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Race to the Top vision, theory of action, and strategy

Thank you for your participation in the Massachusetts Race to the Top (RTTT) program. The support of all 258 participating districts and charter schools was critical to the U.S. Department of Education’s decision to award RTTT funds to Massachusetts.

In its RTTT proposal, Massachusetts outlined its vision and theory of action for the next phase of education reform. If we...

- Attract, develop, and retain an effective, academically capable, diverse, and culturally proficient educator workforce;
- Provide curricular and instructional resources to educators, including resources for data use;
- Concentrate great instruction and additional supports for educators, students, and families in our lowest performing schools and their districts; and
- Increase dramatically the number of students who graduate from high school ready for college and career,

...we will increase achievement for all students and accelerate the improvement of those farthest behind.

The six strategies outlined in this RFP are each tied to this vision and theory of action and align with the commitments LEAs made when they signed on to participate in the RTTT program. The tables below outline the state’s strategic objectives and outcomes expected by the end of four years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 1: Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic objective:</strong> Every classroom in the Commonwealth will be staffed by an effective educator in schools and districts organized to support student achievement and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome measures:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase in percentage of teachers and principals rated as proficient or higher in the new educator evaluation framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other results:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A new educator evaluation framework that uses student performance as a significant factor, provides timely feedback, allows effective teachers to be recognized, and identifies those who need support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An educator workforce that is more diverse, culturally competent, and effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 2: Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic objective:</strong> Provide every educator with the tools necessary to promote and support student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome measures:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase in percentage of mathematics, science, special education, and English as a Second Language teachers rated as proficient or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improvement in measures of leadership and supports for professional practice from surveys of working conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Use of ESE-developed tool or process to evaluate the impact of professional supports

Other results:
1. Fully adopted and implemented Common Core State Standards in English language arts and mathematics
2. A fully developed new common college and career readiness system in ELA and mathematics that will be ready for implementation in the 2014–15 school year
3. A highly skilled, well-trained educator workforce that has been sufficiently prepared to implement the requirements of the Common Core State Standards
4. A new career ladder for teachers, supported through the development of endorsements to licensure for teacher-leaders

**Strategy 3: Use data to inform instruction**

Strategic objective: Provide educators with the real-time actionable data they need to meet the needs of every student

Outcome measures:
1. LEA use of the Education Data Warehouse to inform instructional decisions and improve instruction, assessment, and operations
2. Reduction in effort to complete state data reporting requirements

Other results:
1. Real-time access to student performance data for all 80,000 educators statewide
2. 25,000 educators trained in ways to use data more effectively

**Strategy 4: Increase college and career readiness**

Strategic objective: Prepare all students for success in college and career

Outcome measures:
1. Increase in percent of students with a plan on YourPlanforCollege or another college and career planning tool
2. Increase in percent of students scoring at or above the minimum entrance score on the SAT for admission to a Massachusetts public four-year college
3. Decrease in annual dropout rate
4. Increase in percent of students who have completed a Work-Based Learning Plan

Other results:
1. A college and career readiness high school course of study that is aligned with college admission requirements and available statewide
2. Six new STEM Early College High Schools
3. More than 1,000 teachers in up to 65 schools trained in pre-AP content
### Strategy 5: Develop and implement the teaching and learning system

**Strategic objective:** Provide every educator with the tools necessary to promote and support student achievement

**Outcome measures:**
1. Percent of LEA staff using model curriculum units from the state teaching and learning system
2. Percent of LEA staff using curriculum-embedded performance assessments from the state teaching and learning system
3. Percent of LEA staff using the interim/formative assessment system from the state teaching and learning system
4. Percent of LEA staff using the revised vocational-technical competency tracking system

**Other results:**
1. A new statewide teaching and learning system for all educators that will provide instructional resources and actionable data to support teacher development and academic success for all students

### Strategy 6: Turn around the lowest achieving schools

**Strategic objective:** Significantly improve the performance in the state’s lowest achieving schools and set them on a path for continued improvement

**Outcome measures:**
1. Number of Measureable Annual Goals met for student achievement, rates, college readiness, and school culture
2. Increase in student growth in Level 3 and 4 schools (both English Language Arts and mathematics)
3. Number of schools that exit out of Level 4 status

**Other results:**
1. At least 75 percent of our lowest achieving schools turned around
2. A highly skilled specialized corps of educators prepared to contribute substantially to school turnaround efforts across the state
3. Proven partners identified to support our lowest achieving schools
4. District and state capacity to prevent low achievement and to sustain progress
Overview

This document provides guidance on the requirements and options for LEAs as they implement Massachusetts RTTT program and respond to the request for proposal (RFP). Please note that throughout the document, we will refer to districts and charter schools as local education authorities (LEAs). Frequently asked questions (FAQs), program updates, and other materials are available on the RTTT website: http://www.doe.mass.edu/arra/rttt/.

The list below represents the various sections of the RFP. We encourage you to read through the entire proposal carefully, as there have been some changes since the Year 1 RFP. To go directly to any of these sections, click on the title below.

- Changes from the July 2011 Years 2 – 4 RFP
- LEA projects
- State goals and performance measures
- Timeline
- Year 2–4 process and submission requirements
- Allowable expenses
- Criteria for evaluating LEA plans and budgets
- Technical assistance
- Overview of RTTT projects available to LEAs
- Project descriptions
- Appendix I: RTTT final LEA allocations and MOU commitments as of 5/19/11
- Appendix II: Performance measures
- Appendix III: Allowable costs

Changes from the July 2011 Years 2—4 RFP

ESE has made changes to the following projects in the Years 2 – 4 RFP. All changes are shown in blue throughout the document.

- 1A – Additional examples of expected activities have been added to this project to make sure that LEAs are maximizing the use of their funds to support implementation of the educator evaluation framework.
- 2A – Allowable uses of funds have been expanded to include implementation of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards for English language learners and the purchase of devices to support implementation of online assessment through the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC). LEAs can also use their funds to support implementation of the Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS).
- 2B.2 – Information has been provided on how to contract with the vendor identified by ESE to work with LEAs on this initiative.
- 2D.3 – SEI category training has been replaced by the new SEI endorsement course that is being offered through ESE’s new Rethinking Equity and Teaching for English Language Learners (RETEL) initiative. Also, going forward, LEAs will pay the registration fees for the professional development courses offered through the DSACs directly to the vendors.
• 3B – LEAs can now use their funds to participate in two ESE sponsored initiatives, the Massachusetts Data Quality Program (MDQP) and Educator Training in Data Use (ETDU), or to contract with one of the Priority Partners that have been identified by ESE to provide training on effective data use.

• 5B/C – LEAs can now include costs related to staff participation on the MPAKS Advisory Committee.

• 6B.1 – ESE has identified the partners that it is working with to support the turnaround teacher teams and provided updated budget guidance and costs.

• 6B.2 – ESE has provided updated budget guidance and costs.

LEA projects

ESE has identified a range of projects to support the six goals of the Massachusetts RTTT program. The following tables list the projects required for all LEAs, the projects required for districts that selected the optional elements of the RTTT Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by the LEAs, and the projects that are restricted to certain LEAs. All other projects are optional. If capacity is limited, preference may be given to certain types of participants depending on the goals and intended audiences of the projects.

ESE has also provided a comprehensive table of all projects in the Overview of RTTT projects available to LEAs (see below). Please note that some projects have been deleted, some projects have been renumbered or re-categorized, and some projects have been refined or changed. The individual project descriptions provide more details on the specific district activities and requirements for each project.

Table 1. Projects required for all LEAs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Project #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Program overview</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Implement the statewide educator evaluation framework</td>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Align curriculum to Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks</td>
<td>2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.1</td>
<td>Strengthen climate, conditions and school culture: Use data and results from school surveys for decision making and change</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Implement the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)</td>
<td>3A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Districts must also complete at least one additional project of their choice from among projects 2B.2 through 2D.2.

Table 2. Projects required for LEAs that chose optional elements of the MOU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Project #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Develop and implement a plan to increase the percentage of high school graduates completing MassCore</td>
<td>4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Implement elements of the statewide teaching and learning system</td>
<td>5A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Projects required for and/or limited to certain LEAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Project #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Year 1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Pilot a model, aligned human resource system</td>
<td>This project is restricted to Attleboro, Brockton, and Revere, which were selected through a competitive RFP process.</td>
<td>1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.2</td>
<td><em>Strengthen climate, conditions and school culture:</em> Strengthen labor management relations</td>
<td>Not open to charter schools.</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.3</td>
<td><em>Strengthen climate, conditions and school culture:</em> Use ESE-identified resources to improve district governance</td>
<td>Not open to charter schools.</td>
<td>6B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.1</td>
<td><em>Strengthen skills of existing educators:</em> Participate in the superintendent induction program</td>
<td>Superintendents new to role or to the district. Not open to charter schools.</td>
<td>2I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A, 6B.1, 6B.2, 6C, 6D</td>
<td>Turn around the lowest achieving schools</td>
<td>Districts with Level 4 schools are required to choose at least one project from among those in section 6. Districts with Level 3 schools are eligible to participate in many of these projects as well. None are open to charter schools.</td>
<td>6A, 6B, 6C, 2J, 6D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEAs should carefully review their MOU commitments, as well as the ESE list of projects, and include in their plans all required projects plus those optional projects that best support their goals. LEAs are encouraged to collaborate with other participating LEAs on implementing their plans. Also, though LEAs must meet all RTTT MOU commitments to remain in the program, they are not required to pay for them solely out of RTTT funding. The application budget forms will allow LEAs to indicate that particular commitments will be met using RTTT funds, local funds, or a combination of local and RTTT funds.

The preliminary project selections LEAs made in last year’s RFP are **not binding**. LEAs may propose to participate in any projects for which they are eligible, so long as they select projects that fulfill their MOU commitments. Please read the project descriptions carefully, as some projects are closed to new participants and some projects have changed since last year’s description.

In signing the MOU, each district and charter school provided an assurance that it would negotiate over implementation of its work plan with the local collective bargaining agent. Implementing some of the projects outlined in these materials and other activities that a LEA may propose in its work plan may require collective bargaining. When this occurs, LEAs must comply with the bargaining obligations set forth in the MOU signed by ESE, the district and charter school, the school committee chair, and the local collective bargaining agent. In addition, any stipend paid to an educator represented by a local bargaining agent will be a stipend already detailed in an existing collective bargaining agreement or a stipend negotiated pursuant to RTTT activities and added to the collective bargaining agreement.

Please note that on several projects, ESE will contract with an outside vendor to help support the project. If the vendor has been identified, ESE has noted this in this guidance document. Otherwise, ESE will update the RTTT website as these vendors are identified.
Many projects make reference to stipends and other compensation items, and in a few projects might have included recommended amounts. Compensation is governed by collective bargaining agreements and any current and future amounts are subject to collective bargaining.

**State goals and performance measures**

RTTT comes with substantial accountability for results. The US Department of Education (USED) is demanding a great deal of data about the progress each RTTT state is making towards its goals, and ESE also needs timely information about the progress of implementation in LEAs to manage the program effectively statewide. As part of its RTTT application, Massachusetts set specific goals for improving outcomes and reducing gaps in student performance, high school graduation, and college enrollment by 2014. Recently, these MCAS proficiency and college readiness targets were aligned with those included in Massachusetts' Elementary and Secondary Education Act (commonly known as No Child Left Behind) approved flexibility waiver (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 4. State goals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cut the MCAS mathematics proficiency gap by 25% between 2011 and 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut the MCAS ELA proficiency gap by 25% between 2011 and 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of students who graduate from high school within four years to 80% by 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of students who graduate from high school within five years to 85% by 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of graduates who enroll in college within 16 months of high school graduation by 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce gaps in college enrollment within 16 months of high school graduation for each low performing subgroup by 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the percentage of students who have completed MassCore from 70% to 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut the MCAS mathematics proficiency gap by 25% between 2011 and 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this RFP, ESE has also set specific process and outcome measures for each RTTT project to help districts and the state assess progress toward implementation. ESE has already collected baseline, benchmark, and target date information from each district for each measure and is now collecting semi-annual progress reports from participating districts.

ESE is collecting data on many of these measures from program staff, vendors, or other existing LEA data reports. For the fewer than 20 percent of measures where data is not available from other sources, LEAs will be asked to report progress twice per year. Appendix II includes a listing of all performance measures and identifies whether the LEA or ESE is responsible for reporting on the measure.

Progress data on the state goals and all of the performance measures for each LEA are being reported in the *RTTT goals and performance measures workbook*, which is posted at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/rttt/district.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/rttt/district.html).

In addition, external evaluators have been hired to conduct in-depth evaluation of the success of specific projects. The evaluators may make implementation visits to LEAs or analyze district-level data.
collected by the state. The goal of these activities is to evaluate the implementation and early outcomes of the RTTT program. We will share the results of this work with districts as it becomes available.

**Timeline**

ESE has reviewed and approved Year 2 – 4 RTTT implementation plans for all participating LEAs. LEAs can use the amendment process to propose any changes to their plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 2011</td>
<td>Y2–4 RFP released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-June, 2011</td>
<td>New online grant management system launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June to September, 2011</td>
<td>Technical assistance workshops, webinars, and written materials posted on ESE’s website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 29, 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>First RFP application deadline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30 to August 31, 2011</td>
<td>Review period for proposals submitted by July 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31, 2011</td>
<td>RTTT award Year 1 ends for LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2011</td>
<td>RTTT award Year 2 begins for LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 30, 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>Second (and final) RFP application deadline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of September 2011</td>
<td>Expected date by which districts that apply by July 29 will have access to their funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of September 2011</td>
<td>Year 1 annual performance report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30 to October 31,</td>
<td>Review period for proposals submitted by September 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>October 30, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of November, 2011</td>
<td>Expected date by which districts that apply by September 30 will have access to their funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>Semi-annual performance report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late April/early May 2012</td>
<td>LEA budget amendments due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td>Semi-annual performance report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2012</td>
<td>RTTT award Year 2 ends for LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2012</td>
<td>RTTT award Year 3 begins for LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29, 2012</td>
<td>RTTT LEA final expenditure report due for Year 2 (60 days from the last day of Year 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2013</td>
<td>Semi-annual performance report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early April 2013</strong></td>
<td>LEA budget amendments due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Semi-annual performance report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2013</td>
<td>RTTT award Year 3 ends for LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2013</td>
<td>RTTT award Year 4 begins for LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29, 2013</td>
<td>RTTT LEA final expenditure report due for Year 3 (60 days from the last day of Year 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2013</td>
<td>Semi-annual performance report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early April 2014</td>
<td>LEA budget amendments due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Semi-annual performance report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>RTTT award ends for LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29, 2014</td>
<td>RTTT LEA final expenditure report due for Year 4 (60 days from the last day of Year 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29, 2014</td>
<td>RTTT LEA final performance report due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The list of participating LEAs, their total grant allocations, and estimated remaining grant balances at the close of fiscal year 2012 can be found here [http://www.doe.mass.edu/rttt/district.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/rttt/district.html). Please email rttt@doe.mass.edu if you see an error in ESE’s records.

**Years 2–4 process and submission requirements**

ESE is in the process of implementing a new online grants management system that supports multi-year grant applications. During fiscal year 2013 LEAs will continue to manage their grants using the Excel budget workbooks that were first developed for fiscal year 2012, while ESE runs the new system in the background. We expect that LEAs will be trained during the spring of 2013 and begin using the new system starting in fiscal year 2014. We will keep LEAs updated as we learn more and will provide additional instructions at that time. The instructions below pertain to the online grants management system.

In responding to the RFP, LEAs are required to provide narrative and budget information for each project that they plan to participate in for the remaining years of the RTTT program, including fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014. In order for RTTT to be managed as a multi-year grant, fiscal year 2012 will begin on September 1, 2011 and end on June 30, 2012; fiscal years 2013 and 2014 will begin on July 1 and end on June 30. All RTTT funds must be obligated by June 30, 2014.

The application process will consist of two parts. The first part will consist of providing project details and budget, and the second part will consist of providing performance measure baselines, benchmarks, and target dates.

The following information is a brief introduction to the application and the forms that districts and charters schools will be completing online. The technical user guide will provide a step-by-step process for completing the application and will include information on post-award reporting and amendments. Close to the two application deadlines, ESE will also conduct trainings to demonstrate how to use the new grant management tool.

- **Project Selection form**

  Each LEA’s total Years 2–4 grant allocation will be displayed on the Project Selection form. This amount reflects an estimate of available funding based on the district’s or charter school’s fiscal...
year 2011 budget. Note that these allocations might change based on final fiscal year 2011 expenditure reports, which are due 60 days after the close of the last day of the previous fiscal year. LEAs will be able to file amendments to adjust their Year 2–4 budgets following the Year 1 grant closeout period as needed.

The Project Selection form will also be pre-populated with the list of mandatory and optional projects that the LEA selected in response to the Year 1 RFP. LEAs should review these project selections. LEAs can make changes to their Year 1 selections, including unselecting projects and adding new projects, as long as program requirements are fulfilled.

The Project Selection form also includes a summary of the total grant funding that districts and charter school have allocated to each selected project, including indirect costs. Since districts will be budgeting for the remaining three years of the RTTT program, this information will facilitate completing the application. Please note that while the LEAs are asked to provide budgets for Years 2–4, only Year 2 funding will be available following approval of the proposal. Subsequent year funding will be available at the beginning of each fiscal year.

- **Program Overview Details and Budget form**
  The Program Overview Details and Budget form is a required section for all LEAs. It asks for the same information as the Project Details and Budget Form (below), but instead of pertaining to a specific project, LEAs should use this form to explain how the LEA’s improvement plan priorities and strategies align with the specific RTTT projects that the district has selected. Districts should use the budget narrative and budget fields on the Project Overview Details and Budget form to budget for overall program management costs. This form is accessed through the Project Selection form.

- **Project Details and Budget form**
  LEAs need to complete a Project Details and Budget form for each selected project. The Project Details and Budget form includes questions about how the LEA is funding its RTTT project activities, with grant funds, with other district funds, or some combination of the two. It also includes program and budget narrative questions and a budget form encompassing the remaining project years, including fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014. This form is accessed through the Project Selection form.

  Even if a LEA plans to fund a project 100 percent with resources other than the district or school’s RTTT grant, the LEA should select the project on the project selection form. While respondents will not be required to provide a budget for projects funded 100 percent with non-RTTT funds, they will need to provide a program narrative for the project.

- **Project Contacts**
  The Project Contact section of the Program Overview Details and Budget form and the Project Details and Budget form will pre-populate with the district and charter school contact that ESE has on record. LEAs should use the Project Contact section of either of the two forms to identify the right project contact for each project.

- **Total Expenditure form**
  The Total Expenditure form total all of the budgeted expenditures from the Program Overview and Project Details and Budget forms for each fiscal year. Indirect costs are also calculated on the Total Expenditure form. LEAs that are claiming indirect costs should enter their approved indirect cost rate in order to calculate the indirect cost amount.

- **Additional Project Information**

Race to the Top in Massachusetts: Guidance for responses to the Years 2–4 Request for Proposals
Some projects require LEAs to provide data in a data field format to facilitate ESE’s review of their Project Details and Budget forms and to allow for better project planning at the state level; e.g. how many teachers are attending training. LEAs will be asked to complete the Additional Project Information form, a separate form in the grants management system. The projects that will require LEAs to complete the Additional Project Information form are:

- Project 2A: Align curriculum to Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks
- Project 2C.1: Develop experienced and effective teachers as mentors
- Project 2C.2: Support teachers in earning a moderate disability special education license
- Project 2C.3: Support teachers in earning English as a Second Language license
- Project 2C.4: Expand the pipeline of effective teachers: Support National Board of Professional Teaching Standards certification for teachers
- Project 2D.1: Strengthen skills of existing educators: Participate in the superintendent induction program
- Project 2D.3: Access ESE-sponsored or -approved professional development in priority areas
- Project 3A: Create near-real-time access to date in the Education Data Warehouse by implementing the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)
- Project 3C: Provide feedback to guide the development of new data systems and tools
- Project 4D: Participate in pre-AP training for middle or high school teacher teams
- Project 5A-D: Implement elements of the statewide teaching and learning system

**Information and Affirmation**
This section includes standard state-required information and affirmation statements that district and charter schools verify when submitting grants to the state.

- **Governance statement**
  By checking the box next to the governance statement on the signature page, the superintendent or the charter school leader certifies that he or she collaborated with the school committee chair and union leader (or equivalent roles), as required by the initial RTTT MOU, to develop the district and charter schools RTTT work plan and that the LEA has provided a copy of the Y2–4 RFP and the entire district response to the school committee chair and union leader (or equivalent roles).

- **Signature page**
  Mail two copies of the signature page, each with the superintendent’s or charter school leader’s original signature, to:

  Cheryl Clinch  
  Office of Planning and Research  
  Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
  75 Pleasant St.  
  Malden, MA 02148
• Performance Measures form

ESE is using its new online grants management system to track each LEA’s progress toward meeting its RTTT implementation goals. LEAs will need to report on performance measures as part of ESE’s monitoring of grant activities. The performance measure reports will help ESE track each LEA’s progress toward meeting the goals of each project and to satisfy USED RTTT program reporting requirements.

Performance measures have been defined for all projects, and all performance measures are listed on the Performance Measures form. In response to the Years 2–4 RFP, LEAs will be required to set baseline and target measures and target dates for some of the measures; for others, ESE will provide the relevant data. Appendix II includes a listing of all performance measures and identifies whether the LEA or ESE is responsible for reporting on the measure.

In addition to the required measures that ESE has established, LEAs also have the ability to define an additional two performance measures on their own. LEAs that decide to create their own measures will need to define each aspect of the measure, including: the measure type, the benchmark type (technical implementation or evidence of change), a baseline measure, a target/benchmark measure and target date. ESE will not track progress toward meeting self-defined performance measures. ESE will only review the mandatory measures that LEAs are required to submit.

Additional training on how to complete these forms and how to use the performance measurement system to focus and drive implementation will be available as part of ESE’s regional RFP workshops and webinars to be held throughout the summer.

Allowable expenses

LEAs may expend RTTT resources on costs directly associated with implementing any of the projects listed in this RFP. Each project description lists examples of likely allowable expenses associated with that project, but those lists should not be considered exclusive.

Because RTTT is meant to foster change in current district and charter school practices, ESE in general will not approve expenditures through RTTT that substitute for current expenditures or budget cut decisions. Exceptions may be made under very limited circumstances with substantial justification. LEAs that would like to be considered for an exception should provide a detailed justification in the appropriate Project Details and Budget form(s).

ESE will also carefully review budgets that include instructional coaching, technology hardware, and transportation costs to ensure that these costs directly support implementation of a RTTT project.

Criteria for evaluating LEA plans and budget

ESE will review the LEA RTTT proposals and budgets according to the following criteria:

• LEA plans are anchored in its improvement plan priorities and in the state plan and goals;
• Plans are ambitious yet achievable given available resources;
• All required commitments are met, using RTTT allocations and/or local funds;
• Budget is appropriate for planned activities; costs are allowable per federal requirements and regulations and state policies, including project-specific restrictions;
• All required information is provided, both for the overall RTTT application and for the specific projects the district has chosen; and
• Proposal is complete and ESE has received the required signature page.
Each proposal will be rated as Approved if the response is clear and complete and provides evidence that the criterion is met; and Not Approved if the response is incomplete or missing or provides limited evidence that the criterion is met.

ESE will request clarification or revision of proposals from LEAs for which proposals are rated as Not Approved on some or all criteria. This may delay fund availability. Prompt reporting, completion of performance benchmarks, and progress towards meeting outcome measures will be a requirement for grant continuance in future years.

**Technical assistance**

Throughout the summer of 2011, ESE will hold a number of regional technical assistance workshops to provide an overview of LEA requirements and guidance for completing the RTTT proposal. The workshops will also include training on how to use the performance measurement system to help LEAs reach their goals. ESE will offer webinars near each application due date to provide assistance on the logistics of completing the grant application forms.

The dates, times, and location of these workshops are being finalized and will be provided to all LEAs in a separate communication. In addition, all presentation materials from training sessions and webinars will be posted on ESE’s website. ESE encourages all district and charter school stakeholders to attend these sessions, including union and school committee leadership and representatives from both central office and school-based staff.
# Summary of Race to the Top projects available to LEAs

## Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number and name of project</td>
<td>Indicates whether a project is required (mandatory) and for whom</td>
<td>Indicates which LEAs are eligible to participate</td>
<td>Identifies whether a project has an additional selection process and what it is</td>
<td>Years (Yrs) in which the project is active. “Yrs 2–4” indicates participation is required in ALL years.</td>
<td>Projects marked “Yes” offer state cost-sharing, usually via a competitive RFP</td>
<td>This is the Year 1 RFP project number. Some numbers have changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Project summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Program Overview</td>
<td>Mandatory for all LEAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improve teacher and principal effectiveness

1A Implement the statewide educator evaluation framework | Mandatory for all LEAs | No | N/A | Yrs 2–4 | No | 1A |

1B Pilot a model, aligned human resource system | Closed to new participants | Restricted to Attleboro, Brockton, and Revere | Closed | Yrs 2–4 | Yes | 1B |

### Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom

2A Align curriculum to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks | Mandatory for all LEAs | No | N/A | Beginning in Y2 or 3 until complete | No | 2A |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2B.1  <em>Strengthen climate, conditions and school culture:</em> Use data and results from school surveys for decision making and change</td>
<td>Mandatory for all LEAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2B.2  *Strengthen climate, conditions and school culture:* Strengthen labor management relations | All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2 | If demand exceeds capacity  
*Not open to charter schools* | Priority will be given to Level 3 or 4 districts | Any or all of Years 2–4 | No | 2B       |
| 2B.3  *Strengthen climate, conditions and school culture:* Use ESE-identified resources to improve district governance | All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2 | If demand exceeds capacity  
*Not open to charter schools* | Priority will be given to Level 3 or 4 districts | Any or all of Years 2–4 | No | 6B       |
<p>| 2C.1  <em>Expand the pipeline of effective teachers:</em> Develop experienced and effective teachers as mentors | All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2 | Year 2 course enrollment limited to 90 mentors (30 per region) and 3 regions. | Year 2 (2011–12) will be a pilot year and priority will be given to LEAs signing up STEM, ESL, and/or special education mentor teachers. During Years 3 and 4 enrollment will be extended to all regions. | Any or all of Years 2–4 | No | 2C       |
| 2C.2  <em>Expand the pipeline of effective teachers:</em> Support teachers in earning a moderate disabilities special education license | All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2 | If demand exceeds capacity, will only be available to teachers working with a waiver | Priority will be given to LEAs with demonstrated low capacity to educate students with moderate disabilities or with a high number of teachers on waiver | Any or all of Years 2–4 | Yes | 2F       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2C.3</strong> <em>Expand the pipeline of effective teachers: Support teachers in earning an English as a Second Language license</em></td>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>If demand exceeds capacity, will only be available to teachers working with a waiver</td>
<td>Priority will be given to LEAs with demonstrated low capacity to support English Language Learner (ELL) students or with a high number of teachers on waivers</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2C.4</strong> <em>Expand the pipeline of effective teachers: Support National Board of Professional Teaching Standards certification for teachers</em></td>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>If demand exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Priority to teachers in Level 3 or 4 schools and special education, ESL and STEM teachers</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>This project is supported by a federal formula grant that subsidizes costs for certification or exam retakes.</td>
<td>2G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2D.1</strong> <em>Strengthen skills of existing educators: Participate in the superintendent induction program</em></td>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>Yes <em>Not open to charter schools.</em></td>
<td>Superintendents new to the role or to the district.</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2D.2</strong> <em>Strengthen skills of existing educators: Participate in National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training for principals</em></td>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Beginning in Years 2 or 3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2D.3</strong> <em>Strengthen skills of existing educators: Access ESE-sponsored or approved professional development in priority areas</em></td>
<td>Optional <em>Note: This project does not meet the MOU commitment in this area.</em></td>
<td>If demand exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Priority will be given to Level 3 and 4 districts and to teachers on waivers or with preliminary license</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use data to inform instruction</strong></td>
<td>Mandatory for all LEAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Beginning in any of Years 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Selection Process</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Supplemental Grants</td>
<td>Y1 RFP #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access ESE-sponsored or approved professional development on using data to improve instruction</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide feedback to guide the development of new data systems and tools</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase college and career readiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a plan to increase the percentage of high school graduates completing MassCore</td>
<td>Required for LEAs that committed to this MOU area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement YourPlanforCollege: Get Ready for Life After High School</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>If demands exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Priority will be given to Level 3 and 4 districts</td>
<td>Any of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in pre-AP training for middle and high school teacher teams</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a STEM-focused Early College High School (ECHS)</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>Yes (awarded spring 2011)</td>
<td>4E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement an Innovation School</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Help develop and use a statewide teaching and learning system</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement one or more components of the statewide teaching and learning system</td>
<td>Required for LEAs that committed to this MOU area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate on the committee to develop model curriculum units and curriculum-embedded performance assessments (CEPAs)</td>
<td>Closed to new members</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LEAs that appointed members to the Advisory Committee in Year 1</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5B and 5C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Selection Process</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Supplemental Grants</td>
<td>Y1 RFP #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>Participate on an advisory committee to develop online formative and interim assessments</td>
<td>Closed to new members</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LEAs that appointed members to the Advisory Committee in Year 1</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>Implement an improved competency tracking system for vocational technical students</td>
<td>Closed to new members</td>
<td>Yes for committee membership. See the project description for additional non-restricted opportunities.</td>
<td>LEAs that appointed members to the Advisory Committee in Year 1</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turn around the lowest achieving schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Use ESE-identified turnaround partners to address essential conditions (&quot;Priority Partners&quot;)</td>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts with Level 3 or 4 schools are eligible; priority will be given to Level 4 schools</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B.1</td>
<td>Hire from the new cadre of turnaround teacher teams</td>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts with Level 3 or 4 schools are eligible</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 3–4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B.2</td>
<td>Hire from the new cadre of turnaround leaders and leadership teams</td>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts with Level 3 or 4 schools are eligible</td>
<td>Any of all of Years 3–4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Participate in a network for principals of high need schools</td>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts with Level 3 or 4 schools are eligible</td>
<td>To commence no later than summer 2012</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>Implement a wraparound zone</td>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts that have been approved to implement a wraparound zone through the competitive grant program are eligible</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEA project descriptions

Race to the Top vision and theory of action
If we…

- Attract, develop, and retain an effective, academically capable, diverse, and culturally proficient educator workforce;
- Provide curricular and instructional resources to educators, including resources for data use;
- Concentrate great instruction and additional supports for educators, students, and families in our lowest performing schools and their districts; and
- Increase dramatically the number of students who graduate from high school ready for college and career,

…we will increase achievement for all students and accelerate the improvement of those farthest behind.

Strategies

1. Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance
2. Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom
3. Use data to inform instruction
4. Increase college and career readiness
5. Develop and implement a teaching and learning system
6. Turn around the lowest achieving schools
Program overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory for all LEAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

In the program overview, LEAs should briefly describe their local improvement plans and gaps between those plans and the state’s RTTT goals. They should demonstrate how their chosen RTTT activities help meet both local improvement priorities and state RTTT goals.

Expected LEA activities

- LEAs are required to participate in mandatory projects and select other projects as they align with their overall reform strategy.
- LEAs will be required to report progress on the overall program and for each selected project.
- All LEAs must ensure that an individual has been named to oversee and take responsibility for RTTT implementation. This person will serve as the main point of contact for ESE.
- External evaluators are evaluating some LEA projects, which may potentially result in data collection in LEAs such as surveys, interviews, and focus groups. LEAs will need to respond as required for these evaluations.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

LEAs should describe in the Program Overview Details and Budget form how the mandatory and optional projects the LEA has selected will all help the LEA advance and achieve their local goals.

Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs may choose to budget up to 2 percent of their total allocation to overall program oversight and project management. Such costs might include salary support or a stipend for a program or project manager to coordinate the LEA’s RTTT activities, or for training or consulting on project management and implementation strategies. Other direct costs of implementing RTTT that cannot be assigned to a single project may also be included.
Strategy 1: Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance

Strategic objective: Every classroom in the Commonwealth will be staffed by an effective educator in schools and districts organized to support student achievement and success

Outcome measures:
1. Increase in percentage of teachers and principals rated as proficient or higher in the new educator evaluation framework

Other results:
1. A new educator evaluation framework that uses student performance as a significant factor, provides timely feedback, allows effective teachers to be recognized, and identifies those who need support
2. An educator workforce that is more diverse, culturally competent, and effective

Projects
• 1A: Implement the statewide educator evaluation framework
• 1B: Pilot a model, aligned human resource system
Project 1A: Implement the statewide educator evaluation framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory for all LEAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

All LEAs must participate in this project to design and implement an effective evaluation system for administrators and teachers aligned to a new state framework for educator evaluation. Proposed regulations on educator evaluation are posted at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/proposed/p603cmr35.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/proposed/p603cmr35.pdf). The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education are expected to approve the final regulations in June 2011.

ESE is currently in the process of creating a model evaluation system based on the proposed regulations. The first components of the model system will be made available to LEAs to adapt and adopt starting this summer. LEAs may also elect to create their own evaluation system aligned to the regulations.

The key goals of the state evaluation system, as well as of any LEA-designed system, will be to:

- Ensure an active role for educators in their own evaluation;
- Provide more meaningful feedback on performance;
- Differentiate the evaluation process for career stage and performance;
- Incorporate multiple measures of student growth and learning as a significant part of the evaluation process for everyone; and
- Develop a shared LEA- and state-wide understanding of effective leadership and teaching practice

The model evaluation will incorporate the following design features:

- 4 standards with core indicators;
- 4 performance ratings;
- 3 categories of evidence, including multiple measures of student learning, growth and achievement; and feedback from students, parents and (for administrators) staff;
- 5-step evaluation cycle, starting with educator self-reflection and goal setting; and
- Differentiated evaluation paths and development/growth/improvement plans differentiated by career stage and performance;

Key components of the model evaluation system when it is fully developed will be:

- Contract language describing process, timelines, and collection of evidence;
- A rubric for each standard and indicator that describes professional practice vividly and clearly at four levels of performance and is differentiated for different roles, e.g., classroom teacher, caseload teacher, counselor, central office administrator;
- Templates for self-assessments, plans, and goals;

---

1 The proposed regulations are currently in the public comment phase. The model system will conform to the requirements in the final regulations to be adopted by the Board in late June 2011.
• Models or guidelines for developing and using multiple measures of student learning, growth and achievement; and
• Examples of ways to collect and use student, staff, and parent feedback (initially for administrators)

Expected LEA activities

All LEAs in Massachusetts will need to adopt an evaluation system for teachers and administrators based on the new state regulations according to the following schedule:

• All Level 4 schools (only those designated in 2010): **By fall 2011** for implementation in SY11-12
• All RTTT LEAs (including the remaining schools in Level 4 districts): **By fall 2012** for implementation in SY12-13
• All remaining LEAs in Massachusetts (non-RTTT LEAs): **By fall 2013** for implementation in SY13–14

Listed below are some of the key activities LEAs will need to do for planning and implementation of a new evaluation system. Some of these activities could require different sequencing based on the LEA’s implementation plan; and other activities, such as collective bargaining, might be iterative. The timing of these activities should align with the implementation dates above.

• Form an Evaluation Implementation Working Group comprised of labor and management to develop an implementation strategy and timetable. The Working Group is not meant to replace any existing LEA labor-management team already in place that could undertake implementation planning and execution.
• Ensure widespread educator understanding of the new regulations and principles of educator evaluation.
• Analyze the regulations, current evaluation practices, and the model system to determine what changes, if any, will be required.
• As needed, enter into collective bargaining to determine changes, whether to adopt the model evaluation system without modification, adapt the model evaluation system or create the LEA’s own evaluation system that aligns with the regulations. ESE will provide additional guidance concerning collective bargaining related to educator evaluation once new regulations are adopted. Please note that LEAs not using the model evaluation will need to submit the details of their proposed evaluation system, including standards and procedures, to ESE for review prior to implementation.
• Develop the new educator evaluation implementation plan, including identifying and planning for obstacles that might hinder implementation.
• Provide professional development to educators and evaluators on how to use the new evaluation system.
• Implement the new evaluation system.
• Assess the progress of implementing the new evaluation system, and refine as appropriate.
• **Identify, develop, and pilot district-determined measures**
• **Launch implementation of staff and student surveys in 2013-2014**
• **Invest in technology to support implementation of the 5-step evaluation cycle**
• Provide additional evaluator training through approved vendors to hone skills such as inter-rater reliability

In order to assist LEAs with the implementation of the new evaluation system, ESE will sponsor regional information and working group sessions and interactive webinars. ESE will provide other tools and supports based on LEA feedback and with the assistance of one or more vendors. ESE will keep LEAs apprised of any activities and additional supports to help ensure successful educator evaluation implementation.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. LEAs will be able to allocate costs to develop or adapt and implement a new educator evaluation system aligned with the regulations. There may be costs to learn about the new regulations, bargain on this issue, develop new policies and practices, and provide training and professional development to teachers, administrators, and evaluators.

LEAs will need to support the cost of the new evaluation system in the future, so RTTT funds should support one-time costs of transitioning to the new system. Allowable costs include stipends and travel for administrative and instructional staff and consultants as well as other direct costs. Costs to purchase computers are not allowed. However, technology costs to implement an online educator evaluation system, such as an online performance management system, or observation tools such as a 360o camera and walk-through data collection, are allowed.
Project 1B: Pilot a model, aligned human resource system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed to new participants</td>
<td>Restricted to Attleboro, Brockton, and Revere</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

This project is restricted to Attleboro, Brockton, and Revere. These three districts were selected through a separate competitive RFP process.

The purpose of the Human Resources (HR) Pilot Project is to support more efficient, effective, and supportive comprehensive HR systems in school districts. The HR Pilot Project is aligned with multiple goals of Massachusetts’ RTTT plan, including increasing educator effectiveness and addressing the equitable distribution of educators. The HR Pilot Project was developed through a partnership between the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) and the Working Group for Educator Excellence (WGEE). Additional information about WGEE may be found at: [http://teachers21.org/public-policy-and-discourse/working-group-for-educator-excellence/](http://teachers21.org/public-policy-and-discourse/working-group-for-educator-excellence/).

ESE intends to use the HR Pilots to identify the most effective HR redesign strategies for improving educator performance and to identify model HR systems that can be replicated elsewhere. The HR Pilot Project is fundamentally a research project; the final selection of the three participating districts has been driven by the needs of the research design and made in coordination with ESE’s research collaborators.

The HR Pilot Project will be supported by work related to the implementation of the State’s new evaluation regulatory framework. In addition, it is possible that the HR Pilot Project may connect to the following projects: school climate, conditions and culture; expanding effective preparation programs; and potentially lessons learned from the state’s Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) project.

**Expected LEA activities**

ESE will contact those districts working on this project in order to offer guidance for the budgets for Years 2–4. Efforts under this program will commence in Year 2. By the end of the project, a model HR system will be available for other LEAs to use and adapt.

Participating districts will be asked to resubmit their budgets and work plans annually. During that time, ESE will use the feedback from the research vendor and Teachers21 (T21) to evaluate the program outcomes. The assumption is that districts will follow their plans, while making slight adjustments due to the results of the planning year.

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative section of the Project Details form, the three districts selected should explain their plans for the project.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

Throughout the project, ESE will receive regular updates from T21 and the research vendor to identify preliminary lessons that may be shared with others LEAs, and to adjust the scope of services of the three districts request in their annual budget amendments.
Strategy 2: Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom

Strategic objective: Provide every educator with the tools necessary to promote and support student achievement

Outcome measures:

1. Increase in percentage of mathematics, science, special education, and English as a Second Language teachers rated as proficient or higher
2. Improvement in measures of leadership and supports for professional practice from surveys of working conditions
3. Use of ESE-developed tool or process to evaluate the impact of professional supports

Other results:

1. Fully adopted and implemented Common Core State Standards in English language arts and mathematics
2. A fully developed new common college and career readiness system in ELA and mathematics that will be ready for implementation in the 2014–15 school year
3. A highly skilled, well-trained educator workforce that has been sufficiently prepared to implement the requirements of the Common Core State Standards
4. A new career ladder for teachers, supported through the development of endorsements to licensure for teacher-leaders

Projects

- 2A: Align curriculum to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks
- 2B: Strengthen climate, conditions, and school culture
  - 2B.1: Use data and results from school surveys for decision-making and change
  - 2B.2: Strengthen labor-management relations
  - 2B.3: Use ESE-identified resources to improve district governance
- 2C: Expand the pipeline of effective teachers
  - 2C.1: Develop experienced and effective teachers as mentors
  - 2C.2: Support teachers in earning a moderate disabilities special education license
  - 2C.3: Support teachers in earning an English as a Second Language education license
  - 2C.4: Support National Board of Professional Teaching Standards certification for teachers
- 2D: Strengthen skills of existing educators
  - 2D.1: Participate in the superintendent induction program
  - 2D.2: Participate in the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) program
  - 2D.3: Access ESE-sponsored or approved professional development in priority areas
### Project 2A: Align curriculum to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory for all LEAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Beginning in Y2 or 3 until complete</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project description

All LEAs are expected to have aligned their local curriculum with the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy (incorporating the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects) and the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for Mathematics (incorporating the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics) by the beginning of the 2013–14 school year. LEAs participating in RTTT will receive an orientation to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and resources to help them do this work.

The 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks provide grade-level standards that are expected to improve consistency of teaching and increase rigor in some areas. These outcomes may be captured at the local level during project evaluation. LEAs may see increases in teacher effectiveness or measures of high quality teaching. Ultimately, this project is expected to build the capacity of LEAs to improve student achievement in mathematics and ELA and to reduce achievement gaps.

ESE is expanding the scope of this project to allow districts to use their RTTT funding to support implementing the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards for ELL students as well as to prepare for the rollout of online assessment through the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC) by making necessary investments in technology. LEAs can also use their funds to support implementation of the Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS).

In May 2012, Massachusetts joined the WIDA Consortium as part of a larger initiative to improve academic outcomes for ELL students, the Rethinking Equity and Teaching (RETT) initiative. WIDA provides a rigorous system of standards and assessments to promote academic language development for ELL students across core content areas: language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. The WIDA ELD standards provide tools and resources to help teachers ensure ELs can interact with the rigorous expectations of the 2011 Massachusetts ELA and Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks in ways appropriate to their level of English language proficiency. These standards also support ELs’ literacy development across content areas, one of the key instructional shifts in the Common Core State Standards.

Massachusetts is a member of PARCC, one of two multi-state consortia funded by the U.S. Department of Education to develop the next generation of student assessments. PARCC is developing these assessments to be delivered online, enabling innovative items that are able to capture aspects of student performance beyond the reach of even the best current paper-and-pencil assessments. Online assessments, however, will challenge the technology infrastructure capacity of many school districts in PARCC member states. ESE would like to leverage available RTTT dollars to support LEAs prepare to implement the PARCC by purchasing devices needed to support online assessment as long as the LEA has made substantial progress in aligning their curriculum with the Curriculum Frameworks. Also, while technology enablement will help with online assessment readiness, devices should not be purchased solely for the purpose of online assessments but also to create rich digital learning opportunities that will engage students.

The Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on system structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the
It was developed to help guide the establishment of a system that provides high-quality core educational experiences in a safe and supportive learning environment for all students and targeted interventions/supports for students who experience academic and/or behavioral difficulties and students who have already demonstrated mastery of the concept and skills being taught.

**Expected LEA activities**

*Curriculum alignment:*

LEAs will nominate a team of six classroom teachers, curriculum coordinators, principals and/or central office leadership to attend six half-day sessions that will orient them to the new standards and provide them with resources to help LEAs align their curriculum to the new Common Core State Standards. It is strongly recommended that classroom teachers be included on the team since teachers typically complete curriculum maps. Topics of the six sessions may also include updates on content frameworks and pilot assessments aligned to the standards to be provided by the assessment consortium to which Massachusetts belongs, PARCC. Sessions are expected to be held at the regional Readiness Centers or DSACs. This team is expected to take a leadership role in aligning existing curriculum maps, guidelines, and materials for parents and guardians with the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and other standards documents as they are revised.

LEAs are required to send a team to training and to report on progress, but the state will not be reviewing curriculum mapping, etc.

In addition, LEAs may also undertake other local activities to align their curricula to the new Curriculum Frameworks, such as convening teacher teams to work on curriculum alignment.

*WIDA implementation:*

LEAs participating in RTTT can use RTTT funds to support integration of the WIDA ELD Standards along with implementation of the Curriculum Frameworks in several ways:

1. **Fund WIDA professional development opportunities for district staff.** LEAs can use funds to access training provided by the WIDA Consortium, including workshops and academies on differentiation, developing curriculum and lesson plans integrating the WIDA standards, and increasing collaboration between content area and ESL teachers. LEAs can contact the WIDA Consortium directly to coordinate workshops in their district, see [http://www.wida.us/ProfessionalDev/](http://www.wida.us/ProfessionalDev/).

2. **Purchase additional WIDA standards and assessment material.** Most WIDA materials can be downloaded for free from the WIDA online download library. However, the consortium also offers additional assessment tools and support materials available for purchase, including the WIDA Model screening assessment, ACCESS training DVD, CAN DO Descriptor and Standards booklets.

3. **Fund opportunities for content area and ESL teachers to collaborate on developing curricula that integrates the WIDA standards.** Integrating the new WIDA standards will require common effort and approach from both ESL and content area teachers. Although the WIDA standards provide useful tools and resources, they are not a scope and sequence for language development classes as the previous ELP standards (ELPBOs) were. Additionally, the new WIDA standards include language development across content areas, which means LEAs’ math, science, and social studies curricula will also require additional revision. LEAs can support this work by providing release time, stipends, and ensuring educators have common planning and curriculum writing time. Supporting collaborative conversations
between content area and ESL teachers ensures LEA curricula are designed in a way that addresses the global needs of ELLs in their specific context.

4. **Fund training opportunities for teachers to acquire collaborative leadership skills so enable them to facilitate local and regional in-person and online professional learning communities (PLC’s).**

5. **Encourage teachers to participate in ESE-sponsored WIDA trainings.** ESE will fund the delivery of these trainings, though LEAs may incur costs for stipends, substitutes, and travel.

**PARCC readiness:** The requirements for using RTTT funds to purchase technology devices to support PARCC online assessment are:

1. **Progress on curriculum alignment.** LEA must have made significant progress on aligning its curriculum with the Curriculum Frameworks before dedicating grant funds to purchase technology devices. Participation in Project 5A is not required but preferred.

2. **Infrastructure readiness.** The LEA must have a network infrastructure and policies in place to support the deployment of technology devices. LEAs should use the PARCC Technology Readiness Tool (TRT), LEA Technology Plan, and Digital Learning survey results to assess infrastructure readiness. LEAs may **NOT** use RTTT funds to invest in network infrastructure.

3. **Device readiness.** LEAs can only purchase devices that meet the PARCC minimum requirements, see [http://www.parcconline.org/technology](http://www.parcconline.org/technology). ESE recommends devices that are mobile and can easily be accessed in multiple areas throughout the school. Netbooks and tablets (iPad mini screen size is too small) are mobile and preferred for LEAs with wireless networks.

4. **Mobile device management.** LEAs may use RTTT funds to purchase device management systems. But, LEAs must demonstrate they have the right infrastructure in place before using RTTT funds to invest in mobile device management solutions (see Infrastructure Readiness).

5. **Professional development.** When procuring technology devices, ESE strongly recommends that LEAs include professional development on the setup and use of the tools as part of the device purchasing agreement. The professional development can be provided by the hardware vendor, a third party vendor, or delivered by the LEA. Professional development on creating digital curriculum using Edwin or other digital tools is preferred along with setup and use of the devices and acceptable use policies. LEAs may use the ESE tri-state rubric as part of the professional development.

6. **Device usage.** LEAs should indicate in their budget narratives which grade(s) and curriculum standards will be covered using the devices. LEAs are also strongly encouraged to consider the device end of life policy as recommended by the device manufacturer to ensure ample planning for device replacement in the future.

**MTSS implementation:**

LEAs should use their RTTT funding to work toward an integrated approach to support students’ academic and social-emotional competencies. All students should receive academic instruction and behavioral supports that include differentiation and extension activities and are guided by the three Universal Design for Learning principles (multiple means of representation, multiple means of action and expressions, and multiple means of engagement).
The MTSS blueprint describes the flexible tiers (see http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/blueprint/), academic and non-academic core components, and school and district system of supports. The flexible tiers represent a robust and responsive educational environment that provides students with a continuum of multiple supports to meet their needs. The tiers represent increasing intensity of academic and non-academic support and interventions. There is flexibility of the system and the programming to allow movement between the tiers (to both a more or less intensive type of support/intervention).

What to include in the RFP response

In the narrative, for activities related to curriculum alignment, LEAs should include information on the curriculum used for pre-K through grade 3 reading, writing, and language development, grades 6-8 mathematics, Algebra 1, writing in the content areas, ELL, and special education. In addition, LEAs should provide feedback in the narrative on the specific curriculum areas that are of most interest to LEAs in order to help the state plan effective information sessions and supports.

For activities related to WIDA implementation, LEAs should describe how they will use RTTT funds to support implementation of the new WIDA standards, through professional development, common planning time, and leadership development. Allowable expenses include salaries, stipends, contractual services, travel, and supplies and materials.

PARCC implementation costs should describe the type and quantity of devices that will be purchased, confirmation that they meet the PARCC minimum standards, a description of how the devices will be used to implement the Curriculum Frameworks and PARCC, and a description of the professional development that will be provided to support rollout of the devices.

Activities related to implementing the MTSS should be geared to meet the needs of all learners and help schools address the use of the standards with English language learners, advanced learners, and students with disabilities.

Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. LEAs should budget costs to pay for teams to attend the six state-sponsored sessions; allowable expenses include travel, substitutes, and stipends. In addition, LEAs may allocate costs for local alignment work sessions addressing the Curriculum Frameworks as well as WIDA and MTSS implementation, including substitutes, stipends and supplies. Salary support for district staff to manage the alignment process is allowable. Consultants are allowed only to the extent that they are directly involved in working with LEA staff on the alignment project. With the exception of WIDA standards and assessment materials, purchasing curriculum, curriculum training, or instruction or assessment materials or software is not allowable. Purchasing devices to support implementation of the Curriculum Frameworks and PARCC is allowed in keeping with the guidelines provided in this section.
Project 2B.1: Strengthen climate, conditions, and school culture: Use data and results from surveys for decision making and change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory for all LEAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

The goal of this project is to work collaboratively within the LEA to improve the climate, conditions and school culture. Teacher retention and effectiveness is strengthened when teachers and administrators identify areas for improvement on the basis of evidence and work together collaboratively to resolve them.

To help inform decisions on the most pressing areas requiring special attention, LEAs will use data and results from a high quality survey of school climate and working conditions. Working collaboratively, LEA administrators and when applicable, their union leaders, will identify at least one issue to address. Together, they will develop an agreement about the process to be used in developing a plan for addressing it, including benchmarks of progress.

To facilitate the work on this project, ESE will administer the Massachusetts Teaching, Learning, and Leading Survey (Mass TeLLS) twice over the next three years. (LEAs with a history of administering a different survey may propose to use their own; see details below.) Mass TeLLS, first administered in Massachusetts in the spring of 2008, provides all licensed in-school educators across the Commonwealth the opportunity to anonymously report their thoughts on teaching and learning conditions within their respective schools. Mass TeLLS can be a powerful tool for identifying starting points for strengthening climate, conditions, and culture in a LEA.

ESE is working with the New Teacher Center (NTC) at the University of California to administer the Mass TeLLS survey, analyze the results and provide reports to schools, districts, and ESE. ESE will work with NTC to administer the survey in the fall of 2011 and again in fall of 2013 and make the results available to all districts and schools, along with technical assistance in the form of a facilitator manual.

Expected LEA activities

- Participate in the Mass TeLLS survey in the fall of 2011 and the fall of 2013.
  - LEAs with a history of using a comparable survey for a similar purpose may seek a waiver in the narrative of the Project Budget and Details form from ESE to substitute a different survey. ESE must approve the survey and, if approved, LEAs must submit a summary of their in-house survey’s findings in an agreed-upon format.
- During winter 2011 through spring of 2012, LEA administrators and union leaders (where applicable) are expected to use the survey to identify at least one issue to address and agree on the process to develop a plan for addressing it and the benchmarks to be used in assessing progress. LEAs may use these RTTT funds to support this collaborative engagement. However, LEAs are discouraged from using RTTT funding for costly program initiatives that cannot be sustained after RTTT resources end.
- Before the end of Year 2 of the grant (by June 2012), LEAs will report to ESE through the new online grants management system on the progress toward developing an action plan. This report will be a requirement for seeking the renewal of RTTT funds in Years 3 and 4.
- LEAs may propose to do work in just one year or over multiple years. They may propose a plan to address the same issue over several years or focus on different issues in different years.
What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies, including how the LEA intends to address the survey results and when. The results of the surveys that are administered in the fall of 2011 and the fall of 2013 will not be available to LEAs until the beginning of the next calendar year. LEA work plans should reflect this.

If an LEA wishes to use an alternate survey, it should request a waiver in the Project Details and Budget form. The request should include:

- The name of the proposed alternate survey tool and, preferably, a link to more information about the survey instrument;
- A description of how long and how frequently the alternate survey has been administered in the LEA;
- An explanation of how the survey is comparable to Mass TeLLS, particularly the leadership and supports for professional practice measures; and
- Details on when the LEA intends to implement the survey. The LEA survey must be administered at least twice during the next three years to qualify.

Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. There is no cost to the LEA for the Massachusetts TeLLS survey, detailed reports of district and school results and findings, or the facilitator manual. Project costs are restricted to those associated with convening the LEA management (and when applicable, union leadership team) to identify the issue raised by the survey, to propose solutions, and to monitor impact. If a LEA believes that there are significant unaccounted costs to participate in the Mass TeLLS survey, it should identify these costs in the budget and justify their inclusion in the budget narrative.

Costs of administering alternate surveys are **not** allowable, as this would be supplanting: only districts previously administering other surveys are eligible for waivers.

As specified above, the survey will be administered in the fall of 2011 and the fall of 2013. Results from these surveys should be available in the early part of 2012 and 2014, and the budget should align accordingly.
**Project 2B.2: Strengthen climate, conditions and school culture: Strengthen labor management relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>If demand exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Priority will be given to Level 3 and 4 school districts</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

Together with the superintendent, the school committee creates a culture of collaboration and develops contracts and agreements that encourage all stakeholders to work together to support higher levels of student achievement. District superintendents and union leaders often need assistance to establish more effective ways to collaborate, identify shared interests and overcome differences in ways that maintain a shared focus on improving student learning. Toward this end, ESE is supporting the District Capacity Project (DCP), an initiative of the newly formed Massachusetts Education Partnership (MEP), to help establish and guide labor-management teams as they collaborate to:

- Advance student achievement and success;
- Increase teacher engagement and leadership in school and district governance; and
- Develop and sustain more effective policies, structures and practices.

An expert facilitator with deep experience in interest-based process, team-building, and leadership development will work onsite with labor management teams to develop and, dependent on project scope, pursue action plans to improve education outcomes in a specific area of work chosen by the district. Additional coaching from content experts will be made available as needed on issues ranging from educator evaluation to school innovation to interest-based bargaining practices.

District participation in activities proposed by the labor management assistance teams will be monitored. Teachers, principals, administrators and others are expected to develop skills that spread, helping their systems to cultivate leaders and engage in sustainable strategies that improve district labor relations. Successful implementation is expected to improve school climate and teacher/principal effectiveness, and help the district keep its focus on improving student learning.

**Expected district activities**

For more information, districts which have indicated their intent to participate should contact project co-managers Tim Fitzgerald at mutualgain@aol.com or 207-332-0899 OR Andrew Bundy at abundy@communitymatters.net or 617-823-9144. ESE will monitor and track team and district participation.

A wide range of DCP support activities are available to districts depending on budget and interest, including:

---

2 An initiative to assist districts on issues related to labor-management relations is also being addressed in the project to strengthen district governance practices (see Project 2B.3).

3 Massachusetts Education Partnership is a new undertaking co-led by the American Federation of Teachers - Massachusetts, Massachusetts Association of School Committees, Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Teachers Association, Northeastern University, the Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy, and University of Massachusetts Boston. ESE is a non-voting member of the MEP board.
• Workshops with expert facilitators to improve labor management relations through interest-based bargaining and other collaborative practices;
• Content facilitation and coaching by experts for labor-management teams on specific elements of Massachusetts education reform agenda;
• Sustained facilitation to develop district and/or school improvement plans ranging from three months to two years;
• Participation in capacity building institutes offered by the DCP three times a year; and
• Participation in other activities offered by the MEP.

For more information on the MEP visit http://massedpartnership.org/.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the district plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the district’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

Specific budget guidance and costs

Districts should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. The cost to engage the labor-management team will vary, depending on the intensity and duration of the engagement. Estimates are $5,000 to $15,000 per year. The district budget should support the development of an action plan and its ongoing monitoring.
Project 2B.3: Strengthen climate, conditions and school culture: Use ESE-approved resources to improve district governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>If demand exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Priority will be given to districts with Level 3 or 4 schools</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

Through its district review process, ESE has identified a common and persistent area of need in many districts for stronger governance practices as the role of school committees under Education Reform evolves. Many school committees and district leaders, for example, need to learn to collaborate to make data-driven decisions focused on student achievement the norm in their practice. In some districts, roles and responsibilities of school committees and superintendents, particularly in relation to one another, are not sufficiently defined, understood or practiced. Too often, this lack of clarity contributes to policy- and decision-making practices in these districts that serve to detract from a focus on improving student achievement. A growing number of districts can benefit from guidance and support in the area of effective governance and data-driven decision-making processes.

Operating in conjunction with the new superintendent induction program (project 2D.1) and using a similar framework for effective governance, the District Governance Support project will help build greater understanding, common language and a more solid foundation for positive and productive governance practices. This is a collaborative project among ESE, the Massachusetts Association of School Committees (MASC), and the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents (MASS).

This project will make available two-member training teams that can work with school committees and district administrators using:

1. An intervention model used in those cases where school committee and superintendent relations and capacity to work together on behalf of improved student achievement appear to be limited, or
2. A prevention model used at times of transition (of the superintendent or the school committee) to support new personnel to develop collaborative, productive working relationships.4

Implementation will be monitored by deployment of the support teams and district implementation of a governance improvement plan. This project is expected to strengthen relationships between school committee members and district administrators, build capacity of district leaders to focus their work on improving student achievement, and result in more effective district governance.

Expected district school activities

School committee members and superintendents will participate in activities designed to assess strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities, as well as orientation workshops and workshops on special topics such as using data to inform policy. Technical assistance and/or coaching will also be provided to support the creation and implementation of a governance improvement plan. Districts can expect to

---

4 An initiative to provide labor management support teams to assist districts in issues related to labor-management relations is also being developed to strengthen district governance practices (see Project 2B.2).
participate in two to eight meetings to project activities. Coaches may also work with school committee members or district administrators to assist them in applying theory to practice.

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the district plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the district’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

Specifically, districts that select this project should indicate the project year(s) of participation and whether the district is requesting an intervention team or a prevention team. A short narrative including a training needs/areas for improvement statement should be provided. An assurance that the school committee or governing board is willing to work with the LEA leadership through this process is required. If the district is requesting support for outside consultants, speakers or coaches to assist with strengthening district governance, a short narrative explanation should be provided.

Districts should also describe the composition of the school committee (or governing board) including membership details, elections, etc.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

Districts should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. Districts should budget up to $3,000 annually for activities and coaching from the governance support team. (ESE’s share of RTTT funds will be used to subsidize remaining costs.) Districts may use RTTT funds for other direct costs for this project, including travel and materials. Outside consultants, speakers, or coaches related to district governance may be funded through this project with ESE approval. Computers or instructional technology and salary support are not allowed.
Project 2C.1: Expand the pipeline of effective teachers:
Develop experienced and effective teachers as mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>Year 2 course enrollment limited to 90 mentors (30 per region) and 3 regions.</td>
<td>Year 2 (2011-2012) will be a pilot year and priority will be given to LEAs signing up STEM, ESL, and/or special education mentor teachers. During Years 3 and 4 enrollment will be extended to all regions.</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

This project is focused on expanding the number of qualified and effective mentors throughout the Commonwealth by providing access to a three-credit course designed to develop leadership capacity and support effective mentoring during a mentor’s first year of service.

One of the most imposing obstacles to developing and maintaining an effective educator workforce is the high turnover rate of new teachers. According to the Teacher Attrition and Mobility survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics, the turnover rate from the SY07–08 to SY08–09 was 15 percent for all teachers and 23 percent for teachers with one to three years of experience. A 2003 research report conducted by Richard Ingersoll found that between 40 percent and 50 percent of new teachers leave the profession within their first five years of teaching. In addition, both studies found that the annual turnover rates were far higher for teachers in special education, mathematics, and science than for those in other fields, and that the rates of teacher turnover in high poverty schools were nearly twice those for teachers in low poverty schools. In investigating how to combat these trends, research has found that turnover rates decline dramatically when new teachers are provided with a high quality, collective induction program, and that new teachers assigned to a mentor in their same content area are 30 percent less likely to leave the profession.

LEAs that select this project will approve teachers to attend and complete the state-sponsored “Project S.U.C.C.E.S.S.: Mentoring in Action” mentor training program. This training will be led by Carol Pelletier Radford, Ed.D., from the Center for University, School, and Community Partnerships (CUSP) and in collaboration with the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth. The program is a three-credit “hybrid” course (conducted online and in-person) focused on developing leadership capacity and supporting effective mentoring during a mentor’s first year of service. Mentors will work with new teachers in their home district or school throughout the training program in order to strengthen the transition experience and support teachers during the initial years of their career. Outside of the kickoff event held in August, all in-person classes will take place after school, and mentors required to travel to in-person training sessions will receive a travel voucher.

This project may be particularly effective for training mentors in low-performing schools, those working with special education or ELL teachers, and those working with teachers in low-retention fields such as science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). The training program meets the mentor training requirements outlined in the Standards for Induction Programs for Teachers (603
Online modules and in-person training sessions will begin for the pilot cohort of mentors in August 2011. A new cohort will be trained in each of project Years 3 and 4.

This project is aligned with the state goal of improving educator effectiveness by providing a greater number of new teachers with the support system they need during their first years of teaching. In addition to enhancing teacher practice, the project is expected to boost new teachers’ perspectives on school culture and climate and increase retention rates of teachers, particularly in hard to staff areas.

**Expected LEA activities**

LEAs interested in participating during Year 2 (2011–12 school year) **MUST** submit a budget and narrative by July 29, 2011. Any proposals submitted after July 29th will only be considered for participation during Years 3 and/or 4.

LEAs are expected to nominate experienced and effective teachers as new mentors to participate in the hybrid mentor-training program. (For guidance on selecting effective mentors, please refer to the ESE’s [Guidelines for Induction Programs](#).) For the pilot cohort of mentors, participating during Year 2 (the 2011–12 school year), LEAs should nominate STEM, ESL, and/or special education teachers as new mentors. During the pilot year, LEAs must limit their mentor nominations to a maximum of 30 mentor teachers. While LEAs may submit up to 30 mentor nominations, not all may be chosen, as ESE will establish a cohort of 30 mentors per region. During Year 2, there will be three regions for a total of 90 mentors. In subsequent years, LEAs can expand the number of nominated mentor teachers and extend their nominations to include new mentors in a variety of content areas. LEAs will be notified of the training timeline and assignments prior to the beginning of training in August 2011. If there are additional training slots, ESE will notify LEAs that they can recruit additional teachers. Depending on their needs, LEAs can choose to participate in the program beginning in Year 3 or 4 as part of the second or third cohort.

Mentors should be paired with new teachers at the beginning of their training year and each subsequent year. Because of the increased responsibility and time commitment required of mentors, the LEA is encouraged to provide some amount of financial compensation to each mentor. Any compensation provided must be determined at the school/district level and, if applicable, must be aligned with any current or future teacher collective bargaining agreements.

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly explain the areas in which the LEA struggles to retain new teachers, and describe how increasing the number of trained and effective mentors relates to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. LEAs must budget $3,700 per mentor for course registration, texts and supplies, online coursework, and technical assistance from mentor experts retained to work with mentors as part of the program. LEAs can use additional RTTT funds for mentor stipends or other forms of compensation. RTTT funds cannot be used to provide mentor training outside of this program, nor can RTTT funds be used to purchase computers or support salaries (other than stipends).

---

5 Please note that these guidelines were published in 2001 and should be used for guidance on selecting mentors. ESE plans to update the guidelines to reflect current knowledge and experience from the field as well as licensure requirements.

6 The three regions in Year 2 will be selected based on the number of mentors and location of the LEAs that respond for participation in the Year 2 mentor program.
Project 2C.2: Expand the pipeline of effective teachers:  
Support teachers in earning moderate disabilities special education licenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>If demand exceeds capacity and is only available to teachers working with a waiver</td>
<td>Priority will be given to LEAs with demonstrated low capacity to educate students with moderate disabilities</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

To participate in this project, teachers must have at least a bachelor’s degree, be currently teaching in the role of teacher of students with moderate disabilities, have passed the Communication and Literacy MTEL and have submitted an application licensure to ESE. For each individual teacher, the sponsoring district must have received a waiver from ESE for the current school year.

Teachers will access DESE-sponsored and –approved, 3-credit online graduate level college courses through MassONE. The Licensure Academy will include seven courses that meet the requirements to fulfill the competency review. Based on the individual educator’s DESE competency review, participants will select those courses needed to earn a preliminary license as Teacher of Students with Moderate Disabilities. In addition, participants working toward an initial license or a second license of Teachers of Students with Moderate Disabilities may apply the courses toward these licenses.

In 2010, the three areas with the highest percentages of teachers on waivers were moderate disabilities special education (38%), mathematics (8%), and ELL (7%). In addition, CPI for students with moderate disabilities shows significant achievement gaps statewide. This project provides an opportunity for LEAs to increase their pool of licensed teachers and reduce the number of teachers on waivers in the high need area of special education for students with moderate disabilities.

**Expected LEA activities**

Teachers must maintain a B average or better to continue in the program. Teachers will not be able to audit the course. Providers will issue PDPs to all participants, and college credit is optional. The sponsoring LEA is expected to obtain a MassONE account for each participating teacher.

LEAs must assure that there is a good faith commitment to continue to provide a mentor, coach, or cooperating teacher as appropriate to support teachers in training throughout the period of federal funding. The mentor/coach/cooperating teacher must be 1) trained, 2) have a similar subject or assignment, and 3) must otherwise be qualified to be a mentor according to LEA policy. LEAs are required to maintain a 1:1 ratio of mentor to teacher in training.

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

LEAs will need to indicate whether they have identified the list of teachers who will be trained. For those already identified, LEAs should provide additional information including name, MEPID, current license and level, enrollment in moderate special education courses, MTEL passed, and number of credit hours applied toward competency review. This information is included in the Additional Project Information form of the online grants management system.
Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. LEAs may use RTTT funds to support teachers who participate in the Licensure Academy and mentor/coach/cooperating teachers.

The following are recommended rates of financial support:

**Participant**: $750 stipend per course: $500 at the beginning of each course which can be applied towards college credit, course materials, MTEL fees and other related expenses; and $250 at the successful completion of each course. It is anticipated that the participant will spend four to six hours per week in addition to online participation in the course.

**Mentor**: $2,000 stipend per year of mentoring;

**District**: May use up to $1,000 for discretionary expenses such as substitute teacher salaries and other appropriate costs to support the teacher’s participation in the course(s).

LEAs should budget for all sponsored teachers and mentors. If demand exceeds capacity and not all teachers can be accommodated, the LEA will be notified of acceptances and can amend its budget, if needed.

---

7 Compensation is subject to local collective bargaining.
Project 2C.3: Expand the pipeline of effective teachers: Support teachers in earning English as a Second Language (ESL) licenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>If demand exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Priority will be given to LEAs with a low capacity to support English Language Learner (ELL) students or high numbers of teachers on waivers</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

Teacher who have already submitted an application to ESE for licensure and have a bachelor’s degree are eligible to participate in this program to earn licensure as teachers of English as a Second Language (ESL). Participants may be in the process of earning a preliminary license, their initial license, or dual licensure. Participants will access ESE-sponsored and –approved online professional development through MassONE. For ESL teachers, coursework will prepare them to take the MTEL. There are four courses as part of this program and one course is allowed per semester.

Based on 2010 data, the three areas with the highest percentages of teachers on waivers are moderate special education (38%), mathematics (8%) and ELL (7%). In addition, CPI for ELL students shows significant achievement gaps statewide particularly in districts that serve low incidence ELL. This project provides an opportunity for LEAs to increase their pool of licensed teachers and reduce the number of teachers on waivers in the high need area of ESL. Priority will be given to districts with demonstrated low capacity to educate ELLs.

Expected LEA activities

Teachers must maintain a B average or better to continue in the program. Teachers will not be able to audit the course and will be issued college credit. The sponsoring LEA is expected to obtain a MassONE account for each participating teacher.

LEAs must assure that there is a good faith commitment to continue to provide a mentor, coach, or cooperating teacher as appropriate to support teachers in training throughout the period of federal funding. The mentor/coach/cooperating teacher must be 1) trained, 2) have a similar subject or assignment, and 3) must otherwise be qualified to be a mentor according to LEA policy. LEAs are required to maintain a 1:1 ratio of mentor to teacher in training.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies. LEAs will need to indicate, in the Additional Information form, if they have identified the list of teachers who will be trained.
Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. Districts may use RTTT funds to support teachers who participate in the Licensure Academy and mentor/coach/cooperating teachers. LEAs will be responsible for paying the $100 test fees the ESL MTEL as well as a $30 registration fee. The teacher, if desired, will need to purchase materials and college credit. Excluded costs are travel, other professional development including conferences or workshops, consultants, tutors, salaries, and administrative stipends. LEAs should budget for all sponsored teachers and mentors. If demand exceeds capacity and not all teachers can be accommodated, the LEA will be notified of acceptances and can amend its budget, if needed.

LEAs may use RTTT funds to support teachers who participate in the Licensure Academy and mentor/coach/cooperating teachers. It is anticipated that there will be four courses, but not every participant will require four courses if they have already completed a similar course and can show proof.

The following are recommended rates of financial support:

- **Participant**: $750 stipend per course: $500 at the beginning of each course which can be applied towards college credit, course materials, MTEL fees and other related expenses; and $250 at the successful completion of each course. It is anticipated that the participant will spend four to six hours per week in addition to online participation in the course.

- **Mentor**: $2,000 stipend per year of mentoring;

- **District**: May use up to $1,000 for discretionary expenses such as substitute teacher salaries and other appropriate costs to support the teacher’s participation in the course(s).

LEAs should budget for all sponsored teachers and mentors. If demand exceeds capacity and not all teachers can be accommodated, the LEA will be notified of acceptances and can amend its budget, if needed.

---

8 Compensation is subject to local collective bargaining.
Project 2C.4: Expand the pipeline of effective teachers: Support National Board of Professional Teaching Standards certification for teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>If demand exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Priority to teachers in Level 3 or 4 schools, special education, ESL and STEM teachers</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>This project is supported by a federal formula grant that subsidizes costs for certification or exam-retakes</td>
<td>2G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

This project provides LEAs with an opportunity for outstanding teachers to receive national recognition and certification (or recertification) as accomplished teachers through the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards rigorous performance-based assessment process. The state has a federal formula grant that currently pays for half of a teacher’s cost for certification for up a limited number of teachers (http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/recognition/nbpts.html). If subsidized by the state, teachers register on the National Board website and pay their portion of the fee. The Massachusetts Coordinator then goes online, approves registrants, and the federal funds are transmitted directly to the National Board. If the number of proposed candidates exceeds the number of applicants, priority will be given to teachers from high poverty, low performing schools. If not subsidized, teachers would need to pay the entire fee; payment plans are available. Through this project LEAs can set aside RTTT allocated funds to reimburse teachers for the fee, pay fees for the Take One! Program, and/or pay for teacher recertification or exam retakes.

Teachers who achieve National Board Certification have met high standards through study, expert evaluation, self-assessment, and peer review. Research shows candidates demonstrate significant improvement in their teaching practice. Teachers who achieve certification have been assessed against the nation’s highest advanced teaching standards.

Take One! participants study the National Board standards, complete a video portfolio featuring a lesson delivered to preK-12 students and submit the videotaped lesson to the National Board for scoring in accordance with the deadlines and policies of the current National Board assessment program. Take One! is high-quality professional development that provides a job-embedded and sustained staff development experience, helps build learning communities in schools, strengthens professional collaboration among educators, and informs teachers who are thinking about pursuing National Board Certification.

The state has set a goal to have 200 new National Board certified teachers in high need schools by 2014. LEAs with Level 3 and 4 schools are thereby strongly encouraged to recruit teachers to register for one of the National Board programs. This project is aligned with state goals to increase student achievement and reduce achievement gaps.

Expected LEA activities

LEAs choosing this project must set a goal for the number of teachers that will be National Board certified by the end of Year 4. In addition, LEAs must indicate the number of teachers who will register for National Board certification, the number who will participate in a Take One! cohort, and/or the number who are retaking exams or recertification.
**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form and should allocate $1,250 per teacher registering for certification, $400 per teacher participating in *Take One!*, and $350 per exam retake. Note that individual teachers can receive only a one-time subsidy through the federal program. This can be used for the initial certification fee or two exam retakes. There is no subsidy for *Take One!* or for recertification. LEAs should plan accordingly.
Project 2D.1: Strengthen skills of existing educators: Participate in the superintendent induction program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Superintendents new to the role or to the district</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

Superintendents face enormous opportunities and challenges in their first years on the job, and it is in their first years that they set the tone and agenda for their work. The Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents (MASS) and ESE have partnered to develop a three-year induction program for cohorts of superintendents new to the role or the district. A first cohort, for superintendents new to Level 3 and 4 districts, began in August 2010.

The first year of the induction program is designed to guide and support superintendents new to the role or the district as they attend to four of the most critical things successful superintendents do in their first year:

1. Develop and implement an entry plan aimed at building relationships and assessing current conditions, including effective labor-management relations;
2. Create a strategy to raise student achievement;
3. Develop a high-functioning, senior leadership team that works productively to focus the district’s work on improving student learning; and
4. Establish a strong relationship with school committee members and a clear, shared understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the committee.

Participants devote eight days to professional development with their cohort group beginning in the summer. Subsequent meetings are held every six to eight weeks throughout the school year. The program curriculum draws from the work new superintendents are doing in their districts. To help ensure translation of theory to practice, the program matches each superintendent with a coach who provides ten hours of coaching each month. The second year of the program is being designed around the same four areas of curriculum, going deeper in all areas, with special emphasis on human capital management and supervision and evaluation. The third year of the program will be designed based on participant feedback.

Expected district activities

Each district selecting this project must commit to participating in a cohort. A second cohort, open to superintendents new to the role in any district, will begin in the summer of 2011. A third cohort will begin in the summer of 2012, and a fourth will launch in the summer of 2013. Each cohort will meet for three years.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the district plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the district’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.
Specific budget guidance and costs

Districts should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. The induction program will be *substantially* subsidized by ESE for districts at Levels 1 and 2 and *fully* subsidized for Levels 3 and 4 districts. The cost for Level 1 and 2 districts is $3,000 per year.
**Project 2D.2: Strengthen skills of existing educators:**
Participate in National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training for principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All LEAs need to complete at least one project from 2B.2 through 2D.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Beginning in Years 2 or 3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

The National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training is a comprehensive professional development program for Massachusetts’ principals, assistant principals, school-based leaders, LEA administrators, and superintendents to enhance educator effectiveness and leadership development in Massachusetts. Stakeholders in the NISL training program are LEAs, program participants, the staff and students of schools in which participants work, NISL national headquarters, NISL facilitators, ESE liaisons to Commissioner’s Districts, ESE District and School Assistance Center (DSAC) staff, and several universities that offer advanced degrees aligned with NISL. Instructional leadership in LEAs will be improved through the proven work of NISL. For more information, see: [http://www.nisl.net/](http://www.nisl.net/) and [http://www.doe.mass.edu/edleadership/nisl/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edleadership/nisl/).

The 18- to 24-month NISL Executive Development for School Leadership curriculum focuses on:

- Training in standards-based instructional systems aligned by ESE and NISL staff with the Massachusetts state frameworks;
- Training in data analysis skills related to student achievement data and on coaching teachers on how to use data in order to enrich classroom instruction;
- Capacity to take learning theory into practice, by providing skills and knowledge to enable principals to be instructional leaders in literacy, mathematics and science in their own schools;
- Training principals in distributed leadership strategies that will assist in developing the professional capacity of school staff; especially empowering instructional leadership teams; and
- Helping school leaders create a culture that fosters instructional collaboration and high achievement.

**Expected LEA activities**

NISL professional development for principals, assistant principals, LEA administrators, and superintendents will consist of 27 days of training over 18 to 24 months. In Year 2 there will be three vehicles by which LEAs can participate in NISL:

- District facilitation teams will conduct trainings in a host district with support of NISL and the ESE, (only districts expressly invited by host district are eligible – see details below);
- There will be one cohort in each of the regional DSACs (see details below); and
- LEAs that are not eligible for participation in a cohort sponsored by a host district or DSAC cohorts can sign up to participate in NISL RTTT cohorts.

Since 2005, the NISL training program has been delivered to over 1,200 educational leaders in Massachusetts. Over the years research has shown that the NISL training is most effective in LEAs that support participants as they implement instructional leadership improvement practices in their role.
in the LEA, as well as honor their time commitment to the program. Training is most effective in LEAs where the following conditions are met:

- **Targeted participants:** LEA cohorts should be comprised of principals, assistant principals, LEA directors for curriculum and instruction, LEA- or school-based instructional coaches, and assistant superintendents. Superintendents are strongly encouraged to participate. In some cases, if the superintendent approves, teacher-leaders from schools can participate with their principal and or assistant principal as part of the school’s leadership team that will help implement the NISL concepts and practices in a particular high-needs school.

- **LEA teams:** At a minimum, LEA teams should include three principals and one central office administrator to ensure successful implementation in high-needs schools and LEAs.

- **Critical mass:** The power of NISL training increases significantly when all leaders in a LEA are operating from the same knowledge base and conceptual framework around instructional leadership. LEAs will commit to training all principals, either in one cohort or over a series of two or three NISL training cycles, depending on the size of the LEA.

- **Superintendent/academic leader and LEA leadership team training:** It is important that LEA leaders participate in NISL. If this is not possible superintendents are strongly encouraged to participate in a regional DSAC Instructional Leadership Network (ILN) to understand the conceptual framework of the training and the importance of LEA structures and systems that support the principals’ implementation of quality instructional leadership in their schools. Priority for the ILN will be given to Level 3 and 4 districts.

- **Support for deep implementation:** The LEA will set up systems and structures to support NISL trained principals in their implementation of NISL concepts and practices in their schools. A LEA may choose to contract for a NISL implementation coach through the DSAC (at additional cost to be determined) to assist the LEA leadership team in this process.

- **Superintendent/charter school leader assurance:** The LEA will be asked to commit to all of the above and to require each NISL participant to attend all 27 days of NISL training with their cohort. Principals who need to miss a NISL session will be able to make up the session in another NISL cohort in Massachusetts.

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies. LEAs must include the superintendent/charter school leader’s assurance in the narrative.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. Only the participation fee per LEA is allowed as a cost.

NISL offers several ways to form a cohort of participants; each version carries different eligibility and cost requirements.
NISL Cohort Options:

- **Host District Cohort Participation**
  
  *Eligibility:* Any district or Commissioner’s District (CD) hosting a NISL cohort run by in-district facilitators and non-Commissioner’s districts that have been expressly invited to partner with the host CD.
  
  *Budget:* Districts participating in this type of cohort may spend up to $8,000 per participant for participation fees for the full program to be paid in two fiscal years: Up to $4,000 for Phase 1 of training in Year 1, then up to $4,000 for Phase 2 of training in Year 2.

- **DSAC Cohort Participation**
  
  *Eligibility:* Districts with Level 3 and 4 schools in the DSAC system that have been granted permission to send participants to a DSAC cohort in their region by their Regional Assistance Director (RAD).
  
  *Budget:* The participation fee for districts participating in this type of cohort is $4,075 per participant for the full program to be paid in two fiscal years: $2,300 for Phase 1 in Year 1 and $1,775 for Phase 2 in Year 2.

- **RTTT Cohort Participation**
  
  *Eligibility:* Any LEA not eligible for participation in a Host District or DSAC cohort. Based on availability, LEAs will be assigned to a limited number of RTTT cohorts on a first come, first serve basis. Locations of these RTTT cohorts will be regionally determined according to the LEAs that apply.
  
  *Budget:* The participation fee for LEAs participating in this type of cohort is $6,210 per participant for the full program to be paid in two fiscal years: $4,140 for Phase 1 in Year 1 and $2,070 for Phase 2 in Year 2.

**Note:** LEAs paying participation fees for Phase 2 of existing cohorts may use RTTT funds. Please describe the cohort type you are asking for i.e., Host District, DSAC or RTTT (MESPA cohort only), and enter the rate set last fiscal year.
Project description

Substantial and systematic attention to high quality professional development (PD) is critical to put RTTT reform initiatives into practice. Without a commitment to staff development, the reforms will be nothing more than hopes and aspirations. Accordingly, LEAs are encouraged to use local RTTT funds to participate in ESE-sponsored or approved-provider PD offerings in the priority areas identified in the state’s RTTT proposal.

For now, the approved options are limited to activities already being offered by DSACs or directly by ESE. Please note that eligibility may be restricted depending on the activity. Over the coming months, ESE will be revising its professional development system to expand the number of PD options approved for use of RTTT dollars. As these new opportunities are approved, they will be announced to participating LEAs, and LEAs may adjust their budgets accordingly. See the Frequently Asked Questions document on the RTTT webpage for more details.

Expected LEA activities

LEAs should assess their PD needs and have staff (teachers, administrators, leadership teams) participate in those PD offerings that are aligned with their overall goals, will build capacity for high quality teaching and learning, and are part of a long-term plan for staff development. Approved PD for this project include:

- **District and School Assistance Center (DSAC) PD offerings:** DSAC offers a limited number of foundation PD courses in ELL, mathematics, literacy and special education that are accessible to RTTT LEAs. Priority will continue to be given to Level 3 and non-commissioner’s Level 4 districts in these courses. LEAs can see the descriptions of these offerings on the DSAC website (http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/regional/). The cost for each of these courses is included with the course description.

- **Professional Development Institutes (PDIs):** Professional Development Institutes (PDIs) occur during the summer. ESE will release the complete list of PDIs for summer 2011 in April (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/institutes/). Content-specific courses are offered in English language arts, mathematics, the sciences, technology engineering, the arts, history and social studies, health, special education, and instructional technology. There is no cost associated with the course for participants. However, districts should budget for stipends and travel (if required by contract) plus substitute costs and travel for two full-day follow-up sessions during the fall.

- **SEI endorsement course:** The SEI endorsement course is being offered as part of ESE’s Rethinking Equity and Teaching for English Language Learners (RETELL) initiative to improve and support the academic achievement of English language learners. RETELL brings a systemic approach that combines professional development for SEI teachers and
administrators with World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) tools to ensure rigorous content is accessible to English language learners (ELLs), and a shift to the WIDA-ACCESS assessment. RETELL will require that SEI teachers and the administrators who supervise them complete updated SEI professional development or its equivalent, starting with teachers who currently have ELLs in their classes.

- **Regional Network Meetings:** ESE-organized regional networks meet regularly in locations throughout the state to facilitate collaboration and learning among instructional leaders to support specific school and district improvement objectives. ESE is in the process of forming additional regional network meetings for LEA-level instructional leaders. By the end of this school year, all DSAC regions will have mathematics instructional leader networks with participants primarily from Level 3 districts and some Level 2 districts. Literacy networks are expected to be starting up in the fall of 2011. If space is an issue, priority for participation will be given to Level 3 and 4 districts. Registration is free.

- **Statewide meetings:** ESE sponsors several statewide meetings annually, including the Curriculum Summit. Registration is free.

**Eligibility**

Eligibility to participate varies according to the PD offering. Certain ESE-sponsored PD will be targeted to districts with Level 3 schools. Other opportunities, such as regional network meetings, summer Professional Development Institutes and the Annual Curriculum Summits, are open to all LEAs with restrictions only when space is limited. In order to participate in courses LEAs can:

- Join a DSAC cohort in their region (first priority for available spaces will be given to Level 3 and non-Commissioner’s Level 4 districts), or
- Participate in the summer Professional Development Institute (per their directions)

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies. LEAs should be clear how their selection of PD would help them achieve their local priorities and RTTT goals.

LEAs will be asked to provide data on the PD participants in the Additional Project Information section of the online grants management system.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. The process of budgeting is different for each type of PD. Please read the following carefully.

- **DSAC PD offerings**
  LEAs will contract with the providers of DSAC courses and pay the registration fees directly. ESE will no longer be paying these costs on behalf of LEAs (follow this link for the list of available courses: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/support/development.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/support/development.html)). LEAs may allocate RTTT funds for travel, substitutes, and required stipends under local collective bargaining agreements to support their staff’s participation in these activities.

- **Professional Development Institutes (PDIs)**
  There is no registration cost for LEAs to send staff to PDIs. LEAs may allocate RTTT funds for travel, substitutes, and required stipends under local collective bargaining agreements to support their staff’s participation in these activities.
• **RETEL SEI Endorsement Course.** ESE will fund the delivery of the SEI endorsement course, though districts may incur costs for stipends under local collective bargaining agreements. LEAs can choose from the list of approved course providers posted here: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/retell/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/retell/). This link also includes general information about the endorsement course and RETELL in general. RTTT funds may also be used to support the continued development of educators’ SEI skills and practices beyond the conclusion of their participation in the SEI endorsement course, as follows:

  a. **Provide stipends and/or release time so that literacy, math and ELL coaches can participate in ESE-sponsored training to support integration of SEI strategies into the coaching process.**

  b. **Provide substitutes so that teachers can co-plan SEI lessons as well as observe one another during lesson implementation and de-brief afterwards. Collaboration among ESL and content-area teachers is especially encouraged.**

  c. **Provide substitutes so that teachers can attend a series of SEI conferences, and share back what they have learned to colleagues.**

• **Regional networks and state meetings**

  LEAs may budget for costs associated with participating in these free activities, such as travel, substitutes, and stipends.

  ESE will update LEAs on any changes to the course offerings or pricing during the year.

  ESE is currently in the process of developing a preferred provider/approved PD list. Until this process is complete, LEAs will be restricted to using funding only on the PD mentioned above. ESE will update LEAs when this process is complete and LEAs can amend their budgets accordingly.

**Other RTTT professional development initiatives**

Other parts of the RTTT proposal include professional development initiatives for which districts may use their RTTT funds. These offerings include:

• 1A: Implement the statewide educator evaluation framework

• 2C.1: Support experienced teachers to participate in online training to become mentors

• 2C.2: Support teachers in earning moderate disabilities special education license

• 2C.3: Support teachers in earning English as a second language license

• 2C.4: Support National Board of Professional Teaching Standards certification and recertification

• 2D.1: Participate in the superintendent induction program

• 2D.2: Participate in National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training for principals

• 3B: Access ESE-sponsored or –approved professional development on new data systems and tools

• 4B: Implement *YourPlanforCollege: Get Ready for Life After High School*

• 4C: Implement the Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling Programs

• 4D: Participate in pre-AP training for middle and high school teacher teams

• 5A: Implement a component of the teaching and learning system

• 6C: Participate in a network of principals for high need schools
Strategy 3: Use data to improve instruction

Strategic objective: Provide educators with the real-time actionable data they need to meet the needs of every student

### Outcome measures:
1. LEA use of the Education Data Warehouse to inform instructional decisions and improve instruction, assessment, and operations
2. Reduction in effort to complete state data reporting requirements

### Other results:
1. Real-time access to student performance data for all 80,000 educators statewide
2. 25,000 educators trained in ways to use data more effectively

### Projects
- 3A: Create near-real-time access to data in the Education Data Warehouse by implementing the Schools Interoperability Framework
- 3B: Access ESE-sponsored or –approved professional development on using data to improve instruction
- 3C: Provide feedback to guide the development of new data systems and tools
### Project 3A: Create near real-time access to data in the Education Data Warehouse by implementing the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory for all LEAs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Beginning in any of Years 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

As Massachusetts transitions from data for compliance reporting to data to inform decisions and support continuous improvement, the volume and frequency of data collections are rapidly increasing. Currently, LEAs are required to download data, from their Student Information System (SIS) and human resource (HR) systems and upload the information to ESE multiple times per year. The Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) is a standard to support the transfer of data directly from the LEA system to ESE in near real-time.

ESE will be collecting student and staffing information to replace the existing data collection systems). Generally this data resides in two locations: the SIS and the HR system. If this is the case, then the district will need two software solutions for vertical implementation (SIF agents): one interfacing with the SIS and one interfacing with the HR system. However, if a district SIS includes both the student and personnel data then only one SIF agent would be needed.

**Expected LEA activities**

LEAs need a SIF agent for each of their systems. All LEAs should certify whether they already have the required SIF agent(s), and if not, in which of project Years 2–4 they expect to purchase and install one, or both, if needed. Some training is generally included in the cost of the agent and the state will provide online training (one to two hours) at no cost to the district. LEAs may want to budget for more training depending on how data is managed; for example a district that employs a data entry clerk at each school might need to run additional one- to two-hour training sessions in-district. LEAs can use the online training for this purpose and the state will also offer online drop-in training and Q&A sessions. Additional staff hours may be allocated to in-district meetings and data cleaning activities (responding to error reports, remapping data fields).

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project. LEAs should also explain plans for necessary training, hardware needed (if any), correcting error reports, and training for data teams.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. LEAs that have not received funds through a prior federal longitudinal data systems grant program (fund code 120) can apply for a supplemental grant to pay for part of the cost of the SIF agents ([http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants11/rfp/125_204.html](http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants11/rfp/125_204.html)). LEAs that have already received a fund code 120 grant to implement a SIS SIF agent, but who still need an HR agent, may apply for a supplemental grant to pay for the cost of the HR agent (fund code 125 and 204). LEAs may allocate costs not covered by fund code 125 and 204 to this RTTT project to purchase required hardware or pay staff stipends.

Other allowable costs include upgrading or purchasing an established SIS that supports SIF vertical implementation for ESE data collection or costs associated with a horizontal SIF structure that
contributes to the alignment with ESE data collection requirements. Purchasing equipment needed to successfully complete the vertical SIF implementation is allowable but **NOTE** that the cost for servers should be pro-rated to account for the share that will be used for SIF. Funds for consulting on the SIF project are allowable only upon approval of ESE’s SIF project team. Questions regarding the SIF project should be directed to SIFSupport@doe.mass.edu.
## Project 3B: Access ESE-sponsored or approved professional development on using data to improve instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project description

Effective use of student data to drive instruction is an essential strategy for increasing student performance and closing the achievement gap. For several years the state has been providing training on using data to improve instruction, with the Education Data Warehouse as the primary source of data. ESE is now developing a broader set of new tools and courses to support districts in using multiple forms of data to inform system-wide, school-based, and classroom action planning.

There are three ESE-sponsored or approved professional development opportunities that LEAs can take advantage of in this project area: the Massachusetts Data Quality Program (MDQP), Educator Training in Data Use (ETDU), and accessing training on effective data use through the Priority Partners network. ESE is supporting the delivery of the MDQP and ETDU initiatives, which will allow LEAs to participate at little or no cost. LEAs interested in accessing the Priority Partners network will need to contract directly with one of the Priority Partners approved to provide training on effective data use.

### Expected LEA activities

**Massachusetts Data Quality Program (MDQP)**

The Massachusetts Data Quality Program (MDQP) is designed to help both data collectors and data users understand and address the issues that may affect the production of high-quality data. It provides lesson guides, instructional handouts, and material tailored to the specific needs of the K-12 schools and districts, while being able to support all educational segments.

Collecting the highest quality of data at the source improves information speed, reporting accuracy, and strengthens the decisions that can be made from the data. The program focuses on three very important areas: Establishing a Culture of Data Quality; Collecting and Managing Quality Data; and Improving Data Quality.

ESE will be offering training for this program in different formats such as face-to-face, regional and WebEx sessions. ESE’s goal is to offer the training statewide by reaching out to school and district staff members who play a role in data collection and reporting. We recommend sending teams of more than one person to secure the full benefits of the program.

Please check the Data Collection web site for the upcoming training schedule and details on how to register: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/). ESE will send out email notifications when training dates become available.

**Educator Training in Data Use (ETDU)**

Effective use of educational data to drive practice is essential to increasing student performance and closing the achievement gap. For several years the state has been providing training on using data to improve instruction, with the Education Data Warehouse as the primary source of data. Beginning in spring of 2013, ESE will pilot a series of online, hybrid and face to face courses, for PDP’s and/or graduate credit, through the Educator Training in Date Use (ETDU) initiative to support districts in using multiple forms of data to inform system-wide, school-based, and classroom action planning. In
the fall of 2013, ESE will launch these courses, which will include professional development to support the use of Edwin. For more information on Edwin go to: [www.doe.mass.edu/Edwin](http://www.doe.mass.edu/Edwin).

LEAs interested in piloting these courses will be required to send at least two staff members to participate in the pilot.

LEAs interested in participating in the fall launch should submit a description in their budget narrative proposing how many educators will participate in the courses and how the course will be delivered, self paced or as a group. ESE will pay for the cost of delivering the training, though LEAs may incur costs for substitutes or stipends to allow their staff to attend.

LEAs interested in having staff participate in the train the trainer component should indicate that as well.

ETDU participants will be asked to:

- apply what they learn in their building or classroom,
- serve on data teams or participate in a professional learning community, and
- engage their school and/or district colleagues in meaningful application of what they learn

Participation in the pilot and the initial launch from 2013-2014 will be made available to the LEAs for free. Training will be conducted by pre-qualified providers from a list that will be published in the fall.

Note that for districts participating in Project 4C (Implement the *Massachusetts Model for School Counseling*), at least one representative from the school counseling team is expected to participate in at least 2 ETDU courses during the pilot or fall launch.

*Priority Partner training on effective data use*

In addition to the ESE sponsored training, starting in Year 3 districts can use their funds to access training on effective data use from the list of vendors identified as Priority Partners. The vendors on this list include: Achievement Network, Boston Plan for Excellence/Boston Teachers Residency, Cambridge Education, the Center for Collaborative Education, Focus on Results, Leadership and Learning Center, Lesley Center for Reading Recovery and Literacy Collaborative, PCG Education, Research for Better Teaching, and Wireless Generation. Previously only districts with Level 3 and 4 schools could use their RTTT funds to contract with these providers, but going forward all RTTT districts will be able to use their grant funds to access their services. For more information go to: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/PriorityPartners.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/PriorityPartners.pdf).

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

LEAs should briefly explain:

- The current professional development plan for building capacity to access data in the Education Data Warehouse and any modifications to the existing plan based on the new training options described above,
- The data team role in each school,
- The plan to build the role of the data team leaders, and
- The tools in addition to the Education Data Warehouse that the LEA currently uses to access data to inform instruction.
• If the district is engaging one of the vendors from the Priority Partners list, please describe the goal of the engagement.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. ESE will pay for the cost of delivering the MDQP and ETDU trainings, though LEAs may charge expenses directly connected with the training, such as substitutes, or stipends to allow their staff to attend.

LEAs interested in accessing the Priority Partners network will need to contract directly with one of the Priority Partners approved to provide training on effective data use. For more information go to: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/PriorityPartners.pdf.
Project 3C: Provide feedback to guide the development of new data systems and tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This project does not meet the MOU commitment in this area.

Project description

ESE will build or enhance a variety of data systems and tools as part of the RTTT program. For example, the performance of the Educator Data Warehouse will be improved to enable the system to provide student achievement reports to 80,000 educators statewide, the licensure data system will be linked with the Data Warehouse so that LEAs can more easily compare educator certifications with teaching assignments, and a new online Teaching and Learning System will be created. Feedback from LEAs is critical to the design and implementation of these systems in order to ensure that they are relevant and easy to use.

It is important to note that because these new and enhanced systems will begin to come on line in Year 2, LEAs are discouraged from using local RTTT or other LEA funds to purchase redundant systems or software solutions, unless the need is urgent and the solution is inexpensive enough to make it worthwhile to use as a stopgap for one year. ESE will not support redundant or alternative software or grant waivers to LEAs after Year 2.

LEAs will be required at a minimum to respond to ESE requests for comments on draft reports and materials, on pilot-tested new tools and systems, and to provide other written feedback to ESE as systems are developed. Higher optional levels of participation for interested teachers and LEAs are listed below.

Expected LEA activities

LEAs may choose from the following options:

- **Provide comments** upon request of ESE, generally once or twice per year, about 1 hour or less.

- **Online discussion groups**: Registered individuals will discuss specific or focused issues, 15–60 minutes per week; individuals will be notified of weekly topics by broadcast email and commit to be an active participant in at least one per year.

- **Focus groups**: Registered individuals will be invited, not more than one half day commitment per year; including travel to site or participation by webinar to a group convened to answer specific questions, elicit reactions, and invite recommendations as needed for specific development projects.

- **User groups**: Registered individuals will be assigned to a role-specific user group that will convene for 3–4 half-day sessions per year to test, react to and discuss, and advise on specific data systems and tools; email communication or online discussion will augment in-person sessions.

- **Advisory committees**: Cross-sections of stakeholders such as administrators, teachers, technology staff members, policy leaders and ESE staff members will convene for 3–4 half-
day sessions per year to review activities and feedback, answer specific questions, and make recommendations.

LEAs may participate in more than one option. LEAs may include the same participants as in Year 1 and/or nominate new participants, and indicate the option in which the individual will participate. LEAs must also assure that their Survey of Data and Information Technology Infrastructure (link) is completed and must confirm that the data provided is correct and true.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. For this project, LEAs may only allocate costs for substitutes or stipends and travel, for participants. No other costs for information technology, staff support, or training can be allocated to this project.
Strategy 4: Increase college and career readiness

Strategic objective: Prepare all students for success in college and career

Outcome measures:
1. Increase in percent of students with a plan on YourPlanforCollege or another college and career planning tool
2. Increase in percent of students scoring at or above the minimum entrance score on the SAT for admission to a Massachusetts public four-year college
3. Decrease in annual dropout rate
4. Increase in percent of students who have completed a Work-Based Learning Plan

Other results:
1. A college and career readiness high school course of study that is aligned with college admission requirements and available statewide
2. Six new STEM Early College High Schools
3. More than 1,000 teachers in up to 65 schools trained in pre-AP content

Projects
- 4A: Develop and implement a plan to increase the percentage of high school graduates completing MassCore
- 4B: Implement YourPlanforCollege: Get Ready for Life After High School
- 4C: Implement the Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling Programs
- 4D: Participate in pre-AP training for middle and high school teacher teams
- 4E: Develop and implement a STEM-focused Early College High School
- 4F: Develop and implement an Innovation School
Project 4A: Develop and implement a plan to increase the percentage of high school graduates completing MassCore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required for LEAs that committed to this MOU area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

MassCore is the recommended high school course of study for all MA students. It consists of four years of English, four years of mathematics, three years of a lab-based science, three years of history, two years of the same foreign language, one year of an arts program, and five additional "core" courses such as business education, health, and/or technology. MassCore also includes additional learning opportunities including AP classes, dual enrollment, a senior project, online courses for high school or college credit, and service or work-based learning.

LEAs participating in this project will develop new pathways for high school students to complete rigorous coursework. Students completing the MassCore course of study will leave high school with foundational knowledge to move to the next level: ready for college, post-secondary training and career. The MassCore project is 21st century education: innovative solutions that could look very different across participating LEAs. While a great deal of attention should be spent on the development of coursework based on rigorous standards that cover high school and post-secondary level work, the intent is also to build the 21st century skills that are vital for success in post-secondary education and careers.

The MassCore initiative supports one of the state’s primary goals, which is to increase the percentage of students graduating from public high schools prepared to succeed in first-year, credit-bearing college courses and for entry level jobs with career opportunities. While over 70% of Massachusetts’ high school graduates go on to higher education, one third of graduates who enter public colleges and universities need to take non-credit, developmental courses. Two-thirds of graduates who enter Massachusetts’ community colleges require developmental coursework. Studies indicate that students who are required to take developmental coursework face higher tuition costs and are less likely to persist and earn a degree. The key beneficiaries of this initiative will be the public school students of the Commonwealth, especially economically disadvantaged students who are less likely to have taken a rigorous and comprehensive course of studies before graduating from high school.

The overarching goal of the MassCore project is to increase the percentage of high school graduates who have completed MassCore to 85% by 2014. The current estimate of the percentage of graduates currently completing MassCore is about 70%. Implementation will be monitored using technical measures such as conducting a first year district assessment of MassCore completion, planning for MassCore expansion, and collection and reporting of two years of data. LEAs will also conduct needs assessments to determine which courses are needed to meet targets, as well as report new courses developed and implemented. Successful implementation should result in an increase in the number of high school graduates who have successfully completed the courses required for entry into Massachusetts colleges and universities, an increase in the number who qualify for college credit-bearing courses without the need for developmental coursework (remediation), and an increase in the number of students who are prepared academically for all the challenges of post-secondary education and careers.
Expected LEA activities

All LEAs that selected this assurance area in their MOU are required to participate in this project in all three years. All others are also eligible and may begin the project in Year 2 or Year 3; LEAs new to the initiative will set targets, improve data quality, and conduct a needs assessment in their first year of project implementation.

All LEAs that choose this project, irrespective of if they selected this assurance in their MOU, are expected to complete the following activities:

• In the first year of participation, determine the percentage of students in the class of 2011 that graduated having completed MassCore and set aggressive but attainable targets for increasing that percentage for each of the graduating classes 2012–2014 and beyond. More information on MassCore is available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/hsreform/masscore/. Current local data on MassCore completion is available in the RTTT goals workbook posted at http://www.doe.mass.edu/arra/rttt/.

• Focus on students not completing MassCore, including particular sub-groups (race, economic status), and recognize and address the gaps between a rigorous course of study for students in identified groups.

• If needed, in the first year of participation establish an accurate baseline and a plan for improving the quality of the LEAs’ reporting of the SIMS data element on MassCore completion.

• In the first year of participation, conduct a needs assessment to determine specific areas in which existing courses or supports need to be expanded or new ones added in order to meet LEA targets. Identify any other supports that will help the LEA to meet its targets (for example, participation in Project 4B: YourPlanforCollege; Project 4C: the Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling, and U Teach, a project ESE is undertaking as part of their RTTT program at the state level).

• In any or all years, use local RTTT funds to develop and implement new courses or expand existing ones as needed, or to implement other supports designed to increase the percentage of students who graduate having completed MassCore.

• Create innovative solutions for rigorous course completion. Incorporate discussion and implementation of new Common Core standards and how they will fit into completion of a rigorous course of study.

• As part of ESE’s monitoring of implementation, LEAs may be asked to provide the results of further needs assessments and/or the details of their implementation plans.

NOTE: The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education is considering options to make MassCore the default course of study, with opt-out provision for parents and administrators. The state Board of Higher Education also recently voted to require four years of mathematics, including Algebra I and II, geometry or trigonometry, and mathematics in the senior year as a requirement for admission to Massachusetts four-year public colleges beginning in fall 2016.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies. Please include a brief, initial needs assessment identifying current course taking and other gaps in the LEA that may account for lower levels of MassCore completion. Identify possible initial solutions to increase MassCore completion rates. This needs assessment will assist ESE in identifying resources to support MassCore implementation statewide.
Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. Reasonable costs associated with participation in the project are acceptable, such as staff salary and fringe benefits, stipends, consultants, contracted services (e.g., from college or university partners), specialists, instructors, substitutes, textbooks and instructional materials, instructional technology, and travel.
Project 4B: Implement YourPlanforCollege: Get Ready for Life after High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

The Massachusetts Education Financing Authority (MEFA) has launched a new college and career planning web portal called YourPlanforCollege: Get Ready for Life after High School (YPC). The system is available at no cost for every high school (public and private) in the Commonwealth. YPC will help students and parents plan for college and careers by providing online application tools to make the college admissions process easier and more efficient for guidance counselors to manage. Guidance counselors will be able to access training on how to upload student data into the system. YPC has a strong career-planning component for all students and is intended to work in concert with other college and career readiness initiatives including MassCore (Project 4A) and the Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling (Project 4C). In Year 2, projected for September 2011, YPC will be expanded to middle schools.

Successful implementation is expected to result in increased college enrollment and a reduced gap in college enrollment for targeted demographic groups.

Expected LEA activities

All LEAs may participate in any or all years of YPC; participating LEAs must execute an Intent to Participate with MEFA which they can request from YPC at info@YourPlanForcollege.org.

LEAs must also:

- Attend centralized online or regional trainings where best practices for implementation and engagement will be showcased including how YPC can support other college and career readiness initiatives under RTTT.
- Collaborate with the YPC team for the development of a utilization and success plan that details implementation as well as student and parent engagement commitments; work with the YPC team throughout the school year for successful execution of this plan.
- Work with the YPC team to import verified student demographic and academic data from your student information management system(s) with the assistance of YPC staff.
- Promote YPC within the high school and LEA community.
- Participate in semi-annual recommendations for enhancements.

Note: It will take approximately two hours to complete the initial set up of YPC (i.e., to upload data from the LEA’s student information system) as well as an hour per semester to refresh the data submitted. Technical assistance for this work will be available online and by phone. School counselors should also expect to spend about one hour per month on trainings and feedback sessions about the site. Additional time spent using the site will be determined by individual counselors.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies. Please also include any technical support or professional development that your LEA may need in implementation.
Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. YPC is free and supported by a centralized, online, and regional structure. There is no cost to LEAs for the building, expanding, and maintaining of YPC and the online and phone supports. Additional implementation and support services are available for a fee and include onsite planning and staff training, student and parent engagement support, such as college and career planning events, as well as customized reporting and analytics. Reasonable costs associated with implementing YPC, such as stipends and consultants are allowed, especially those associated with parent academies and other information sessions for families and other events supporting first generation college students. No computer hardware expenses are allowed.
Project 4C: Implement the Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>If demand exceeds capacity</td>
<td>Priority will be given to Level 3 and 4 districts</td>
<td>Any of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

The Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling (Model) is a programmatic, organizational tool that links school counseling programs to supporting college and career readiness. The Model provides a framework for program implementation designed to transform the way that school counselors work. Program goals and outcomes are proactive rather than reactive. Program delivery is done equitably, moving away from traditional over-reliance on one-to-one counseling to a balanced mix of classroom-based content and individual guidance, advising and counseling. School counselors develop and use data and evaluation methods to measure the impact of their programs and coordinate efforts to ensure that all students graduate from high school with the requisite academic/technical, workplace readiness and personal/social knowledge skills and attitudes for college and career success.

The Model is designed to ensure that all students benefit from the school’s guidance counseling program by providing consistent, classroom-based, prevention-oriented, evidence-based programming for all students as well as targeted small group and individual interventions for students identified as at risk.

The primary focus of the Model implementation for this project must be on improving college and career readiness data outcomes (e.g., graduation and MassCore completion rates). At least one school counseling representative from the project implementation team will participate in at least one course in RTTT Project 3B: Access ESE-sponsored or -approved professional development on using data to inform instruction.

ESE is partnering with the Massachusetts Association of School Counselors (MASCA) to:

- Plan its annual conferences to support the Model implementation in support of college and career readiness;
- Identify potential professional development and technical assistance providers to project implementation; and
- Identify and disseminate promising practices and outcomes from the LEAs participating in this project.

ESE will track the performance of this project by reviewing the implementation plan, gap analysis reports, and tracking of target data outcomes. Successful implementation will:

- Build the capacity of counselors to use data to plan and implement programs and interventions to improve college and career readiness outcomes including, but NOT limited to, increasing MassCore completion and five year graduation rates with a focus on reducing achievement gaps for at risk populations.
- Result in readiness gains as measured by plans of high school graduates, postsecondary enrollment, and remediation and retention.
Expected LEA activities

LEAs may begin Model implementation LEA-wide or in one or more of its schools in Year 2 or 3 of RTTT. If support for additional LEAs in Years 2–4 should exceed the project’s capacity, priority will be given to Level 3 or 4 districts. At a minimum, participating LEAs are expected to:

First year of implementation

- New Project 4C districts will identify members of a Model implementation team comprised of at least one administrator, guidance director/leader, teacher, school counselor, parent, and student. At least two members of the team will attend a RTTT Model Implementation Meeting at the Massachusetts School Counselors Association (MASCA) fall conference in October 2011. At the fall conference, first-year participants will complete a guided review of the Model and receive instructions in completing gap analyses of current program components.

- The principal or his/her designee must participate on the implementation team.

- By March of a LEA’s first year, it must complete gap analyses with regard to Model implementation with a specific focus on using data to drive programming for college and career readiness.

- At least two team members must attend MASCA’s April conference. At that conference, first year participants will receive technical assistance in conducting an in-depth review of gap analyses results and evaluating their current capacity for data-based management of Model implementation.

- At least one school counseling representative from the project implementation team will participate in the required ESE-sponsored or –approved professional development on effective use of new data systems and tools as described in Project 3B.

- During the summer, the Model implementation team will complete its in-depth review of gap analysis data, relevant college and career readiness data, and district/school improvement goals. In partnership with each school’s data teams, the implementation team, informed by its in-depth data review, will identify the most salient foci for program delivery and develop an implementation plan. The plan will include ways to organize, direct, and manage school guidance counseling resources and time effectively so as to be able to implement a data driven project to improve targeted college and career readiness outcomes. Technical assistance for these activities will be available from an ESE-approved provider list (i.e., based in part on recommendations from MASCA, ESE will provide an approved provider list for professional development and curriculum).

Subsequent years of implementation

- Implementation team representatives will attend the College and Career Readiness Summit to be held at the MASCA annual conferences and ESE-sponsored professional development and technical assistance that:
  - Strengthens school counselors’ capacity to use data to determine program needs, identify obstacles to implementation, and target interventions for groups or individual students at-risk with respect to college and career readiness targets;
  - Strengthens school counselors’ capacity to monitor the use of resources and evaluate results for college and career readiness; and
  - Develops an accountability system to measure student outcomes in college and career readiness.
• At least one school counseling representative from the project implementation team will participate in the ESE-sponsored or –approved professional development on effective use of data to improve instruction as described in Project 3B.

• LEAs will carry out their implementation plans using data to guide mid-course corrections and evaluate outcomes. Assistance in analyzing, evaluating, and utilizing data will be available from an ESE-approved list of technical assistance and professional development providers.

• Each year the district will send at least two members of its Model implementation team to attend the fall and spring MASCA conferences.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies. Participating districts must provide a narrative describing their current guidance-counseling program and in which year the project would begin.

Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. Cost will vary depending on the LEA’s implementation plan and RTTT allocation.

LEAs may use RTTT funds to pay registration fees and other costs associated with implementation team members’ attendance at MASCA conferences and workshops specific to support of this project. This includes support for individual MASCA membership fees and other professional association memberships that directly support project implementation.

Participating LEAs may also use RTTT funds to support professional development for school counselors and/or stipends for school counselors to carry out the district’s/school’s implementation plan. Participating LEAs may also use RTTT funds to hire approved technical assistance and professional development providers to support project implementation.

Reasonable costs associated with the work of the implementation team and project implementation such as substitutes, supplies, materials, and travel are allowed. Costs associated with salaries and additional technology hardware are not allowed.
Project 4D: Participate in pre-AP training for middle and high school teacher teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

The intent of this project is to provide training and technical assistance for middle and high school teacher teams, thus promoting equitable access to Advanced Placement (AP) and other college level coursework for all students and increasing the number of high school graduates prepared to enroll and succeed in credit-bearing coursework in college.

Early exposure to rigorous curricula and college-level work is a proven strategy for increasing college and career readiness, particularly for low income and minority students. By offering high quality pre-Advanced Placement (pre-AP) training for teams of teachers of middle and high school ELA, science and technology/engineering (science), and mathematics content areas, teachers will engage an increasing number of low-income and minority students with rigorous college preparatory curriculum and instruction.

This pre-AP teacher training is high quality professional development designed to assist vertical teams of teachers in developing curricula, instruction, and performance expectations that prepare students for AP coursework. Vertical teams of teachers in a content area will have the ability to vertically align curriculum, and create more rigorous, standards-based curriculum. One grade level of teachers or only middle school teachers participating is unlikely to have high sustainable impact.

Goals of the pre-AP training:

- Ensure more equitable access to AP and other high level coursework for low-income and minority students and an increase in the proportion of high school graduates prepared to enroll and succeed in credit-bearing coursework in college.
- Increase the proportion of low-income and minority students prepared to participate in and succeed in mathematics, science, and English AP courses or other rigorous programs such as International Baccalaureate (IB), early college and dual enrollment coursework.

Successful implementation is expected to result in the following outcomes:

- By August 2014, one thousand teachers from all across Massachusetts and from at least 65 low-income schools will have completed pre-AP teacher training. A majority of these teachers will be from schools serving primarily low-income and minority students. These teachers will show evidence of change:
  - Improved teaching strategies;
  - Improved content knowledge; and
  - Fidelity to the implementation of pre-AP strategies and resources in their classrooms.
- By September 1, 2014, participating LEAs will provide evidence that there is an increased proportion of low-income and minority students enrolled in and succeeding in AP courses and other rigorous programs such as IB, early college and dual enrollment coursework.
Expected LEA activities

This project will be conducted in the areas of English, mathematics, and science. LEAs may choose to participate in one, two, or all three of these content areas. The following guidelines apply to all participating LEAs:

- LEAs must establish a team of middle and high school educators made up of grades 6–12 teachers for each of the content areas in which they choose to participate. Team members should include department heads and curriculum directors. Optimally, the team will include all/most of the middle and high school faculty in the content area. However, plans to include fewer will be considered. Large LEAs may identify one or more high schools and feeder middle schools.

- In the Additional Project Information section of the online grants management system (or in an alternate report to be provided by ESE if the grant system is not available), LEAs should list the content areas in which they plan to participate and the number of educators by grade level in each area. Teams may be in the content areas of English, mathematics, and/or science.

- LEAs must commit each team (of the same teachers) to participate in four days of professional development each year for three years, for a total of 12 days. Professional development may occur during the summer, school year, or combination of the school year and summer and be conducted within the LEA or regionally, depending on the number of participating teachers.

- LEAs should plan and budget for a minimum of four vertical team meetings throughout the school year when pre-AP trained teachers will work as a professional learning community to vertically align LEA curriculum, provide and receive pre-AP implementation support, and embed pre-AP activities and strategies in the LEA curriculum at all levels.

- LEAs must identify an educator on each content area team to serve as a lead teacher. The lead teacher must agree to participate in additional professional development, and will be responsible for:
  - Planning, organizing, and facilitating four vertical team meetings, one meeting each term, with support from MMSI pre-AP staff;
  - Acting as a pre-AP content resource and mentor for pre-AP teachers in the LEA; and
  - Acting as a moderator for LEA’s participation in the professional learning community. The lead teacher may be compensated for his/her time based on the collective bargaining agreement; this compensation may be included in the budget.

- Project 4D requires LEAs to commit to this three-year pre-AP program. The same team of teachers will get 12 days of training over the three-year period, four days each year. (Exceptions will be made for LEAs already involved in MMSI pre-AP teacher training.)

- LEAs beginning in Year 2 must enroll teams in Year 2, and teams must participate in Years 2–4.

Technical guidance:

- **Definition of a vertical team**: A vertical team is a team of teachers, grades 6–12 who teach the same content area and who will to work together to improve content rigor and vertical alignment of district and charter school curriculum. To participate, LEAs must form vertical teams of middle and high school teachers, who represent, at a minimum, grades 6–10. It is strongly suggested the vertical teams represent grades 6–12. There should be at least one teacher who represents each grade level. Depending on the LEA size, the team should be no fewer than five members per content area.
• Due to the integral nature of guidance counselors’ roles in student scheduling and in understanding graduation requirements, it is strongly recommended that the middle and high school guidance counselors understand the pre-AP program by participating in the first vertical team meeting and in setting district and charter school pre-AP goals and benchmarks.

• LEAs will contract directly with the ESE-designated vendor, Mass Insight Education, a vendor with a proven track record in providing pre-AP professional and program development. ESE will manage the work of the vendor.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

In addition, please identify:

• The content area or areas in which the teachers will receive training.

• The number of teachers in each content area and the grade levels the teachers represent.

• The lead teacher for each content area.

• The mechanism by which the vertical team meetings will take place that will allow all pre-AP trained teachers, grades 6–12, to meet together for the purpose of vertical curriculum articulation and to share pre-AP implementation strategies.

• How teacher stipends are calculated and for what activities stipends will be paid.

• Other costs such as travel and substitutes (including justification).

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. Reasonable costs associated with the training, including stipends, substitutes, travel, and supplies and materials are allowable.

• The cost for professional development will be approximately $1,000 per teacher per year ($3,000 per teacher over the course of the project). The cost for each lead teacher will be approximately $2,500 per year ($7,500 over the course of the project). LEAs should also budget for travel, stipends, and substitutes for participating teachers.

  o For example, if a LEA decides to participate in ELA pre-AP training and includes 20 faculty, the cost of the program would be $21,500 per year (19 @ $1,000 and 1 @ $2,500) plus travel, substitutes, and stipends, as needed, to cover the costs of the training, and the time the teachers will spend in the vertical team meetings.

Level 3 districts will be eligible to apply for state funds to cover up to 40 percent of their RTTT costs for this initiative, and so it is in the interest of Level 3 districts to budget for the entire cost of 4D using RTTT grant funds. The RFP for this grant will be issued in the spring of each year. Level 3 districts should develop their budget and budget narrative assuming they will **not** receive state funding. Reimbursements will be issued as a grant. The key purpose of this reimbursement is to further support pre-AP teacher training, vertical team activities, and pre-AP implementation.

**NOTE:** This is strictly a pre-AP teacher professional development initiative. LEAs are **not allowed** to allocate costs to this project for the following purposes:

• For teacher and student incentives related to pre-AP and AP courses and exams;

• To purchase student AP curriculum, tests or pre-AP curriculum such as Springboard®;
• To purchase classroom supplies and materials. The purchase of supplies and materials is limited for the purpose of the teacher professional development, not for student supplies and materials; and

• For AP teacher training or AP-related programs.
Project 4E: Develop and implement a STEM Early College High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>Yes (awarded spring 2011)</td>
<td>4E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

Early college high schools (ECHS) are a proven model for preparing students, especially low-income, minority, and first-generation college-goers, for postsecondary education. They provide students with a college experience and an opportunity to get a head start on earning college credits while still in high school. Given the state’s need for highly skilled workers in STEM areas, LEAs have been encouraged to consider developing ECHS that motivate and prepare students to explore STEM career pathways while still enrolled in high school and to pursue STEM majors in college. ECHS are designed to result in higher rates of college going for students currently underrepresented in higher education and to build an accelerated route linking secondary education with postsecondary educational opportunities. These schools are developed through agreements between high schools and postsecondary institutions.

Competitive implementation grants have been provided to the Boston Public Schools, Marlborough Public Schools, Quaboag Regional School District, Randolph Public Schools, Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical School, and Worcester Public Schools to support their efforts over a four-year period. Technical assistance on program development and implementation will be provided by Jobs for the Future (JFF) and a more coordinated effort from an Early College Designs panel will assist LEAs in developing policies to encourage early college experiences and dual enrollment.

It is anticipated that successful implementation will lead to improvements in student achievement in STEM subjects and increased enrollment in STEM college majors, especially for low-income, minority, and first-generation college students.

Expected LEA activities

LEAs may collaborate to propose a joint school serving several LEAs or develop a STEM ECHS as either a program or pathway within an existing high school or a new or conversion high school. A new ECHS may be established as an Innovation School. LEAs interested in establishing an ECHS as an Innovation School may potentially be able to combine state RTTT funding from this project with state RTTT funding from the Innovation School project (Project 4F).

LEAs must establish a partnership with an institution of higher education. This must include a way for students to receive dual enrollment credit at no cost to students. The LEA and its higher education partner must develop an implementation plan as well as a long-term plan to sustain financial support for the school beyond the RTTT funding period.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. Any LEA is eligible to use local RTTT funds to support implementation of a STEM ECHS with no selection or additional application process. LEAs will need to identify significant non-RTTT funds to implement a STEM ECHS. Costs will vary widely depending on local design specifications.
Reasonable costs associated with planning for and implementing an ECHS, such as staff salaries and benefits, consultants, specialists, instructors, speakers, substitutes, supplies and materials, and travel are allowed. Contracted services with institution(s) of higher education and community partners are also allowable. LEAs that have been awarded competitive grants may use these funds to supplement their competitive awards. LEAs not awarded competitive funds may use these funds to continue efforts to establish STEM ECHS and pathways.
Project 4F: Establish and operate an Innovation School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yrs 2-4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

The Innovation School initiative, a signature component of An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap that Governor Patrick signed in January 2010, provides educators and other stakeholders across the state with the opportunity to create new in-district schools that can implement creative and inventive strategies, increase student achievement, and reduce achievement gaps while keeping school funding within districts. These unique schools—which may be established by teachers, school and district administrators, superintendents, union leaders, school committees, parents, parent-teacher organizations, colleges and universities, non-profit and business organizations, charter school operators, education management organizations, educational collaboratives, or other groups authorized by the Commissioner of ESE—operate with increased autonomy and flexibility in six key areas:

- Curriculum;
- Budget;
- School schedule and calendar;
- Staffing (including waivers from or exemptions to collective bargaining agreements);
- Professional development; and
- School district policies.

In exchange for greater authority to establish the school conditions that will lead to improved teaching and learning, the operators of Innovation Schools will be held accountable for meeting annual benchmarks for student achievement and school performance. There are no caps on the number of Innovation Schools. New schools can be created or existing schools can be converted in every district in Massachusetts. Guidance documents about the Innovation School model and the locally based approval process are available at the Innovation Schools website: www.mass.gov/edu/innovationschools.

Eligible applicants may create an “Innovation Zone” that may include a set of schools within a district or geographic region, schools that will operate in accordance with particular instructional or curricular themes, or schools that are defined by other factors as determined by the applicants. Multiple LEAs can also work together to establish an Innovation School that would serve students from different communities.

Expected LEA activities

Any participating LEA operator is eligible to use their local RTTT funds to establish an Innovation School. Planning and implementation grants using state RTTT funds will be distributed through competitive grant processes to eligible applicants (as described above) and participating LEAs. A total of $1.5 million is available to support the establishment and operation of Innovation Schools in Years 1 to 3. ESE will award planning and implementation grants to two cohorts of Innovation Schools; the first cohort began planning activities during SY10–11, and the second cohort will begin planning activities during SY11–12. A third cohort could be supported pending the availability of state RTTT funds. The press release announcing the recipients of the first round of planning grants (awarded in March 2011) is available at the following website: http://www.mass.gov/?pageID=edupressrelease&L=1&L0=Home&sid=Ededu&b=pressrelease&f=20110317_innovation_schools&csid=Ededu.
State-funded planning grants

Planning grants (maximum amount of $15,000 per proposed Innovation School) will be awarded to eligible applicants and RTTT participating LEAs to support the development of innovation plans. In order to be eligible to apply for a planning grant, the applicant must have completed the first stage of the Innovation School authorization process as outlined in state law – two-thirds approval of the applicant’s initial prospectus by a three-member screening committee consisting of the superintendent or designee, a school committee member or a designee selected by the school committee, and a representative of the local teacher’s union. The participating LEA will serve as the fiscal agent for the planning grant, and the applicant will work with appropriate LEA administrators to make decisions about spending the grant funds.

An applicant interested in receiving a planning grant in SY11–12 must submit an approved prospectus, a proposed budget, and other materials to ESE by November 15, 2011. ESE will issue a RFP for these grants at the start of SY11–12; this document will include detailed information about eligibility and submission requirements, and it will be posted on the Innovation Schools’ website.

Note: The initial prospectuses for selected recipients of planning grants have been posted on the Innovation Schools’ website, and new applicants can use these documents to inform the development of their prospectuses.

State-funded implementation grants

Implementation grants ($25,000 to $75,000 per authorized Innovation School) will be awarded to eligible applicants and RTTT participating LEAs to support the operation of these schools for one school year. In order to be eligible to apply for an implementation grant, the applicant must have completed the final stage of the authorization process as outlined in state law – approval of the innovation plan by the local school committee. The participating LEA will serve as the fiscal agent for the implementation grant, and the applicant will work with the appropriate LEA administrators to make decisions about spending the grant funds.

An applicant interested in receiving an implementation grant at the end of SY12–13 must submit an approved innovation plan, a proposed budget, and other materials to ESE by June 30, 2012. ESE will issue an RFP for these grants during the spring of 2012; this document will include detailed information about eligibility and submission requirements, and it will be posted on the Innovation Schools’ website.

Note: Selected innovation plans that have been approved by local school committees have been posted on the Innovation Schools website, and applicants can use these documents to inform the development of their innovation plans.

An eligible applicant and partner district that did not apply for or receive a state-funded planning grant may apply for an implementation grant if they meet the eligibility criteria described above.

Funding Priorities

Priority will be given to planning and implementation grant proposals for:

- Establishing and operating Innovation Schools in Level 3 and 4 districts; and
- Establishing and operating STEM-focused Innovation Schools.

Given the availability of other state and federal resources, planning and implementation grants will not be awarded to convert Level 4 schools into Innovation Schools.
Participating RTTT districts that were awarded Readiness School Preliminary Planning Grants (FY10 Fund Code: 221-G) during the summer of 2009 (please refer to http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants10/awards/221G.html) may apply for another planning grant, but their proposals will receive lowest priority unless the applicant can justify why additional funding is needed.

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

The Innovation School model was designed to be fiscally neutral; longer-term support for new programs or services will be supported by the per pupil allocation required by state law, increased flexibility with regard to the school budget and the allocation of resources, and the ability of the applicant to apply for supplement grant funds from public or private sources. However, as with any new initiative, there may be initial start-up and implementation costs that will vary depending on the particular design and size of the proposed Innovation School. Reasonable expenses associated with the establishment and operation of an Innovation School include stipends for educators, reimbursements for substitute teachers, consultant support, and instructional or curricular materials, among others; detailed information about allowable and unallowable expenses for planning and implementation grant funds will be included in the RFPs issued by ESE.

LEAs that wish to establish or operate an Innovation School using its local RTTT allocation must submit a budget and narrative for any costs associated with this project in the Project Detail and Budget form. LEAs that wish to work with eligible applicants to apply for the competitive planning and implementation grants must comply with the previously described eligibility and submission requirements.
Strategy 5: Develop and implement the teaching and learning system

Strategic objective: Provide every educator with the tools necessary to promote and support student achievement

Outcome measures:
1. Percent of LEA staff using model curriculum units from the state teaching and learning system
2. Percent of LEA staff using curriculum-embedded performance assessments from the state teaching and learning system
3. Percent of LEA staff using the interim/formative assessment system from the state teaching and learning system
4. Percent of LEA staff using the revised vocational-technical competency tracking system

Other results:
1. A new statewide teaching and learning system for all educators that will provide instructional resources and actionable data to support teacher development and academic success for all students

Projects

- 5A: Implement one or more components of the statewide teaching and learning system
- 5B/C: Participate on the committee to develop model curriculum units and curriculum-embedded performance assessments (CEPAs)
- 5D: Participate on an advisory committee to develop online formative and interim assessments
- 5E: Implement an improved competency tracking system for vocational-technical students
Project 5A: Implement element(s) of the statewide teaching and learning system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required for LEAs that committed to this MOU area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

One of the strategies to improve the planning, delivery, and targeting of instruction through the Massachusetts RTTT initiative is to build a statewide Teaching and Learning System aligned with the state curriculum frameworks, including the new Common Core Standards. With the assistance of advisory committees drawn from LEAs (projects 5B/C, 5D, and 5E), ESE will develop model curriculum maps and units with curriculum embedded performance assessments (CEPAs), expand the existing digital library of curriculum resources, develop a test builder engine to deliver interim and formative assessments, and develop an improved competency tracking system for career vocational technical schools. The subjects for 5A–5D are all four-core subject areas: mathematics, science and technology/engineering, history and social science, and ELA.

The curriculum maps will define a model scope and sequence and pacing for grade-level standards for curriculum. These maps will be aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and serve as a foundation for effective instructional planning. CEPAs are tasks to be conducted in the classroom over the course of several days to two or more weeks to address and assess several standards and will be created in parallel with curriculum resources.

In order to create useful guides that will clearly articulate the content and promising instructional strategies, educators need engaging, high quality, accurate, up-to-date, and academically relevant resources. ESE started building a digital library two years ago by partnering with the WGBH Educational Foundation. WGBH has used the resources in its PBS Teachers Domain portal to create a Massachusetts Teachers Domain and aligned its extensive instructional resources to the Massachusetts frameworks. ESE will continue this partnership to customize digital resources and enhance the Massachusetts Teachers Domain in order to fully develop the core digital library in the Teaching and Learning System.

Formative assessment tools and resources will include MCAS questions released since 1998 (by 2014 this will include 12,000 to 14,000 items); an assessment builder into which teachers will be able to load selected items; and an interface with the Educator Data Warehouse. The test builder tool will also be available for developing interim assessments, and ESE will provide guidance on how to build such assessments effectively.

LEAs will have the opportunity to pilot one or more components of the Teaching and Learning System beginning in project Year 2. Participating LEAs will receive training on the use of the resources and will provide feedback to ESE about their usefulness at the district level. All materials and tools will be made available at no charge to LEAs. For LEAs that are currently purchasing services from a commercial vendor or developing district-level curriculum or tools, using the state system may result in cost savings.

It is important to note that because these new and enhanced systems will begin to come on line in Year 2, LEAs are discouraged from using local RTTT or other LEA funds to purchase redundant systems or software solutions, unless the need is urgent and the solution is inexpensive enough to make it worthwhile to use as a stopgap for one year. ESE will not support redundant or alternative software or grant waivers to LEAs after Year 2.
This project is expected to increase grade level parity and curriculum rigor, strengthen and target instruction, and increase students’ 21st century skills for LEAs that increase the use of CEPAs. Ultimately this project is expected to increase student achievement and reduce achievement gaps.

**Expected LEA activities**

LEAs that select this project must appoint a Teaching and Learning System coordinator to oversee LEA implementation and be the point of contact with ESE. This contact will be notified when new components of the Teaching and Learning System come online and when training sessions are available. The coordinator will manage communication within the LEA and ensure that educators know about and select appropriate opportunities. Educators that select a component to pilot are expected to access training (online or at a DSAC) if needed and to provide feedback.

Components of the system will include:

- Standards-based curriculum resources and CEPAs, including preK–8 curriculum maps, high school course syllabi, model instructional units with associated curriculum resources, and CEPAs that may include research, writing, problem-solving, experiments and oral presentations
- A test builder engine that enables teachers to develop formative and interim assessments based on Massachusetts standards. This system will draw upon an assessment bank of standards-based assessment questions (multiple choice, open response, essay) and online assessment and assessment builder tools
- A Vocational Technical Competency Tracking System that enables teachers to systematically record how students are meeting competencies in the Career/Vocational Technical Education (CVTE) Frameworks. This system will interface with the Educator Data Warehouse and will include standards-based assessment results to provide a more comprehensive profile of student strengths and weaknesses and opportunities for support and intervention

Teachers will be expected to give feedback after piloting each resource. This may be in the form of a response to an ESE email communication, completing a brief online survey, or posting comments to an online bulletin board or discussion group.

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

LEAs should indicate the component(s) they intend to pilot and the year(s) of implementation. LEAs with educators participating on an Advisory Committee (projects 5B-C, 5D, and 5E) should plan to pilot that component, but may also select others. For example, a vocational technical school participating in project 5E will pilot the competency tracking system but may also choose to implement curriculum resources or CEPAs. For the curriculum resources, CEPAs, and online assessment tools, LEAs should indicate if there is a preference for a content area or grade level(s).

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. LEAs should plan for release time, substitutes, travel, and any required stipend under the local collective bargaining agreement for the Teaching and Learning System coordinator. The coordinator role is expected to require up to 50 hours for each piloted component. LEAs should anticipate paying for the cost of five to six educators per district to access training (half-day per component area; 20 hours for CVTE), and LEAs may allocate costs for additional planning time, if needed, and time to
provide feedback (1-2 hours per resource piloted). LEAs can use their grant funds to purchase curriculum materials related to implementing the model curriculum units.

The cost of classroom materials not related to implementing the model curriculum units, computers or instructional technology, consultants, or other salary support are not allowed under this project.
Project 5B/C: Participate on the advisory committee to develop standards-based curriculum resources and curriculum-embedded performance assessments (CEPAs), and the Massachusetts Performance Assessments of Knowledge and Skills (MPAKS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed to new members</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LEAs that appointed members to the Advisory Committee in Year 1</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5B, 5C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

The Curriculum and CEPAs Advisory Committee was formed in Year 1. This group of educators is developing preK–8 curriculum maps and high school course syllabi, as well as instructional units that include digital resources and curriculum-embedded performance assessments that will eventually become an integral part of the Teaching and Learning System. Implementation of this project will be monitored by attendance and completion of work products.

The goal of MPAKS is to develop another statewide summative assessment that can be used assess standards that are not captured by traditional paper and pencil testing. The MPAKS Advisory Committee (MAC) was formed in Year 3 to assist ESE in developing and reviewing MPAKS tasks, test questions, and scoring rubrics. The group will review items for alignment with the Curriculum Frameworks and MPAKS specifications, developmental appropriateness, and content accuracy.

**Expected LEA activities**

The Curriculum and CEPA Advisory Committee participants are expected to attend four school days (full-day), a five-day summer institute, and to help develop curriculum materials or CEPAs to contribute to the Teaching and Learning System. Each participant will contribute at least one work product per year. Participants will pilot and implement elements of the Teaching and Learning System, but those activities should be included under project 5A. For the Years 2–4 RFP LEAs need to assure that participants will continue in each project year. The schedule for the meetings is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010–2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 25, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Friday, July 25–29, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011–2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday to Thursday, October 25–26 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday to Thursday, April 4–5, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Friday, July 30–August 3, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012–2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday to Thursday, October 17–18, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday to Thursday, April 3–4, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Friday, July 29–August 2, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2013–2014 |
Wednesday to Thursday, October 16–17, 2013  
Wednesday to Thursday, April 16–17, 2014  
Monday to Friday, July 28–August 1, 2014

Each MAC participant is expected to attend four full-day meetings to develop and review MPAKS. Some MAC participants will also have the opportunity to pilot MPAKS during the school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012–2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 29, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, January 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 7, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, June 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. LEAs should budget for participation in the scheduled meetings and, in the case of the Curriculum and CEPAs Advisory Committee, five-day summer institute (travel, including overnight stay if necessary, and substitutes) and for the creation of work products. No costs for computers, salary, or consultants are allowed under this project.

Any costs to pilot or implement elements of the Teaching and Learning System should not be included here, but under project 5A.
Project 5D: Participate on the advisory committee to develop online formative and interim assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed to new members</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LEAs that appointed members to the Advisory Committee in Year 1</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

The Online Formative and Interim Assessment Advisory Committee was formed in Year 1. This group of educators is advising ESE and an ESE-approved vendor who are developing online tools and resources for creating formative and interim assessments that will eventually become an integral part of the Teaching and Learning System. The subjects for 5D are all four core subject areas: mathematics; science and technology/engineering; history and social science; and ELA.

Expected LEA activities

Advisory committee participants are expected to attend four days each year from 2010 through 2014 and to provide feedback on the assessment tools and resources created for the Teaching and Learning System. Participants will be expected to pilot and implement elements of the Teaching and Learning System, but those activities should be included under project 5A. For the Years 2–4 RFP, LEAs need to ensure that participants will continue in the remaining project years.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the LEA plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the LEA’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

Specific budget guidance and costs

LEAs should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. LEAs should budget for participation in four full day meetings per year (travel, substitutes). No costs for computers, salary, or consultants are allowed under this project.

Any costs to pilot or implement elements of the Teaching and Learning System should not be included here, but under project 5A.
**Project 5E: Participate on the advisory committee to develop an improved competency tracking system for vocational technical students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed to new members</td>
<td>Yes for committee membership. See below for additional non-restricted opportunities</td>
<td>LEAs that appointed members to the Advisory Committee in Year 1</td>
<td>Yrs 2–4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

The Education Reform Act established the Certificate of Occupational Proficiency. The statute, M.G.L.c.69 section 1D (iii), states: “The certificate of occupational proficiency shall be awarded to students who successfully complete a comprehensive education and training program in a particular trade or professional skill area and shall reflect a determination that the recipient has demonstrated mastery of a core of skills, competencies and knowledge comparable to that possessed by students of equivalent age entering the particular trade or profession from the most advanced education systems in the world.”

For Year 1 of RTTT, 16 districts nominated educators to serve on the Competency Tracking System Advisory Committee. Committee members include technical teachers, administrators, and technology directors. Members come from regional vocational technical high schools, comprehensive high schools, urban vocational schools and an agricultural high school. The advisory committee will inform and make recommendations to the ESE and an ESE-approved vendor for an improved competency tracking system.

It is anticipated that improvements to the Vocational Technical Competency Tracking System will result in further utilization of the Competency Tracking system for the purpose of tracking students’ mastery of a core of skills, competencies and knowledge and identifying areas in which students require additional instruction and support.

Massachusetts’ commitment to improving the Vocational Technical Competency Tracking System is essential to establishing an assessment system for awarding the Certificate of Occupational Proficiency. The long-range goal of this project is that the competency tracking system becomes a part of the Teaching and Learning System, eventually interfacing with the Educator Data Warehouse to provide a comprehensive profile of student strengths and weaknesses and opportunities for support and intervention.

Performance will be monitored at the state and district levels and will include:

1. The final recommendations of the Competency Tracking System Advisory Committee, focus group and subcommittee reports;
2. Surveys results of educators in schools that pilot the system; and
3. Implemented improvements to the competency tracking system, including but not limited to technical teachers, administrators, and district technology directors.

Improvements to the Vocational Technical Competency Tracking System will help prepare all students at career/vocational technical education schools (CVTE) for success in college and career. An improved system will allow teachers to track individual student competencies and identify areas where students need additional support or intervention. The project is a critical component of an effective
certificate of occupational proficiency assessment system. The current system is not well reviewed by the CVTE schools and is consequently not widely used.

**Expected district activities**

Advisory committee participants are expected to attend a minimum of six (full-day) meetings, and to provide feedback on the competency tracking system and integration into the Teaching and Learning System. Advisory committee participants will be expected to pilot and implement elements of the Teaching and Learning System, but those activities should be included under project 5A. For the Years 2–4 RFP, districts with advisory committee participants shall provide assurances that members will continue in the remaining project years.

While membership on the advisory committee is closed to new members, districts that did not nominate individuals to serve on the advisory committee in Year 1 will still have an opportunity to participate in this project in Years 2–4. Districts will be able to provide feedback on the design by responding to ESE emailed communication, completing a brief online survey, or posting comments to an online bulletin board or discussion group.

Districts may also participate in piloting and implementing elements of the Teaching and Learning System, but those activities should be included under project 5A.

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the district plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the district’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

Districts should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. Districts should budget for participation in the meetings, costs to include travel and substitutes. No costs for computers, salary, or consultants are allowed under this project. Costs of classroom materials or instructional technology, consultants, or other salary support are also not allowed under this project.

Districts should plan for release time and any required stipend under the local collective bargaining agreement, estimated to be 20 hours for the competency tracking system advisory committee members. Districts may allocate costs for additional planning time, if needed, and time to provide feedback (one to two hours per resource piloted). Training and access to the competency tracking system will be provided at no charge.

Any costs to provide feedback (if not a committee member), pilot or implement improvements to the competency tracking system should not be included here, but under project 5A.
**Strategy 6: Turn around the lowest achieving schools**

**Strategic objective:** Significantly improve the performance in the state’s lowest achieving schools and set them on a path for continued improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Measureable Annual Goals met for student achievement, rates, college readiness, and school culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase in student growth in Level 3 and 4 schools (both English Language Arts and mathematics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of schools that exit out of Level 4 status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other results:**
1. At least 75 percent of our lowest achieving schools turned around
2. A highly skilled specialized corps of educators prepared to contribute substantially to school turnaround efforts across the state
3. Proven partners identified to support our lowest achieving schools
4. District and state capacity to prevent low achievement and to sustain progress

**Projects**
- **6A:** Use ESE-identified turnaround partners to address essential conditions (“Priority Partners”)
- **6B.1:** Hire from the new cadre of turnaround teacher teams
- **6B.2:** Hire from the new cadre of turnaround leader and leadership teams
- **6C:** Participate in a network for principals of high need schools
- **6D:** Implement a wraparound zone
Project 6A: Use ESE-identified turnaround partners to address essential conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–6D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts with Level 3 or 4 schools are eligible; priority will be given to Level 4 schools</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

Districts seeking to turn around schools need access to proven providers who specialize in addressing the Conditions for School Effectiveness. ESE is identifying Priority Partners for Turnaround to support districts with Level 3 or 4 schools in their turnaround initiatives. If demand exceeds capacity, priority will be given to Level 4 schools. Districts can use RTTT funds to pay for the services of these Priority Partners.

Districts and schools will benefit from access to Priority Partners for Turnaround who are familiar with:

- The context and requirements of Massachusetts school turnaround work;
- The Massachusetts definition of conditions for school effectiveness; and
- The strategy and approach taken by other ESE-priority partners addressing other essential conditions.

Over the past twelve months, ESE has prequalified educational service providers that can support districts and schools in meeting the Conditions for School Effectiveness. ESE will continue to evaluate and screen providers to create approved lists of Priority Partners for Turnaround. Districts will receive these lists of Priority Partners for Turnaround when each list is completed and/or revised and can use RTTT resources to pay for some or all of their services. ESE anticipates having the first lists of Priority Partners for Turnaround by the end of Year 1 (August 2011). The initial focus areas include:

- Students’ social, emotional, and health needs; and
- Adequate learning time.

Districts and schools will benefit when ESE is able to:

- Provide extra support and incentives for proven providers to expand services into new districts and/or regions of the state;
- Evaluate priority partners; and
- Encourage collaboration among priority providers in the network.

Successful implementation should result in improvement in school culture and climate, improvement in student achievement, and reduced achievement gaps.

Note: These approved Priority Partners are distinct from the approved professional development (PD) providers described in project 2D.3. Priority Partners focus on supporting school turnaround efforts and systems reforms, while the PD providers offer more general professional development for educators.
Expected district activities

In any or all of Years 2–4, districts will use a partner selection protocol once available from ESE’s Office of District and School Turnaround to identify which, if any, identified Priority Partner for Turnaround is an appropriate match for their school(s) needs.

By participating in this project, districts will be able to enter into contracts directly with the Priority Partners for Turnaround using local RTTT funds. If a district is already working with a vendor who becomes approved as a Priority Partner for turnaround, participation in this project will enable the district to expand or build on the existing relationship using RTTT funds.

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the district plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the district’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies and if applicable, the School and District Redesign Plans. In addition:

- Explain what priority need exists at the district level for a service provider to address the Conditions of School Effectiveness; and
- Mention if the district already has a relationship with a service provider that they wish to use RTTT funds to expand or build.

Specific budget guidance and costs

Districts should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. ESE plans to identify vendors that address each of the Conditions for School Effectiveness over the next 12 months. In anticipation of the possibility that ESE will identify a Priority Partner that will benefit the district, the district may add funds into the Years 2–4 budgets to cover anticipated costs based on prior experience with providers.

---

*This protocol will be provided to districts once available.*
### Project 6B.1: Participate in turnaround teacher teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–6D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts with Level 3 or 4 schools are eligible</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 3-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

ESE partners with three outside providers, Teach for America, Teach Plus, and Worcester English Language Learner Teacher Residency (WELLTR), to recruit, train and place teams of teachers with specialized skills into Level 3 and 4 schools to support the turnaround process. This partnership will create a new pipeline of dynamic educational leaders dedicated to closing the achievement gap in Massachusetts, and as such will be a key strategy in our turnaround efforts to prepare all students in the Commonwealth for next-generation learning, work and citizenship.

The initiative will recruit and support both new teachers and promising teacher leaders through the work of our three providers.

- WELLTR is an intensive teacher credentialing and Masters in ESL program aligned with the Massachusetts state standards for teacher licensure to prepare and credential two cohorts of 25 ELL teachers to effectively teach English language development and content to ELL students in the Worcester Public Schools.

- Teach Plus T3 will support experienced teacher leaders. The baseline criteria for consideration to be a T3 teacher leader is at least 3 years of teaching experience in a high-poverty school and a track record of effectiveness with students. Teach Plus T3 will then evaluate candidates based on their competency framework.

- Teach for America recruits recent college graduates and professionals who commit two years to teach in urban and rural areas. With extensive training and support, these teachers, known as corps members, are supported through variety of quantitative and qualitative data sources to create and validate our Teaching as Leadership framework, including teacher observations and debriefings, data-driven reflection sessions, teacher video clips and documents, teacher surveys, and teacher interviews.

Participating districts will commit to sufficient time for teacher collaboration and career ladder opportunities and plans to improve school-level working conditions. Turnaround teachers may receive incentives or be compensated for teaching a longer day or year or for giving additional time for targeted professional development.

This project is expected to improve the distribution of high quality teachers, improve school climate and culture, and increase teacher effectiveness. These changes should improve student achievement and reduce achievement gaps, ultimately bringing these schools out of Level 3 or 4 status.

---

10 Note that Y1 RFP Project 6C has been divided into two separate projects: 6B.1 (turnaround teachers) and 6B.2 (turnaround leaders). Districts that indicated participation in project 6C in Y1 RFP can select either or both of these new projects.

11 Please note that elements of this project may need to be collectively bargained.

12 Please note that the base salaries of the turnaround teacher teams cannot be covered using RTTT funds.
Expected district activities

All Level 3 and 4 districts may apply on behalf of their Level 3 and 4 schools. Districts participating in the initiative must indicate the number of schools and positions where teachers or teacher leaders are desired. Districts are encouraged to nominate experienced teachers as candidates for the teacher leader program in fall 2011. The program is designed to place teacher leaders in teams, so consider that configuration in describing district needs. Participating districts will negotiate placements with ESE between November and April and will be informed during that time whether they have received a placement for the following year. Teacher induction and professional development will be expected to occur for the first turnaround teams at the end of Year 2 (summer 2012).

What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the district plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the district’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

Districts should indicate the number of schools in which they wish to place a turnaround teacher team and confirm that they can support turnaround teacher salaries and commitments to data support, coaching and career opportunities, pay incentives and/or additional time for professional development. ESE and an outside provider will work one-on-one with the district to develop a placement plan.

Specific budget guidance and costs

Districts should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. Districts should expect to support a four- to ten-member teacher team per request with salary and benefits paid using local funds.

Districts with schools already committed to the initiative in FY13 must allocate $20,000 per new teacher and/or $15,000 per teacher leader for recruitment, training placement, and support costs during the second year of implementation, FY14. Districts may choose to allocate local RTTT funds for school-based support, including coaches or data support. Base salary support is not allowed under this project and neither are computers or consultants.

If a district that is not currently participating in the initiative is interested in placing a turnaround teacher team in a school, please contact Hope Huynh at hhuynh@doe.mass.edu for budget and cost information as state funding for the initiative is yet to be determined.
**Project 6B.2: Participate in the Turnaround Leadership Initiative to develop experienced and aspiring turnaround leaders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–6D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts with Level 3 or 4 schools are eligible</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 3-4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project description**

ESE will partner with an outside provider to recruit, train, and place teams with specialized skills into Level 3 and 4 schools to lead the turnaround process. The initiative will recruit and support both proven and experienced school leaders and exceptionally promising early-stage leaders. The leaders will be provided with intensive professional development and support for instructional leadership, leading adults and changing culture, managing outcomes, using data to make decisions, implementing effective practices for staff development, and establishing a culture of high expectations. ESE and an outside provider will work one-on-one with the districts participating in this project to ensure participation in the initiative meets the district’s needs.

Districts are expected to support the placements by providing residency placement in Level 4 schools for a training year for emerging leaders and allowing the incoming leaders sufficient operational flexibility over staffing, scheduling, budgeting, and program at least four months before the school year begins. Participating districts will commit to career ladder opportunities and plans to improve school-level working conditions. Turnaround leaders may receive incentives or be compensated for working a longer year giving additional time for targeted professional development. This project is expected to improve the distribution of high quality leaders, improve the school climate and culture, and increase teacher and leader effectiveness. These changes should improve student achievement and reduce achievement gaps, ultimately bringing these schools out of Level 4 status.

**Expected district activities**

All Level 3 and 4 districts can apply on behalf of their Level 3 and 4 schools. Districts participating in the initiative must indicate the number of schools where they wish to place a principal or an aspiring principal. Districts are encouraged to nominate strong, experienced principals to participate in the residency by the fall of 2011 and promising administrators who can rapidly develop into turnaround principals to participate in the residency by the fall of 2012. Districts can also select aspiring leaders from a list of vetted, highly qualified candidates generated by the vendor. Participating districts will negotiate placements with ESE between November and April and will be informed during that time whether they have received a placement for the following year. Induction and professional development will be expected to occur for the second cohort of turnaround leadership initiative participants at the end of Year 3 (summer 2013).

---

13 Note that Y1 RFP Project 6C has been divided into two separate projects: 6B.1 (turnaround teachers) and 6B.2 (turnaround leaders). Districts that indicated participation in project 6C in Y1 RFP can select either or both of these new projects.

14 ESE is currently preparing an RFR to identify the provider.

15 Please note that the base salaries of the turnaround leader and leadership teams cannot be covered using RTTT funds.
What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the district plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the district’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

Districts should indicate the number of participants they wish to participate in the program and should confirm that they can support turnaround leader salaries and commitments to facilitating the residency placement and operational flexibilities. ESE and an outside provider will work one-on-one with the district to create an implementation plan.

Specific budget guidance and costs

The district contribution for participating in Cohort II (2013 – 2014 school year) is $10,000 per experienced leader participant and $15,000 per aspiring leader participant. The remaining costs to the vendor for each participant will be paid for by ESE. Districts are also allowed to set aside up to $110,000 per aspiring leader participant in their RTTT allocation under this Initiative to pay for their salary and benefits while mentoring in a district school throughout the school year.
### Project 6C: Participate in a network for principals of high need schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–6D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts with Level 3 or 4 schools are eligible</td>
<td>To commence no later than summer 2012</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project description

This project is intended to provide principals of high need schools with a forum for communication, sharing best practices, and mentoring. ESE will contract with an outside provider\(^1\) to operate the network beginning no later than summer 2012.

### Expected district activities

More information will be shared with districts when the project becomes available. Districts can indicate interest in this project on the Project Selection Form. All districts with Level 3 or 4 schools will be notified when the network is implemented.

### What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the district plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the district’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

### Specific budget guidance and costs

Districts should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. While the project is not yet defined, districts should budget a nominal amount. Costs to participate in such a network are expected to be under $2,500. When the project becomes available, participating districts can submit a budget amendment, if needed, to allocate for any additional costs.

---

\(^1\) ESE is currently preparing an RFR to identify the provider.
Project 6D: Implement a wraparound zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Supplemental Grants</th>
<th>Y1 RFP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts with level 4 schools are required to select at least one of projects 6A–6D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only districts that have been approved to implement a wraparound zone through the competitive grant program may participate in this project.</td>
<td>Any or all of Years 2–4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description

The Wraparound Zone Initiative seeks to develop district and school systems to systematically address students’ physical, social, and emotional health needs in promoting academic success. Many students face barriers to academic learning, particularly in underperforming schools. Often these students come to school challenged by economic, social, and emotional issues and have difficulty focusing on learning. Without the necessary supports needed to address the challenges they face, many will struggle to succeed. The purpose of the project is to build district capacity to support their schools’ efforts to meet the non-academic needs of students. Simultaneously, the project aims to improve collaboration between district and school administrators and teachers and community-based partners in order to foster positive school climates and effective academic instruction.

Eligible districts will have applied through a separate ESE RFP process (fund code: 209) to implement a wraparound zone. Successful programs will:

- Serve each and every student;
- Assess all students in key academic and non-academic areas;
- Tailor an individualized plan for each student that is benchmarked and followed up at specific intervals;
- Have a range of services within the school and in the larger community including prevention, enrichment, early intervention and crisis response services, and
- Be data-driven.

The selection process will continue throughout the spring and is expected to be complete before the deadline of the grant proposals. Only districts that have been approved to implement a wraparound zone through the separate competitive grant program may participate in this project.

This project is expected to directly and significantly improve student achievement and reduce achievement gaps as well as increase graduation rates and college enrollment, and to bring participating schools out of Level 3 or 4 status.

Expected district activities

Expected activities will be unique to the district’s plan, created through the project-specific grant proposal (fund code: 209). For the response to the Years 2–4 RFP, districts must remain in compliance with all state policies and wraparound zone project rules and guidelines as described in the fund code: 209 RFP. Districts should submit a brief narrative describing the portion of the plan for which costs will be allocated to local RTTT funds. Districts may create new positions for internal hiring in order to
redistribute staff in new roles. Such new positions may be exempt from the “supplement, not supplant” restriction.

**What to include in the Y2–4 RFP response**

In the narrative of the Project Details and Budget form, briefly describe how the district plans to meet the requirements of this project and how these activities relate to the district’s overall improvement plan priorities and strategies.

ESE will be working with wraparound zone grantees over the summer to develop a completed implementation plan for their district. The implementation plan will describe the activities of the district and schools that are beginning the wraparound zone initiative in RTTT Year 2, as well as those schools that will be planning for implementation during RTTT Year 3. The implementation plan template can be downloaded from the online grants management system (or an alternate source to be provided by ESE if the grants system isn’t available) and, once completed, can be uploaded back into the system.17

**Specific budget guidance and costs**

Districts should provide a budget and budget narrative using the Project Details and Budget form. The district must commit $99,000 per school, per year using local RTTT and/or non-RTTT funds. Districts using local RTTT funds to support a wraparound zone planning year may spend up to $35,000 per school.

Review of proposals for project 6D will be coordinated with review of applications submitted in response to the separate RFP for fund code 209 to ensure that districts have targeted sufficient funds to cover the costs of implementing a wraparound zone model. Requested funds for schools participating in project 6D during RTTT Years 3 and 4 are projections only. These funds are subject to amendment after the conclusion of the competitive RFP in FY2013 and FY2014 for participation in the wraparound zone initiative. Several additional districts will also be selected to implement wraparound zones through the FY13 and FY14 competitive RFPs. If selected, these districts will be expected to submit a budget amendment and reallocate local RTTT funds to this initiative, if required.

Allowable costs to local RTTT funds include salaries and/or benefits for a wraparound zone coordinator, substitutes, stipends, and travel for meetings and/or professional development, contracted partners (consultants or specialists), professional development, family engagement services, and development of systems and processes that support student and family needs assessment, resource referral, and information management. Family engagement services may include adult basic education, General Equivalency Diploma (GED) courses, English for speakers of other languages, parent leadership, parent education, and parent-child activities. Direct services to individual students or their families, such as counseling or mental health services, are not allowable.

---

17 Directions for downloading and uploading attachments will be included in the user training guide to be provided later when the online grants management system is available.


**Appendix I: RTTT final LEA allocations and MOU commitments**

For the most current list of LEA allocations and MOU commitments go to: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/rttt/dallocations.xlsx](http://www.doe.mass.edu/rttt/dallocations.xlsx)
## Appendix II: Performance measures

**Note:** LEAs will be responsible for reporting on the measures marked as LEA in the “Responsible for reporting” column. All other measures will be reported by ESE or the vendor contracted by ESE to support the project. Measures in *italics* pertain to all projects under that strategic objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj. #</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible for reporting</th>
<th>Frequency of reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall RTTT program goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accelerate the increase in overall achievement on the mathematics MCAS by 15%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accelerate the increase in overall achievement on the ELA MCAS by 15%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accelerate the increase in overall achievement on the mathematics NAEP by 15%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accelerate the increase in overall achievement on the ELA NAEP by 15%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of students who graduate from high school within four years by 5%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increase the percentage who enroll in college within 16 months of high school graduating by 5%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of graduates who have completed a year of college credits within two years by 5%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reduce MCAS achievement gaps for each low performing subgroup, as measured by CPI, by 25%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reduce NAEP achievement gaps for each low performing subgroup by 25%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTTT program overview</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reduce gaps in high school graduation rates for each low performing subgroup by 15%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. #</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Measure #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible for reporting</td>
<td>Frequency of reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RTTT program overview</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reduce gaps in college enrollment for each low performing subgroup by 15%</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RTTT program overview</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of high school graduates who have completed MassCore to 85% by 2014</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy 1: Improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Improve teacher and principal effectiveness</strong></th>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible for reporting</th>
<th>Frequency of reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Improve teacher and principal effectiveness</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase in % of teachers rated as proficient or higher (once available)</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Improve teacher and principal effectiveness</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase in % of administrators rated as proficient or higher (once available)</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Implement the statewide educator evaluation framework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local evaluation group formed</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Implement the statewide educator evaluation framework</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEA educator evaluation plan reviewed by ESE and rated as meeting state regulatory requirements</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Implement the statewide educator evaluation framework</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N of educators in the LEA trained on the new evaluation system</td>
<td>Vendor (anticipated)</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Implement the statewide educator evaluation framework</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N of evaluators in the LEA trained on the new evaluation system</td>
<td>Vendor (anticipated)</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Pilot a model, aligned human resource system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA has met the objectives defined in its annual workplan</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy 2: Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</strong></th>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible for reporting</th>
<th>Frequency of reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improvement in % of mathematics teachers rated proficient or better (once available)</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improvement in % of science teachers rated proficient or better (once available)</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improvement in % of special education teachers rated proficient or better (once available)</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. #</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Measure #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible for reporting</td>
<td>Frequency of reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improvement in % of ESL teachers rated proficient or better (once available)</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LEA has used ESE-developed tool or process to evaluate the impact of professional supports</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Improvement in average of leadership measures on Mass TeLLS (for LEAs participating in MassTeLLS)</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Improvement on measure(s) of leadership on another survey (for LEAs approved to use another survey)</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Improvement in average of supports for professional practice measures on Mass TeLLS (for LEAs participating in MassTeLLS)</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensure effective teachers and leaders in every classroom</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Improvement in measure(s) of supports for professional practice (for LEAs approved to use another survey)</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Align curriculum to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA team attended state workshops on Common Core</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Align curriculum to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEA has aligned local curriculum with the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Align curriculum to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LEA has aligned local curriculum incorporating the Common Core for the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for Mathematics</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.1</td>
<td>Use data and results from surveys for decision making and change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA has developed a plan (including benchmarks) to address one area of concern in the survey</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.2</td>
<td>Strengthen labor management relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>District has selected members to join the labor management team</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.3</td>
<td>Use ESE-approved resources to improve district governance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>District has created a governance committee working group</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C.1</td>
<td>Develop experienced and effective teachers as mentors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N of teachers identified to be trained as mentors through the program in that year</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. #</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Measure #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible for reporting</td>
<td>Frequency of reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C.2</td>
<td>Support teachers in earning moderate disabilities special education licenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N of teachers on waivers for moderate disabilities special education enrolled in program</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C.2</td>
<td>Support teachers in earning moderate disabilities special education licenses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decline in % of teachers on waiver for moderate disabilities special education</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C.3</td>
<td>Support teachers in earning English as a Second Language (ESL) Licenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N of teachers on waivers for ESL enrolled in program</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C.3</td>
<td>Support teachers in earning English as a Second Language (ESL) Licenses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decline in % of teachers on waiver for ESL</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C.4</td>
<td>Support National Board of Professional Teaching Standards certification for teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N of teachers earning National Board Certification</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.1</td>
<td>Participate in the superintendent induction program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Superintendent successfully completed year one of the induction program</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.1</td>
<td>Participate in the superintendent induction program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Superintendent successfully completed year two of the induction program</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.1</td>
<td>Participate in the superintendent induction program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Superintendent successfully completed year three of the induction program</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.2</td>
<td>Participate in National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training for principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N of administrative leaders enrolled in NISL that year</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.2</td>
<td>Participate in National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training for principals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N of administrative leaders who completed NISL that year</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.3</td>
<td>Assess ESE-sponsored or approved professional development in priority areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA has a process to identify teacher PD needs and match to appropriate PD opportunities</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.3</td>
<td>Assess ESE-sponsored or approved professional development in priority areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEA has a process to identify school-level PD needs and match to appropriate PD opportunities</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. #</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Measure #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible for reporting</td>
<td>Frequency of reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use data to improve instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA is using the EDW to inform instructional decisions</td>
<td>Vendor(s)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use data to improve instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEA is using the Education Data Warehouse to improve instruction, assessment, and operations</td>
<td>Vendor(s)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use data to improve instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reduction in FTE effort to complete SIMS and SCS end of year reports</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Use data to improve instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reduction in FTE effort to complete EPIMS end of year reports</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Create near real-time access to data in Education Data Warehouse by implementing School Interoperability Framework (SIF)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SIS SIF agent installed, configured and connected to send student data automatically to state</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Create near real-time access to data in Education Data Warehouse by implementing School Interoperability Framework (SIF)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HR SIF agent installed, configured and connected to send student data automatically to state</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Assess ESE-sponsored or approved professional development on using data to improve instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N of teachers who have completed data training with an ESE-approved vendor</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Assess ESE-sponsored or approved professional development on using data to improve instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N of district- or school-level data teams</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Assess ESE-sponsored or approved professional development on using data to improve instruction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No LEA implementation benchmark for this project, as the project is meant to help ESE rather than drive change in LEAs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy 4: College & career readiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj. #</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible for reporting</th>
<th>Frequency of reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase college and career readiness</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Increase in % of students who have established a plan on YourPlanforCollege</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. #</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Measure #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible for reporting</td>
<td>Frequency of reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase college and career readiness</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Increase in % of students who have established a plan on another college &amp; career planning tool</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase college and career readiness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase in % of students scoring at or above the minimum SAT score for admission to Massachusetts public four-year colleges</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase college and career readiness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decrease in annual dropout rate</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase college and career readiness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase in % of students who have completed a Work-Based Learning Plan</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Develop and implement a plan to increase the percentage of high school graduates completing Mass Core</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA has performed a needs assessment and developed a plan for increasing the N of students completing MassCore</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Implement YourPlanforCollege: Get Ready for Life after High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA has uploaded data into YPFC</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Implement the Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>District or charter school has completed an implementation plan</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Participate in pre-AP training for middle and high school teacher teams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N of teachers participating in pre-AP training in <strong>ELA</strong></td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Participate in pre-AP training for middle and high school teacher teams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N of teachers participating in pre-AP training in <strong>mathematics</strong></td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Participate in pre-AP training for middle and high school teacher teams</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N of teachers participating in pre-AP training in <strong>science</strong></td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Participate in pre-AP training for middle and high school teacher teams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase in % of high needs students taking AP courses in high school</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Participate in pre-AP training for middle and high school teacher teams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increase in % of high needs students scoring 3 or better on AP tests</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. #</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Measure #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible for reporting</td>
<td>Frequency of reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Develop and implement a STEM-focused Early College High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA has submitted plan to state for STEM ECHS</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Develop and implement a STEM-focused Early College High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEA has signed a collaborative agreement with college partner</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Establish and operation an Innovation School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA has created an Innovation Plan committee</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Establish and operation an Innovation School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LEA’s innovation plan has been approved by the local school committee</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy 5: Develop and implement a teaching and learning system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible for reporting</th>
<th>Frequency of reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>% of staff using model curriculum units (after pilot phase, once available)</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>% of staff using curriculum-embedded performance tasks (after pilot phase, once available)</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>% of staff using the interim/formative assessment system (after pilot phase, once available)</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>% of staff using the revised vocational-technical competency tracking system (after pilot phase, once available)</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of elements of the T&amp;L system piloted by the LEA</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>% of advisory members that have completed one work product per year</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>% of teachers on state committees that have piloted the curriculum units / CEPAs in their classrooms</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. #</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Measure #</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>Participate on the Advisory Committee to develop online formative and interim assessments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>% of teachers on state committees that have piloted the assessment tools in their classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>Participate on the Advisory Committee to develop an improved competency tracking system for vocational technical students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LEA has used the revised competency tracking system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy 6: Turn around the lowest performing schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj. #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measure #</th>
<th>Responsible for reporting</th>
<th>Frequency of Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turn around the lowest performing schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turn around the lowest performing schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turn around the lowest performing schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turn around the lowest performing schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turn around the lowest performing schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turn around the lowest performing schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turn around the lowest performing schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turn around the lowest performing schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Use ESE-identified turnaround partners to address essential conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B.1</td>
<td>Hire from the new cadre of turnaround teacher teams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. #</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Measure #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible for reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B.2</td>
<td>Hire from the new cadre of turnaround leader and leadership teams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N of turnaround leaders or leadership teams placed in Level 3 or 4 schools</td>
<td>ESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Participate in a network for principals of high need schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N of principals enrolled in network</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>Implement a wraparound zone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>District has created a wraparound zone implementation plan</td>
<td>Vendor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>Implement a wraparound zone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improvement in school attendance rate for students in wraparound zone schools</td>
<td>ESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>Implement a wraparound zone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reduction in combined in-school and out-of-school suspensions in wraparound zone schools</td>
<td>ESE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Allowable costs

USED guidance on uses of RTTT funds


What are the allowable uses of Race to the Top funds, and what uses of funds are prohibited?

There are two categories of funding under the RTTT general program. As discussed in other FAQs, fifty percent (50%) of the grant must be sub-granted to LEAs based on their relative share of funding under Title I, Part A of ESEA, sometimes referred to as the “section 14006(c) sub-grant.” LEAs must use these funds in a manner that is consistent with the state’s plan and the MOU or other binding agreement between the LEA and the state. A state may establish more specific requirements for its LEAs’ uses of funds provided they are consistent with the ARRA.

The other 50% of the RTTT funds is reserved for the state to support state-level activities, for disbursements to LEAs, and for other purposes as the state may propose in its plan.

In general, there are few restrictions on the use of RTTT funds, except that they must be used to implement the state’s approved RTTT plan; they must be consistent with the US Department of Education’s (USED) administrative regulations as well as OMB’s cost principle circulars, such as A-87 (www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/); and they must meet the requirements in the ARRA, as described below. With these exceptions, states have considerable latitude in defining their plans and, therefore, have considerable discretion in determining how grant funds will be used if they win (www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/grantee.pdf).

As noted above, the ARRA places several restrictions on uses of funds as follows:

- Section 14003 of the ARRA prohibits an LEA from using RTTT funds for
  - Payment of maintenance costs;
  - Stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions or other events for which admission is charged to the general public;
  - Purchase or upgrade of vehicles;
  - Improvement of stand-alone facilities whose purpose is not the education of children, including central office administration or operations or logistical support facilities; or
  - School modernization, renovation, or repair that is inconsistent with state law (A district or charter school may use RTTT funds for construction of new school facilities as well as for modernization, renovation, or repair of existing facilities to the extent that these projects are consistent with the state’s RTTT plan. However, USED discourages states and districts or charter schools from using RTTT funds for new construction.)

- Section 14011 of the ARRA prohibits RTTT funds from being used to provide financial assistance to students to attend private elementary or secondary schools, unless the funds are used to provide special education and related services to children with disabilities as authorized by the IDEA.

- Section 1604 of the ARRA prohibits RTTT funds from being used for any casino or other gambling establishment, aquarium, zoo, golf course, or swimming pool.

- Finally, as described in FAQ F-3, funds may not be used for costs related to statewide summative assessments.