for Maine's Graduates exceeds our budgeted amount. The balance will be covered by participating LEAs.

See attached for project budget.

The Scale-Up of JMG Core Sites and its alignment with R2T

Date: February 19, 2010

Summary of Direct Costs to Scale-Up JMG Programs through the addition of Twenty (20) core model programs

Total Annual Direct Costs for 20 New Programs

Direct Salary, Wages and Benefits		
JMG Specialist at average of $34,400 salary per year at 20 FTEs		688,000
JMG Regional manager at average of $45,690 salary per year at 2x (5/6) FTEs		76,150
Subtotal of Direct Salary & Wages		764,150
Benefits at 28%		213,970
Total Direct SWB	$	978,120
Other Direct Costs		
Travel and mileage to directly support 20 sites and two (2) regional managers @ 5/6 FTE		59,380
Professional Development Costs per Specialist, avg. $2,175 per year, x20		43,500
Course Reimbursement Cost per Specialist, avg. $1,000 per year, x20		20,000
Programmatic Classroom Supplies at avg. $750 per year, x 20		15,000
Information Technology subscription and support at avg. $3,325 per site per year, x20		66,500
Student Enrichment events, supply and meal costs at avg. $1,875 per site per year, x20		37,500
Total Other Direct Costs	$	241,880
Total Direct Costs for Year One	$	1,220,000
Year Two @ 3% COLA	$	1,256,600
Year Three @ 3% COLA	$	1,294,298
Year Four @ 3% COLA	$	1,333,127
Total R2T Funds Requested	$	5,104,025

Per Site Direct Costs	
S/W/B (1 FTE Specialist & 1/12 FTE Manager)	48,906
Travel and mileage to directly support 1 site & 1/12 regional manager	2,969
Professional Development Cost	2175
Course Reimbursement	1,000
Programmatic Classroom Supplies	750
IT subscriptions & support	3,325
Student Enrichment events	1,875
Total	$ 61,000

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the State should submit a Project-Level Budget Table that includes the budget for the project, for each budget category and each year of the grant.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table
Project Name: Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders Initiative:
Maine Professional Accountability System
Associated with Criteria: Section (D) (1-5)
(Evidence for selection criterion (D)(1-5))

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	915,000	1,115,000	1,115,000	1,115,000	4,260,000
7. Training Stipends	50,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	290,000
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	965,000	1,195,000	1,195,000	1,195,000	4,550,000
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	375,000	375,000	375,000	375,000	1,500,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	1,340,000	1,570,000	1,570,000	1,570,000	6,050,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders

Contractual: By RFP to Service Providers		
Project Director (1): The Project Director will be responsible for the overall leadership and management of all aspects of the MEQEP initiative and will have the commensurate qualifications necessary.		
Regional Coordinators (5): Each Regional Coordinator will be responsible for the overall leadership and management of those activities conducted in the schools within the assigned region		
Master Teacher Coaches (250): Each Master Teacher will be responsible for approximately 2 schools and oversee all professional development and activities at those 2 schools during the grant period.		
Leadership Institute for 60 principals: Contracted services by a professional development provider.		
Travel: Travel expenses include the average reimbursements of .50 per mile 256 participants X 453.13 miles = $58,000		
Note: Ensuing years show small increases for additional cohorts		
Training Stipends: Training Stipends for the 250 Master Teachers and 5 Regional Coordinators	Varies	Stipend by contact hours @ per diem rate
Indirect Costs:		
Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:		

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the State should submit a Project-Level Budget Table that includes the budget for the project, for each budget category and each year of the grant.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table
Project Name: Intervention Teams-School Improvement
Associated with Criteria: (E)(2)(i)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	3,300,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	3,300,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Intervention Teams-School Improvement
Associated with Criteria: (E)(2)(i)

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:

Each school identified as persistently lowest-achieving, as defined in Section **(E)(2)(i)**, will be given approximately $60,000 to purchase school support services from LEA selected providers and/or providers selected through a statewide Request for Information. Estimated numbers of schools in this category are based upon the number of schools identified in 2009-10 and the anticipated growth in schools in these categories as a result of implementation of initiatives supported by this application. In Year 1, we estimate 15 schools in these categories; with 10 supported directly with Title I School Improvement Grant funds. I n Year 2, we estimate 8 schools. In Year 3, we estimate 8 schools. In Year 4, we estimate 6 schools.

The state will commit approximately $500,000 in School Improvement Grant administrative funds to this project in addition to the Race to the Top funds.

Total Costs: $3,300,000

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table **Project Name:** Intervention Teams – Raising Achievement of All Students **Associated with Criteria: (E)(2)(ii)**					
Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	500,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	2,500,000	5,500,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	500,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	2,500,000	5,500,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Project Name: Intervention Teams – Raising Achievement of All Students

Associated with Criteria: (E)(2)(ii)

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:

Each school identified as persistently lowest-achieving or having a 3 year average of proficiency in Reading and Math that is less than 30% and less than the median rate of change for Maine schools will be provided with school support services from "Turnaround Team" members. These team members will be made available to schools from a provider identified through a statewide Request for Information and is based upon a desire to provide schools with at least twenty days of consultation and support on school improvement and reform at $300 per day.

Estimated numbers of "Turnaround Team" members is based upon the number of schools in identified as Tier I and II and those having a 3 year average of proficiency in Reading and Math that is less than 30% and less than the median rate of change in 2009-10, and the anticipated growth in schools in these categories as a result of implementation of initiatives supported by this application.. In Year 1, we estimate 20 schools in these categories and will provide "Turnaround team" member staffing equitable to 5 full time positions. In Year 2, we estimate 30 schools, with 5 additional positions. In Year 3, we estimate 40 schools. In Year 4, we estimate 50 schools. Staffing equitable to 5 positions will be added each year. The inclusion of additional schools each year increases annual costs since as new teams will be needed. Teams assigned in earlier years will stay with schools throughout the grant period.

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs: $5,500,000

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table **Project Name:** Math-In-CTE **Associated with Criteria:** A,B,D,E and Priority 2					
Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	200,000
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	200,000
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	200,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

The Maine Department of Education in collaboration with New Hampshire contracts with the National Center for Research in CTE to deliver Math-In-CTE workshop training to High School mathematics and CTE teachers throughout the state. This is research-based professional development which partners CTE teachers and high school math teachers to build teacher understanding of mathematics content and application to strengthen student achievement. This organization has the expertise to bring this work to scale in Maine over four years.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table
Project Name: STEM Academy
Associated with Criteria: B, D, E, Priority 2

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	120,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	360,000
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	120,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	360,000
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	120,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	360,000

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

The Maine Department of Education will contract with the Maine Mathematics and Science Alliance, Teachers' Domain (WGBH Boston) and the University of Maine system to develop and deliver STEM a series of course that will lead toward a Masters in STEM literacy. This work will target the teachers in low achieving schools to participate in a STEM content and pedagogical learning. The program will blend 120 hours of face to face and online professional development time (WGBH online) over four years using a model driven by the research and best practices described in Adding It Up, Taking Science to School and Ready, Set, Science!, and focused on core grade level appropriate concepts to improve content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and application of technology for learning.

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table **Project Name:** After School Technical Design and Sustainability **Associated with Criteria:** A, B, D, E and Priority 2 **(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))**					
Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	50,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	110,000
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	50,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	110,000
10. Indirect Costs*					
11.Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	50,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	110,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15. Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category. Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years. *If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

The Maine Department of Education will work with the non-formal education providers in Maine to increase the availability of after school opportunities in technological design and sustainability available to students in underrepresented groups and students in poverty. The Department will engage the First Lego League, 4-H, the Maine Environmental Education Association and Maine Audubon to identify high needs areas and to provide and expand these programs.

Budget: Indirect Cost Information

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

Does the State have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?

YES **X**
NO

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

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

From: 07/01/09 To: 06/30/11

Approving Federal agency: **X** ED ___Other

(Please specify agency): _____

Directions for this form:

1. Indicate whether or not the State has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement that was approved by the Federal government.

2. If "No" is checked, ED generally will authorize grantees to use a temporary rate of 10 percent of budgeted salaries and wages subject to the following limitations:
   (a) The grantee must submit an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency within 90 days after ED issues a grant award notification; and
   (b) If after the 90-day period, the grantee has not submitted an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency, the grantee may not charge its grant for indirect costs until it has negotiated an indirect cost rate agreement with its cognizant agency.

3. If "Yes" is checked, indicate the beginning and ending dates covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. In addition, indicate whether ED, another Federal agency (Other) issued the approved agreement. If "Other" was checked, specify the name of the agency that issued the approved agreement.

IX. 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.

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. Standards and Assessments		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments		
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction		
(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		
D. Great Teachers and Leaders		
(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		
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools		

For the Participating LEA

Authorized LEA Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

For the State

Authorized State Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

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

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

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

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

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

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

(B) Select new staff;

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

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

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

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

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

(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and

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

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

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

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

(b) Restart model. A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization

(CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides "whole-school operation" services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

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

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

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

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(E) In secondary schools--

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

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

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

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

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

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

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

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

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

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

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

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

XI. SCORING RUBRIC
(Appendix B in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; and in the Notice Inviting Applications)

I. Introduction

To help ensure inter-reviewer reliability and transparency for State Race to the Top applicants, the U.S. Department of Education has created and is publishing a rubric for scoring State applications. The pages that follow detail the rubric and allocation of point values that reviewers will be using. Race to the Top grants will be awarded on a competitive basis to States in two phases. The rubric will be used by reviewers in each phase to ensure consistency across and within review panels.

The rubric allocates points to each criterion and, in selected cases, to sub-criteria as well. In all, the Race to the Top scoring rubric includes 19 criteria and one competitive priority that collectively add up to 500 points. Several of these criteria account for a large number of points; others account for a comparatively small portion of a State's score.

It is important to emphasize that over half the points that reviewers may award to States are based on States' accomplishments prior to applying—their successes in increasing student achievement, decreasing the achievement gaps, increasing graduation rates, enlisting strong statewide support and commitment to their proposed plans, and creating legal conditions conducive to education reform and innovation. Finally, it bears underscoring that reviewers will be assessing multiple aspects of States' Race to the Top applications. States that fail to earn points or earn a low number of points on one criterion, can still win a Race to the Top award by presenting strong applications and histories of accomplishments on other criteria.

Notwithstanding the guidance being provided to reviewers, reviewers will still be required to make many thoughtful judgments about the quality of States' applications. Beyond judging a State's commitment to the four reform areas specified in the ARRA, reviewers will be assessing, based on the criteria, the comprehensiveness and feasibility of States' applications and plans. Reviewers will be asked to evaluate, for example, if States have set ambitious but achievable annual targets in their applications. Reviewers will need to make informed judgments about States' goals, the activities the State has chosen to undertake and the rationales for such activities, and the timeline and credibility of State plans.

Applicants address the absolute and competitive priorities throughout their applications. The absolute priority must be met in order for an applicant to receive funding. Applications that address the competitive priority comprehensively will earn extra points under that priority. Invitational priorities are extensions to the core reform areas; applicants are invited to address these, but are not granted additional points for doing so.

In this appendix there is information about the point values for each criterion and priority, guidance on scoring, and the rubric that will be provided to reviewers.

II. Points Overview

The chart below shows the maximum number of points that may be assigned to each criterion.

Selection Criteria	Points	Percent
A. State Success Factors	125	25%
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs' participation in it	65	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	*5*	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	*45*	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	*15*	
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	*20*	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	*10*	
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	*5*	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	*25*	
B. Standards and Assessments	70	14%
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	*20*	
(ii) Adopting standards	*20*	
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	47	9%
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	138	28%
Eligibility Requirement (b)	eligibility	
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	
(i) Measuring student growth	*5*	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	*15*	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	*10*	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	*28*	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	*15*	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	*10*	
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	50	10%
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	*5*	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	*35*	
F. General	55	11%
Eligibility Requirement (a)	eligibility	
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative s	40	
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	3%
TOTAL	**500**	**100%**

Subtotal: Accomplishments	260	52%
Subtotal: Plans	240	48%

III. About Scoring

About State Reform Conditions Criteria: The goal for State Reform Conditions Criteria is to ensure that, wherever possible, reviewers are provided with criterion-specific guidance that is clear and specific, making the decisions as "objective" as possible. (See application requirement (d) for the guidance provided to States concerning responding to State Reform Conditions Criteria in their applications.)

About Reform Plan Criteria: For Reform Plan Criteria, reviewers will be given general guidance on how to evaluate the information that each State submits; this guidance will be consistent with application requirement (e). Reviewers will allot points based on the quality of the State's plan and, where specified in the text of the criterion, whether the State has set ambitious yet achievable annual targets for that plan. In making these judgments, reviewers will consider the extent to which the State has:

- *A high-quality plan.* In determining the quality of a State's plan for a given Reform Plan Criterion, reviewers will evaluate the key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the credibility of the plan (as judged, in part, by the information submitted as supporting evidence). States are required to submit this information for each Reform Plan Criterion that the State addresses. States may also submit additional information that they believe will be helpful to peer reviewers.

- *Ambitious yet achievable annual targets* (only for those criteria that specify this). In determining whether a State has ambitious yet achievable annual targets for a given Reform Plan Criterion, reviewers will examine the State's targets in the context of the State's plan and the evidence submitted (if any) in support of the plan. There is no specific target that reviewers will be looking for here; nor will higher targets necessarily be rewarded above lower ones. Rather, reviewers will reward States for developing targets that – in light of the State's plan – are "ambitious yet achievable."

Note that the evidence that States submit may be relevant both to judging whether the State has a high-quality plan and whether its annual targets are ambitious yet achievable.

About Assigning Points: For each criterion, reviewers will assign points to an application. In general, the Department has specified total point values at the criterion level and in some instances, at the sub-criterion level. In the cases where the point totals have not been allocated to sub-criteria, each sub-criterion is weighted equally.

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

Maximum Point Value	Quality of Applicant's Response		
	Low	Medium	High
45	0 – 12	13 – 33	34 – 45
40	0 – 10	11 – 29	30 – 40
35	0 – 9	10 – 25	26 – 35
30	0 – 8	9 – 21	22 – 30
28	0 – 8	9 – 20	21 – 28
25	0 – 7	8 – 18	19 – 25

Maximum Point Value	Quality of Applicant's Response		
	Low	Medium	High
21	0 – 5	6 – 15	16 – 21
20	0 – 5	6 – 14	15 – 20
15	0 – 4	5 – 10	11 – 15
14	0 – 4	5 – 9	10 – 14
10	0 – 2	3 – 7	8 – 10
8	0 – 2	3 – 5	6 – 8
7	0 – 2	3 – 4	5 – 7
6	0 – 1	2 – 3	4 – 6
5	0 – 1	2 – 3	4 – 5

About Priorities: There are three types of priorities in the Race to the Top competition.

- The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It will be assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority. If an application has not met the priority, it will be eliminated from the competition.
- The competitive priority also cuts across the entire application. It is worth 15 points. Applicants will earn all or none of it, making it truly a competitive preference. In those cases where there is a disparity in the reviewers' determinations on the priority, the Department will award the competitive priority points only if a majority of the reviewers on a panel determine that an application should receive the priority points.
- The invitational priorities are addressed in their own separate sections. While applicants are invited to write to the invitational priorities, these will not earn points.

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

IV. Reviewer Guidance for Criteria

A. State Success Factors

General Reviewer Guidance for (A)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (d).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (A)(1)(ii):

- *The model Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), provided in Appendix D to this notice, is an example of a strong MOU.*

(A)(1) **(maximum total points: 65)** Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs' participation in it: The extent to which—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** 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;

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 45)** 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) or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include—

(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) **(maximum subpoints: 15)** 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—

(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.

General Reviewer Guidance for (A)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(A)(2) **(maximum total points: 30)** Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans: The extent to which the State has a high-quality overall plan to—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 20)** Ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by—

(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;

(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;

(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) **(maximum subpoints: 10)** 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—

(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.

General Reviewer Guidance for (A)(3): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

(A)(3) **(maximum total points: 30)** Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps: The extent to which the State has demonstrated its ability to—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** 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;

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 25)** 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—

(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

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (B)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(1)(i)(b) – Significant Number of States:

- *"High" points for a significant number of States are earned if the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country.*
- *"Medium" or "low" points are earned if the consortium includes one-half of the States in the country or less.*

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(1)(ii):

- *"High" points are earned for: Phase 1 applicants' commitment to and progress toward adoption by August 2, 2010; and Phase 2 applicants' adoption by August 2, 2010.*
- *No "Medium" points are assigned for this criterion.*
- *"Low" points are earned for a high-quality plan to adopt by a later specified date in 2010.*
- *No points are earned for a plan that is not high-quality or for a plan to adopt later than 2010.*

(B)(1) **(maximum total points: 40)** Developing and adopting common standards: 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) **(maximum subpoints: 20)** The State's participation in a consortium of States that—

(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) **(maximum subpoints: 20)** (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.[8]

General Reviewer Guidance for (B)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(2)(ii) – Significant Number of States:

- *"High" points for a significant number of States are earned if the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country.*
- *"Medium" or "low" points are earned if the consortium includes one-half of the States in the country or less.*

(B)(2) **(maximum total points: 10)** Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments: 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

General Reviewer Guidance for (B)(3): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets (if any) for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and

presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

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

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (C)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (C)(1):

- *Applicants earn two (2) points for every element the State has, out of 12 elements possible.*

(C)(1) **(maximum total points: 24)** Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system: 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

General Reviewer Guidance for (C)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets (if any) for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (d).

(C)(2) **(maximum total points: 5)** Accessing and using State data: 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.[9]

General Reviewer Guidance for (C)(3): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets (if any) for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(C)(3) **(maximum total points: 18)** Using data to improve instruction: 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, 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

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(1):

- *The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.*

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(1)(i):

- *"High" points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) permit providers who operate independently of institutions of higher education (IHEs), and (b) include at least 4 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice).*
- *"Medium" points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) permit providers who operate independently of IHEs, and (b) include at least 2 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice).*
- *"Low" points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) do not permit providers who operate independently of IHEs, OR (b) include only 1 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice).*

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

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion and annual targets, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(2):

- *The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.*

(D)(2) **(maximum total points: 58)** Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance: 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) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student;

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 15)** 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;

(iii) **(maximum subpoints: 10)** 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

(iv) **(maximum subpoints: 28)** Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding—

(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.

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(3): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(D)(3) **(maximum total points: 25)** Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals: 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) **(maximum subpoints: 15)** 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

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 10)** 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.

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.

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(4): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(4):

- *The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.*

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

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(5): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets (if any) for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

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

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (E)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (E)(1):

- *10 points are earned by States that can intervene directly in both schools and LEAs.*
- *5 points are earned by States that can intervene directly in either schools or LEAs, but not both.*
- *0 points are earned by States that cannot intervene in either schools or LEAs.*

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

General Reviewer Guidance for (E)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(E)(2) **(maximum total points: 40)** Turning around the lowest-achieving schools: The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** 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

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 35)** 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).

F. General

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (F)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(1)(i):

- *"High" points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education increased from FY2008 to FY2009.*
- *"Medium" points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education were substantially unchanged from FY2008 to FY2009.*
- *"Low" points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education decreased from FY2008 to FY2009.*

(F)(1) **(maximum total points: 10)** Making education funding a priority: 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.

General Reviewer Guidance for (F)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(2)(i):

- *"High" points are earned if the State either has no cap on the number of charter schools, or it has a "high" cap (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, ≥10% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools); and the State does not have restrictions, such as those referenced in the "note to reviewers" below, that would be considered even mildly inhibiting.*
- *"Medium" points are earned if the State has a "medium" cap on the number of charter schools (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, ≥5% and <10% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools); or the charter school law has sufficient flexibility to allow for an increase in the number of charter schools as if it were a medium or higher cap (e.g. by allowing for the creation of multiple campuses under the same charter); and the State does not have restrictions, such as those referenced in the "note to reviewers" below, that would be considered moderately or severely inhibiting.*
- *"Low" points are earned if the State has a "low" cap on the number of charter schools (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, <5% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools)* OR *if the State has restrictions, such as those referenced in the "note to reviewers" below, that would be considered severely inhibiting.*
- *No points are earned if the State has no charter school law.*
- *Note to reviewers: Charter school laws are so complex that it is hard to write rules to capture each possible obstacle to charter school growth; therefore, this rubric is meant to guide reviewers, not to bind them. For example, if a State limits the number of charter schools by limiting the share of statewide or district-level funding that can go to charter schools, rather than by explicitly limiting the number of charter schools, reviewers should convert the funding restriction into an approximately equivalent limit on the number of schools and fit that into the guidelines here. As reviewers assess the inhibitions on charter schools, they should look for restrictions such as: disallowing certain types of charter schools (e.g., startups or conversions); restricting charter schools to operate in certain geographic areas; and limiting the number, percent, or demographics of students that may enroll in charter schools. Some States have "smart caps" designed to restrict growth to high-performing charter schools; this is not a problem unless it effectively restricts any new (i.e., unproven) charter schools from starting.*

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(2)(iii):

- *"High" points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is ≥90% of that which is provided to traditional public school students.*
- *"Medium" points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is 80-89% of that which is provided to traditional public school students.*
- *"Low" points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is ≤79% of that which is provided to traditional public school students.*
- *No points are earned if the State has no charter school law.*

(F)(2) **(maximum total points: 40)** Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools: 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.

(v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

General Reviewer Guidance for (F)(3): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

(F)(3) **(maximum total points: 5)** Demonstrating other significant reform conditions: 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.

V. Reviewer Guidance for Priorities

Absolute Priority Guidance: *The application will be judged to ensure that it has met the absolute priority set forth below. The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It is assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority. If an application has not met the priority, it will be eliminated from the competition.*

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.

Competitive Priority Guidance: *The application will be judged to determine whether it has met the competitive preference priority set forth below. The competitive preference priority will be evaluated in the context of the State's entire application. Therefore, a State that is responding to this priority should address it throughout the application, as appropriate, and provide a summary of its approach to addressing the priority. The reviewers will assess the priority as part of their review of a State's application and determine whether it has been met.*

Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority – Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). (competitive preference points: 15, 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.

Invitational Priority Guidance: *No points are awarded for invitational priorities.*

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.

Invitational Priority Guidance: *No points are awarded for invitational priorities.*

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, early childhood programs, at-risk and dropout prevention programs, and school climate and culture programs, as well as information on student mobility, human resources (*i.e.*, information on teachers, principals, and other staff), school finance, student health, postsecondary education, and other relevant areas, with the purpose of connecting and coordinating all parts of the system to allow important questions related to policy, practice, or overall effectiveness to be asked, answered, and incorporated into effective continuous improvement practices.

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.

Invitational Priority Guidance: No points are awarded for invitational priorities.

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.

Invitational Priority Guidance: No points are awarded for invitational priorities.

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.

XII. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

(a) The State's application must be signed by the Governor, the State's chief school officer, and the president of the State board of education (if applicable). States will respond to this requirement in the application, Section III, Race to the Top Application Assurances. In addition, the assurances in Section IV must be signed by the Governor.

(b) The State must describe the progress it has made over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas (as described in criterion (A)(3)(i)).

(c) The State must include a budget that details how it will use grant funds and other resources to meet targets and perform related functions (as described in criterion (A)(2)(i)(d)), including how it will use funds awarded under this program to–

(1) Achieve its targets for improving student achievement and graduation rates and for closing achievement gaps (as described in criterion (A)(1)(iii)); the State must also describe its track record of improving student progress overall and by student subgroup (as described in criterion (A)(3)(ii)); and

(2) Give priority to high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice), in addition to providing 50 percent of the grant to participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) based on their relative shares of funding under Part A of Title I of the ESEA for the most recent year as required under section 14006(c) of the ARRA. (Note: Because all Race to the Top grants will be made in 2010, relative shares will be based on total funding received in FY 2009, including both the regular Title I, Part A appropriation and the amount made available by the ARRA).

(d) The State must provide, for each State Reform Conditions Criterion (listed in this notice) that it chooses to address, a description of the State's current status in meeting that criterion and, at a minimum, the information requested as supporting evidence for the criterion and the performance measures, if any (see Appendix A).

(e) The State must provide, for each Reform Plan Criterion (listed in this notice) that it chooses to address, a detailed plan for use of grant funds that includes, but need not be limited to--

(1) The key goals;

(2) The key activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, which should include why the specific activities are thought to bring about the change envisioned and how these activities are linked to the key goals;

(3) The timeline for implementing the activities;

(4) The party or parties responsible for implementing the activities;

(5) The information requested in the performance measures, where applicable (see Appendix A), and where the State proposes plans for reform efforts not covered by a specified

performance measure, the State is encouraged to propose performance measures and annual targets for those efforts; and

(6) The information requested as supporting evidence, if any, for the criterion, together with any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers in judging the credibility of the State's plan.

(f) The State must submit a certification from the State Attorney General that—

(1) The State's description of, and statements and conclusions concerning State law, statute, and regulation in its application are complete, accurate, and constitute a reasonable interpretation of State law, statute, and regulation; and

(2) At the time the State submits its application, the State does not have any legal, statutory, or regulatory barriers at the State level to linking data on student achievement or student growth to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation.

(g) When addressing issues relating to assessments required under the ESEA or subgroups in the selection criteria, the State must meet the following requirements:

(1) For student subgroups with respect to the NAEP, the State must provide data for the NAEP subgroups described in section 303(b)(2)(G) of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act (20 U.S.C. 9622) (*i.e.*, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, disability, and limited English proficiency). The State must also include the NAEP exclusion rate for students with disabilities and the exclusion rate for English language learners, along with clear documentation of the State's policies and practices for determining whether a student with a disability or an English language learner should participate in the NAEP and whether the student needs accommodations;

(2) For student subgroups with respect to high school graduation rates, college enrollment and credit accumulation rates, and the assessments required under the ESEA, the State must provide data for the subgroups described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency); and

(3) For the assessments required under the ESEA, refer to section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA; in addition, when describing this assessment data in the State's application, the State should note any factors (*e.g.*, changes in cut scores) that would impact the comparability of data from one year to the next.

XIII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A State receiving Race to the Top funds must submit to the Department an annual report which must include, in addition to the standard elements, a description of the State's and its LEAs' progress to date on their goals, timelines, and budgets, as well as actual performance compared to the annual targets the State established in its application with respect to each performance measure. Further, a State receiving funds under this program and its participating LEAs are accountable for meeting the goals, timelines, budget, and annual targets established in the application; adhering to an annual fund drawdown schedule that is tied to meeting these goals, timelines, budget, and annual targets; and fulfilling and maintaining all other conditions for the conduct of the project. The Department will monitor a State's and its participating LEAs' progress in meeting the State's goals, timelines, budget, and annual targets and in fulfilling other applicable requirements. In addition, the Department may collect additional data as part of a State's annual reporting requirements.

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

A State that receives Race to the Top funds must also meet the reporting requirements that apply to all ARRA-funded programs. Specifically, the State must submit reports, within 10 days after the end of each calendar quarter, that contain the information required under section 1512(c) of the ARRA in accordance with any guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget or the Department (ARRA Division A, Section 1512(c)).

In addition, for each year of the program, the State will submit a report to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, that describes:

- the uses of funds within the State;
- how the State distributed the funds it received;
- the number of jobs that the Governor estimates were saved or created with the funds;
- the State's progress in reducing inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers, implementing a State longitudinal data system, and developing and implementing valid and reliable assessments for English language learners and students with disabilities; and
- if applicable, a description of each modernization, renovation, or repair project approved in the State application and funded, including the amounts awarded and project costs (ARRA Division A, Section 14008).

XIV. OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Evaluation

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) will conduct a series of national evaluations of Race to the Top's State grantees as part of its evaluation of programs funded under the ARRA. The Department's goal for these evaluations is to ensure that its studies not only assess program impacts, but also provide valuable information to State and local educators to help inform and improve their practices.

The Department anticipates that the national evaluations will involve such components as–

- Surveys of States, LEAs, and/or schools, which will help identify how program funding is spent and the specific efforts and activities that are underway within each of the four education reform areas and across selected ARRA-funded programs;
- Case studies of promising practices in States, LEAs, and/or schools through surveys and other mechanisms; and
- Evaluations of outcomes, focusing on student achievement and other performance measures, to determine the impact of the reforms implemented under Race to the Top.

Race to the Top grantee States are not required to conduct independent evaluations, but may propose, within their applications, to use funds from Race to the Top to support such evaluations. Grantees must make available, through formal (*e.g.*, peer-reviewed journals) or informal (*e.g.*, newsletters, websites) mechanisms, the results of any evaluations they conduct of their funded activities. In addition, as described elsewhere in this notice and regardless of the final components of the national evaluation, Race to the Top States, LEAs, and schools are expected to identify and share promising practices, make work available within and across States, and make data available in appropriate ways to stakeholders and researchers so as to help all States focus on continuous improvement in service of student outcomes.

Participating LEA Scope of Work

The agreements signed by participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) must include a scope-of-work section. The scope of work submitted by LEAs and States as part of their Race to the Top applications will be preliminary. Preliminary scopes of work should include the portions of the State's proposed reform plans that the LEA is agreeing to implement. If a State is awarded a Race to the Top grant, its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) will have up to 90 days to complete final scopes of work, which must contain detailed work plans that are consistent with their preliminary scopes of work and with the State's grant application, and should include the participating LEAs' specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures.

Making Work Available

Unless otherwise protected by law or agreement as proprietary information, the State and its subgrantees must make any work (*e.g.*, materials, tools, processes, systems) developed under its grant freely available to others, including but not limited to by posting the work on a website identified or sponsored by the Department.

Technical Assistance

The State must participate in applicable technical assistance activities that may be conducted by the Department or its designees.

State Summative Assessments

No funds awarded under this competition may be used to pay for costs related to statewide summative assessments.

XV. CONTRACTING FOR SERVICES

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

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

XVI. APPLICATION SUBMISSION PROCEDURES

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

The deadline for submission of Program applications for Phase 2 applicants is June 1, 2010.

Applications for grants under this competition must be submitted by mail or hand delivery. The Department strongly recommends the use of overnight mail. Applications postmarked on the deadline date but arriving late will not be read.

a. Application Submission Format and Deadline.

Applications for grants under this competition, as well as any amendments regarding adoption of common standards that Phase 2 applicants may file after June 1 and through August 2, 2010, must be submitted in electronic format on a CD or DVD, with CD-ROM or DVD-ROM preferred. In addition, they must submit a signed original of Sections III and IV of the application and one copy of that signed original. Sections III and IV of the application include the Race to the Top Application Assurances and the Accountability, Transparency, Reporting and Other Assurances.

All electronic application files must be in a .DOC (document), .DOCX (document), .RTF (rich text), or .PDF (Portable Document) format. Each file name should clearly identify the part of the application to which the content is responding. If a State submits a file type other than the four file types specified in this paragraph, the Department will not review that material. States should not password-protect these files.

The CD or DVD should be clearly labeled with the State's name and any other relevant information.

The Department must receive all grant applications by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington DC time, on the application deadline date. ***We will not accept an application for this competition after 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date.*** Therefore, we strongly recommend that applicants arrange for mailing or hand delivery of their applications in advance of the application deadline date.

b. Submission of Applications by Mail.

States may submit their application (*i.e.*, the CD or DVD, the signed original of Sections III and IV of the application, and the copy of that original) by mail (either through the U.S. Postal Service or a commercial carrier). We must receive the applications on or before the application deadline date. Therefore, to avoid delays, we strongly recommend sending applications via overnight mail. Mail applications to the Department at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Attention: (CFDA Number 84.395A)
LBJ Basement Level 1
400 Maryland Avenue, SW.
Washington, DC 20202-4260

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

c. Submission of Applications by Hand Delivery.

States may submit their application (*i.e.*, the CD or DVD, the signed original of Sections III and IV of the application, and the copy of that original) by hand delivery (including via a courier service). We must receive the applications on or before the application deadline date, at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Attention: (CFDA Number 84.395A)
550 12th Street, SW.
Room 7041, Potomac Center Plaza
Washington, DC 20202-4260

The Application Control Center accepts hand deliveries daily between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays.

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

d. Envelope requirements and receipt:

When an applicant submits its application, whether by mail or hand delivery--

(1) It must indicate on the envelope that the CFDA number of the competition under which it is submitting its application is 84.395A; and

(2) The Application Control Center will mail to the applicant a notification of receipt of the grant application. If the applicant does not receive this notification, it should call the U.S. Department of Education Application Control Center at (202) 245-6288.

In accordance with EDGAR §75.216 (b) and (c), an application will not be evaluated for funding if the applicant does not comply with all of the procedural rules that govern the submission of the application or the application does not contain the information required under the program.

XVII. APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Please use the following checklist to ensure that your application is complete.

Formatting Recommendations (page 3)

X Are all pages 8.5" x 11", on one side only, with 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides?

X Are all pages numbered?

X Is the line space set to 1.5 spacing using 12 point Times New Roman font?

Race to the Top Application Assurances (page 12)

X Is all of the requested information included on the Race to the Top Application Assurances page?

X SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the Governor or an authorized representative signed and dated the Race to the Top Application Assurances?

X SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the Chief State School Officer signed and dated the Race to the Top Application Assurances?

X SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the President of the State Board of Education signed and dated the Race to the Top Application Assurances?

State Attorney General Certification (page 13)

X SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the State Attorney General or an authorized representative signed and dated the Race to the Top Application Assurances?

Accountability, Transparency, Reporting, and Other Assurances and Certifications (pages 14-16)

X SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the Governor or his/her authorized representative signed and dated the other Assurances and Certifications?

Eligibility Requirements (page 17)

X Has the State provided explanatory information for eligibility requirement (b)? (Note that the Attorney General certification addresses this requirement, so the explanatory information is optional.)

Selection Criteria: Progress and Plans in the Four Education Reform Areas (pages 18-50)

X Has the State responded to all of the selection criteria to which it plans to respond?

X For each selection criterion to which the State is responding, has the State provided the necessary:

- ☐ Narrative response?
- ☐ Performance measures?
- ☐ Evidence?

X Has the State organized the Appendix properly such that each attachment in the appendix is described in the narrative text of the relevant selection criterion?

Competition Priorities (pages 51-54)

X [Optional] Has the State responded to all the competitive preference and invitational priorities to which it plans to respond?

Budget (see pages 56-65)

X Has the State completed the following elements of the budget?

X Budget Part I: Summary Table (page 56)

X Budget Part I: Budget Summary Narrative (page 57)

X Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table (page 58)

X Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Narrative (page 59)

X [If requested] Indirect Costs (page 64)

Application Requirements (see pages 93-94)

X Has the State fulfilled all of the application requirements?

Application Submission Procedures (pages 99-100)

X Has the State complied with the submission format requirements, including the application deadline for submission?

Appendix (page 103)

X Has the State created a table of contents for its appendix?

X Has the State included all required appendix documents per the instructions in the application, as well as any other documents it refers to in its narratives?

XVIII. APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Appendix #	**Attachment Title**	**Relevant Selection Criterion**	Page #
A-1	Title 20-A, MRSA, Section 4710, Kindergarten to Grade 12 Interventions and Title 20-A, MRSA, Section 4722, High School Diploma Standards	(A)(1)(i)	A-1.a-b
A-2	Maine Course Pathways Project Overview	(B)(3)	A-2.a
A-3	MOU - Next Generation Learning Innovation Labs Network (NxGL)	(F)(2)	A-3.a-e
A-4	MOU - Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI)	(B)(1)(i)	A-4.a-c
A-5	MOU - SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium	(B)(2)(i)	A-5. a-o
A-6	Jobs for Maine's Graduates: Program Overview	(B)(3)	A-6. a-c
A-7	Executive Order to Convene Stakeholders Group for Evaluation Models/P.L. 2009, Chapter 646 (LD 1799)	(D)(2)(ii)(iii) and (iv)	A-7.a-d
A-8	Sample - Maine Race to the Top: MOU for Participating Districts/Preliminary Scope of Work	(A)(1)(ii)	A-8.a-q
A-9	Maine DOE Organizational Chart and Key Program Descriptions	(A)(2)(i)	A-9.a-h
A-10	Letters of Support	(A)(2)(ii)	A-10.a-aj
A-11	Maine Principals' Association: 2010 Conference Agenda and Resolutions	(A)(2)(ii)	A-11.a-e
A-12	Maine Educational Assessment Results 2003-2009	(A)(3)(ii)	A-12.a-d
A-13	Subgroup Assessment Data	(A)(3)(ii)	A-13.a-d
A-14	MEA Subgroup Data	(A)(3)(ii)	A-14.a-b
A-15	Maine Achievement Data From 2003-2009: National Assessment of Educational Progress	(A)(3)(ii)	A-15.a-b
A-16	P.L. 2009, Chapter 626 (LD 1658),	(A)(3)(ii)	A-16.a-b

	High School Graduate Rate		
B-1	Proof of Participation in the New England Comprehensive Assessment Program (NECAP):	(B)(1)(i)	B-1.a
B-2	List of signatory states in CCSSI	(B)(1)(i)	B-2.a-b
B-3	Proof of Participation in Career and Technical Education Consortium of States (CTECS)	(B)(1)(i)	B-3.a-b
B-4	Self Assessment	(B)(1)(i)	B-4 a-af
B-5	P.L. 2009, Chapter 647 (LD 1800)	(B)(1)(i)	B-5.a-b
B-6	Checklist of Steps in the Rulemaking Process	(B)(1)(i)	B-6.a-d
B-7	List of states participating in SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium	(B)(2)(ii)	B-7.a
B-8	Proof of Participation in four State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS)	(B)(2)(ii)	B-8.a
B-9	Guiding Principles	(B)(3)	B-9.a-b
B-10	Early Childhood Learning Guidelines	(B)(3)	B-10.a
B-11	NGA AP Honors States Report	(B)(3)	B-11.a-h
C-1	2010 SLDS Grant Capabilities	(C)(1)	C-1.a-b
D-1	Chapter 114, Section 2.1, Unit Standard One – 19: Alternate Route Programs	(D)(1)(i)	D-1.a
D-2	Chapter 115, Native Language Provision – Part 2	(D)(1)(i)	D-2.a-bv
D-3	MDOE Teacher Quality Equity Action Plan	(D)(1)(iii)	D-3.a-q
D-4	Chapter 610: Finance Authority of Maine	(D)(1)(iii)	D-4.a-j
D-5	Title 20-A, MRSA, Section 13013-A, Salary Supplement for National Board-Certified Teachers	(D)(2)(ii)(iii) and (iv)	D-5.a
D-6	Overview of Maine's Administrator Preparation Programs	(D)(4)(ii)	D-6.a-b
D-7	Chapter 125, Section 8.08		D-7.a
E-1	Chapter 125, Sections 13 and 14	(E)(1)	E-1.a-d
E-2	Title 20-A, MRSA, Section 4502: School Approval Requirements	(E)(1)	E-2.a-c
E-3	Title 20-A, MRSA, Section 4504: Implementation and enforcement	(E)(1)	E-3.a
E-4	Title 20-A, MRSA, Section 6209-A: State Validation	(E)(1)	E-4.a
E-5	Chapter 127, Section 9.01	(E)(1)	E-5.a

E-6	Title 20-A, MRSA, Section 6210: School Assistance	(E)(1)	E-6.a
E-7	Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools and Process to Determine Eligibility	(E)(2)(i)	E-7.a-c
F-1	State Budget Evidence	(F)(1)(i)	F-1.a
F-2	P.L. 2009, Chapter 616 (LD 1801)	(F)(2)(v)	F-2.a-b
F-3	P. L. 2007, Chapter 240, Part XXXX, biennial budget	(F)(3)	F-3.a-bj
P3-1	Maine STEM Collaborative 2010 Summit Report and Plan Template	Priority Area 2	P3.1.a-o