

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
District budgets for education in 2009 were higher than those for 2008 and allocations of funds to support education take into account higher resource needs for poverty and related student indicators of educational risk.				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	40	40	
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
There are no limits placed on the number of charter schools in the District--96 charters presently exist. District laws exist articulating clearly the development, implementation and evaluation of charter schools and funding for charters is the same as for non-charters, including the inclusion of a facilities allowance provided for every charter school student. DCPS has a policy mechanism available to develop and implement "innovative and alternative" non-charter schools within its jurisdiction—17 schools are operating under these "autonomous" policies.				
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The District has addressed reform actions leading to policies and practices related to education reform, including accountability processes, charter school development and initial efforts to develop and link student growth to educator effectiveness. Efforts to address early education have become part of the education reform agenda as has the partnership with the Gates foundation to improve graduation rates and increase college going. The platform for education reform is quite extensive.				
Total	55	55	55	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0	0	
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The District makes a very clear effort to prioritize STEM efforts through the use of Catalyst Schools—an existent effort to maximize student access to STEM futures. These schools partner with key STEM higher education entities and promote professional development of teachers at these schools. These schools could be an important bridge to higher math, engineering and related STEM standards, curriculum assessments and support. However, the potential bridge to that goal is not addressed as it relates to STEM enhancement across all participating LEAs and opportunities for underrepresented groups, particularly in charter LEA schools.				
Total	15	0	0	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

These proposed Rtt efforts build directly on the District's history and present an ambitious plan for reform and for student achievement. The goals, processes and overall implementation strategies are usually well articulated. The success of the plan depends substantively on the development and implementation of key elements of a robust and comprehensive student and educator system. If developed and implemented, the district can add significant value to its education reform efforts.

Total		0	0	
Grand Total	500	389	389	

charged with the authority to close public charter schools and is responsible for monitoring charter school quality.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40	40
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(E)(2) The Applicant has had extensive experience and history with turnaround school projects. Their plan includes goals, performance measures, specific strategies and activities, timelines and responsible parties: Goal: Intervene with DC's persistently lowest-achieving schools through closure or another turnaround model that puts them on a trajectory for dramatically improved student achievement by creating conditions of support and attracting high-quality human capital to turnaround schools Performance Measure 1: by 2014, all schools that have undergone at least two years of a turnaround model will have demonstrated a rate of growth in student academic proficiency that exceeds the average statewide rate of growth by 1.5 to 2 times in Year 2, and by 2-3 times in Years 3 and 4. Performance Measure 2: by 2014, all the DCPS schools that have undergone at least one year of a turnaround model will be showing gains on leading indicators to be identified by the Office of School Innovation, such as attendance and credit recovery in secondary schools In order to achieve these goals, DC will implement the following strategies: (A) Identify and Plan for the Turnaround of Persistently Lowest-achieving Schools; (B) Create Pipelines of Turnaround Leaders; (C) Provide Preparation Support for Potential Turnaround Teams; (D) Align School Modernization Efforts to Support School Turnaround; (E) Provide Differential Funding for Turnaround Schools; and, (F) Ensure Capacity for Strong Management of Turnaround Partner. Of the District's 173 Title I schools, 133 have been identified for improvement. Five percent of this total – the requirement for persistently lowest-achieving schools – represents seven schools. In addition, 38 schools are currently under restructuring status and 21 schools are planning for restructuring this year (44% of all Title I schools identified for improvement). Overall, the Applicant has identified two types of schools for turnaround: (1) schools with graduation rates below 60% over a two year-period, and (2) the lowest-achieving 5% of Title I schools identified for improvement. To determine this group, DC has created a definition of low-achieving that is based on statewide criteria, including: (1) number of years a school has not made AYP, (2) overall growth in achievement in the school, and (3) current overall achievement level of the school, separate and apart from whether the school is improving achievement. In the narrative, Applicant includes Table E2.1 School Intervention History and Lessons Learned, SY2004-05 – present. Intervention models: Turnaround – seven schools; Restart – four schools; Closure – 47 schools; and Transformation – 13 schools. Table E2.2 School Intervention Lessons Learned and RTTT Turnaround Plan Implications lists the lesson learned and the corresponding implications for the current RTTT Turnaround plan. For example, Lesson Learned: The success of turnaround work depends on having strong leadership and a human capital strategy with specific turnaround training is critical. Implications: Leadership Training: As noted in Section D4, DCPS plans to work with a university partner to develop an Education Leadership Degree with a strand in turnaround management to equip potential leaders with necessary skills. In addition, the Applicant has indicated in the Appendix, E2.2, a list of the History of Turnaround Schools, including the year of the turnaround intervention and type of intervention model used.

Total	50	50	50
-------	----	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(1)(i) Total revenues for education P-20 increased .4% in 2009 over 2008 and the education budget makes up 23.5 % of the total District of Columbia budget in 2009, an increase of 1.3 percentage points over the 2008 budget. (F)(1)(ii) The Applicant uses the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF), as outlined in DC Official Code § 38-2901 to 2912. Each student receives a 'foundation level' of funding, established by law. Additional individual student weightings are applied based on grade level, special education level, and limited/non-English proficiency, as appropriate (a complete description of the UPSFF weightings is provided in Appendix F1.2). Additional Title I funds flow through OSSE to District LEAs serving children living at the greatest poverty levels.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	39	39
---	-----------	-----------	-----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(2)(i) The Applicant indicates that DC Official Code § 38-1802.03 allows eligible chartering authorities to approve up to twenty annual petitions to establish a public charter school. Twenty charter petitions represents slightly less than 10% of the total number of schools in the District. The Applicant has 57 charter LEAs and 96 charter campuses serving 28,066 students in the District; 38.0% of public school children attend public charter schools and 42.5% of DC schools are charters. (F)(2)(ii) The District's charter law provisions explicitly outline how charter authorizers approve, monitor and oversee, hold accountable, reauthorize, and, as needed, revoke charters [see D.C. Official Code §38-1802.01 -03 (approval), §38-1802.13 §38- 1802.11 (oversight), §38-1802.12 (renewal), §38-1802.13 & 13a (revocation)]. DC Code § 38-1802.06 establishes DC's public charter schools as open-enrollment institutions, open to all DC resident children. This statutory provision explicitly prohibits public charter schools from limiting enrollment on the basis of a student's race, color, religion, national origin, language spoken, intellectual or athletic ability, measures of achievement or aptitude, or status as a student with special needs (although public charter schools may limit enrollment to specific grade levels). Public charter schools, like DCPS, are required to provide a continuum of services and serve all students regardless of special needs. In cases where student applications exceed capacity, local statute requires that public charter schools use a random selection process or lottery to admit students. DC's public charter schools currently serve 88% African-American, 8% Latino (a), and 80% economically disadvantaged students, which reflect higher concentrations of minority and economically disadvantaged than enrollments in DCPS schools. Required evidence is reported in Table F2.2 DC Charter Authorization History, 2004-08. (F)(2)(iii) Applicant has equitable funding for all schools, including charters. (F)(2)(iv) According to the Applicant, in order to make public school facility space more accessible to charter schools, DC Official Code § 38-1802.09 gives the "right of first offer" for any current or former public school property to "an eligible applicant whose petition to establish a public charter school has been conditionally approved." Also, in addition to UPSFF funding, public charter schools also receive a per-student facilities allowance, established by DC Official Code § 38-2908. In FY 2010, this amount is \$2,800 per pupil, which can be used for facilities leasing, purchase, financing, construction, maintenance, and repair. DC Official Code § 38-1804.01 further allows the Mayor and the District of Columbia Council to "adjust the amount of the annual payment ... to increase the amount of such payment for a public charter school to take into account leases or purchases of, or improvements to, real property, if the school... requests such an adjustment." The Applicant also included Figure F2.1 Charter School Facilities Allowance, FY 2001-08 in the narrative. (F)(2)(v) School autonomy is important to charter and non-charter school success and growth, as evidenced by the Applicant's Chancellor-created DCPS' Office of School Innovation (OSI) to increase the level of diversity and innovation in DCPS' school portfolio. The OSI is currently focused on the development and implementation of nine different innovative school models, three of which are autonomous school models: Autonomous Schools, DC Collaborative for Change (DC3), and Partnership Schools. Currently, 17 DCPS schools operate under one of these three autonomous projects.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5
---	----------	----------	----------

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(3) The Applicant offers the following initiatives as evidence of 'other significant reform conditions':
 Universal Pre-Kindergarten: In 2008, the DC Council passed the "Pre-K Enhancement and Expansion

Act" (DC Official Code § 38-273.01), which embodies the strong commitment of DC to school readiness. The act is a multi-pronged initiative that will create high-quality and universally available Pre-Kindergarten (PK) education services in DC, through a mixed delivery system that includes DCPS, public charter schools, community-based organizations, and Head Start by 2014. Special Education Interventions: -- Schoolwide Application Model (SAM) (15 elementary schools and one early childhood center): SAM is a response to intervention (Rtl) model, meaning that individual student achievement and behavior data is used to identify required student supports for progression according to grade level. -- Full Service Schools (FSS) (11 middle schools): a school model that brings together best practices in instructional design, behavior management, and mental health support for middle schools in school restructuring status. FSS also uses Rtl logic to identify and create systems to address school-wide needs in the areas of academic achievement and student behavior. -- College Graduation Initiative: In 2007, a group of DC stakeholders partnered with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to create the Double the Numbers (DTN) Coalition, a group whose sole purpose is to increase the number of DC students who graduate from college. Since then, the number of partners and coalition members has grown to 40. DTN partners include Mayor Fenty, the DC Council, the DC Board of Education, DCPS, the Washington Teachers' Union, PCSB, OSSE, the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area, the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation, the DC College Access Program, the DC College Success Foundation, the DC Education Compact, the DC Public Charter School Association, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Beginning with the students who entered ninth grade in September of 2006 and who are high school seniors in School Year 2009- 10, the DTN Coalition seeks to double the number of 9th graders who (a) finish high school within five years, (b) enroll in college, and (c) graduate from college in a timely fashion.

Total	55	54	54
-------	----	----	----

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

With regard to schools with a science, technology, engineering and mathematics focus, in 2004, DCPS re-opened McKinley Tech Senior High School – a previously low-achieving high school – as the District's first ever STEM high school. McKinley represents a success both as a STEM program and a turnaround model. Closed years earlier as a result of underperformance, McKinley reopened in a fully modernized facility with a completely new STEM academic program. High enrollment in – and demand for – McKinley's STEM program, together with measurable academic growth among its students, has influenced DC's plans to increase its emphasis on STEM as an important part of reform efforts. As recently as July 2009, the Mayor and Chancellor named 13 DC Public Schools selected for transformation into theme-based Catalyst Schools, following a competitive application process. Of these 13 winning schools, six submitted proposals to be STEM schools and are spending School Year 2009-10 creating school design plans to ensure a clearly defined school model for successful STEM delivery. All 13 Catalyst Schools are comprehensive models (i.e., open to all students) and do not require a special admissions process, thus providing STEM access to all students – including more females (who may be underrepresented via application-only STEM programs and are underrepresented in STEM professions in general). The STEM plan would be stronger if acknowledgement and significance were placed on emphasizing elements of STEM in the early grades, thereby building in a more natural path for developing student interest in these four subject areas.

Total	15	15	15
-------	----	----	----

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The District of Columbia's overall application comprehensively and coherently addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria demonstrating that the State and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The application describes how the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use RTTT and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. This application is thoughtful, well-prepared, and uses examples of previous experience and practice in the many areas of school and LEA reform already in place in the District.

Total		0	0	
Grand Total	500	449	451	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

In this section of the application, the District demonstrates that it has the legal and regulatory authority to intervene directly in the persistently lowest-achieving schools. The District reports that in the past 5 years, it has closed 47 schools, worked with 13 schools using a transformational model, worked with 7 schools using a turnaround approach, and restarted 4 schools. DC indicates that it is uniquely positioned for turnaround as it has the governance structure that allows swift intervention.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35	

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Section i-The District indicates that its uniquely compact geographic size, coupled with its unique governance structure and robust pool of human capital, allows it to be effective in implementing turnaround strategies. The District plans to implement the following series of activities around the identification of persistently lowest achieving schools: use federal and district criteria to identify the lowest performing schools, develop a plan for the turnaround of the persistently low performing schools, create a pipeline of turnaround leaders, provide support for potential turnaround teams, align school modernization efforts, provide differential funding for turnaround schools, and ensure management capacity for turning around the identified schools. In this section of the application, the District demonstrates a plan to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools and to prepare management teams and turnaround leaders who will work with the identified schools. Section ii-The District plans to use its extensive experience working with the four turnaround models to document its school intervention history and develop a set of lessons learned. Additionally, the District plans to enable the Office of School Innovation to expand its operations, modernize the school facilities, and give the Chancellor the authority to charter schools. The District plans to fund a planning year, allocate resources to turnaround schools and work with a university partner to equip leaders with the skills to do the turnaround work. Additionally, the District plans to use all four turnaround strategies and be directive in the approaches used with the bottom 5% of schools. In the application, the District described its experiences with the four turnaround strategies, citing the work conducted in schools throughout the District. The state also described its plan to implement human capital strategies including replacing the principal, granting operational flexibility, measuring the effectiveness of staff, implementing a new governance structure and high quality instructional program. In this section of the application, the District demonstrated that it has the experience to implement its turnaround plan and to support its LEAs in implementing one of the four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

Total	50	50	50	
--------------	----	----	----	--

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The District indicates that education funding is a priority in DC and that the charter laws are the strongest in the nation. DC's budget has seven funding clusters with education as the second highest funded cluster. The percentage of the DC budget devoted to education increased from 22.3% in 2008 to 23.5% in 2009. DC distributes the budget according to the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula contained in DC Code. In 2006, DC ranked 13th in the nation in the ranking of per pupil expenditures across the nation. In this section of the application, the District demonstrated that education funding is a priority in DC. The percentage of revenue available to the District increased from 2008 to 2009 and the District has a statute that governs the equitable distribution of funds to all schools.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The District indicated that the DC School Reform Act of 1995 is the strongest charter school law in the nation and received an "A" for its laws governing charter schools by the Center for Educational Reform. The District has witnessed growth in its network of charter schools with 57 charter LEAs and 96 charter campuses serving over 28,000 students. According to Code, chartering authorities may approve up to twenty annual petitions to establish a public charter school, and between 2004 and 2008, an average of five charter schools were approved each year. DC law does not impose a cap on the number of expansion campuses, nor does the law limit the number of students who can be served by charter schools. As open-enrollment institutions, the DC charter schools are open to all resident children and the District's law prohibits charter schools from limiting enrollment to any child who holds membership in a protected class. Charter school accountability is strong in the District as the schools are subject to annual monitoring and a comprehensive monitoring every five years. A charter may be revoked if the school violates the charter agreement, has violations related to students with disabilities, or has fiscal mismanagement. In the five year period during 2004 and 2009, 27 new charter schools were approved, 51 were denied, and 4 were revoked. DC law ensures equal funding for every public school student regardless of the type of LEA, and in addition to per pupil allocations, the DC law governs the funding of facilities for non residential charter schools, gives the charter schools the right of first offer for any unused public school property, and supports the ability of charter schools to operate autonomously. DC charter schools include nine different innovative school models. Four schools operate as autonomous schools, 10 schools operate as collaboratives, and 3 schools are Partnership Schools. In this section of the application, the District demonstrated that it has the successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools. The District has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools or restrict student enrollment in charter schools. The District also has laws regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools. The District's charter schools receive equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues and the District provides charter schools with funding for facilities and the right of first offer for unused public school facilities. Additionally, the District enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5
---	---	---	---

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

DC's application discussed other significant reforms that have been implemented across the District in recent years. The other reform efforts were around universal pre-kindergarten, special education interventions, a college graduation initiative, the Double the Numbers program to establish a P-12 college-going culture, implementation of the Schoolwide Application Model (SAM) in 16 schools and the Full Service Schools (FSS) model in 11 middle schools. Additionally, the District is working with LEAs to provide a continuum of special education services.

Total	55	55	55
--------------	----	----	----

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

In 2004, DC reopened McKinley High School as the District's first STEM high school. Based on the academic success of the STEM high school, the District plans to open six new STEM schools, improve the teacher pipeline and professional development in STEM areas, and increase STEM emphasis in the comprehensive high schools. In 2009, 13 DC public schools were named as Catalyst Schools, six of which are preparing to convert to STEM schools. In addition, the District's Woodson Senior High School is being rebuilt and will become a comprehensive STEM high school. The State Advisory Math Panel has identified math standards that are correlated with the skills and knowledge needed for college and STEM careers. In this section of the application, the District demonstrated that it offers STEM studies in comprehensive and designated STEM high school settings.

Total	15	15	15	
-------	----	----	----	--

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The District's application comprehensively addresses all four education reform areas specified in ARRA, the State Success Factors Criteria, and demonstrates a commitment to implement and achieve the goals in its plan.

Total		0	0	
-------	--	---	---	--

Grand Total	500	429	429	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--

use professional learning communities in which less effective schools are grouped with highly effective schools in a professional collaborative. DC also plans to track professional development utilization by staff and relate participation to improved effectiveness.

Total	138	126	126	
-------	-----	-----	-----	--

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

DC has the statutory authority whereby the mayor may intervene with both public schools and LEAs and has a track record of doing so. Charter schools operate under the authority of an independent board which does have the authority to revoke charters.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35	

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

DC described procedures which are consistent with federal requirements by which it will identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools. DC also indicated the intent to exceed the minimum 5% identification and to identify up to the bottom 20% of schools to target for turnaround efforts. DC provided a high-quality plan for turning around its persistently low-achieving schools using all of the turnaround models. DC provided details concerning its extensive experiences with using all of the Race to the Top identified turnaround models in recent years.

Total	50	50	50	
-------	----	----	----	--

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The portion of DC's budget devoted to education increased slightly (1.2%) from fiscal year 08 to fiscal year 09. DC provided evidence that it has a uniform per student funding formula which generates funds on a per pupil basis for all LEAs and schools including charter schools on an equal basis.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

DC has a charter school law which does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools. Between 2004 and 2008, DC approved an average of five charter schools per year while the charter code allows for approval of up to 20 annual petitions. Some 42.5% of DC schools are charters and 38% of public school students attend charter schools in DC, far exceeding the 10% cap for

assignment of "high points." DC provided evidence that it has a uniform per student funding formula which generates funds on a per pupil basis for all LEAs and schools including charter schools on an equal basis. DC's charter law addresses all of the elements required for the Race to the Top competition. DC has one of the strongest charter school laws in the nation and one of the most extensive charter school implementations in the nation. DC has a complex, multifaceted, array of facility funding sources for its charter schools. Charter schools receive annual funding of \$2800 per student to be used for facilities, leasing purchase, financing construction, maintenance, and repair. Besides that, the federal government makes provisions for low-cost backing of loans and grants including the school incubator initiative. DC also makes available an industrial revenue bond program providing access to low-cost tax-exempt bond financing. DC also has a regulation providing right of first offer for any public school property to applicants whose intent is to establish a public charter school. DC does enable the operation of innovative or autonomous public schools and currently has seventeen such schools in operation.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5
---	----------	----------	----------

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

DC has several other substantial reform initiatives including universal pre-kindergarten, special-education intervention reforms, and the college graduation initiative.

Total	55	55	55
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0	0	

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Surprisingly there were only three brief references to STEM in other sections of this application. Routinely, in other sections of this application, DC provided detailed, high quality plans, but this was not the case with the STEM section. DC did describe STEM activities, but they are generally in the form of a thematic focus for schools rather than being systemic initiatives across grades and disciplines. The information submitted did not show a plan for addressing STEM that is sufficiently systematic, comprehensive, and coherent to be considered of high quality.

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

During the presentation, DC never referenced STEM and it was not referenced in the presentation handouts. Based on a reading of the application, our review team was under the impression that STEM was mostly to be implemented in theme-oriented high schools. During the Q&A session, DC provided clarification that STEM will be implemented in some schools at all grade levels. There was no project level budgeting for STEM and it was not clearly addressed in other project budgets. STEM was not part of the DC vision/theory of change articulated by staff. While DC clearly will be implementing some STEM activities, there is not sufficient evidence that they are part of a high quality plan for STEM implementation.

Total	15	0	0
--------------	-----------	----------	----------

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

DC's application presents a comprehensive approach to supporting the four key education reform areas integrating a wide range of resources to support reform efforts of local schools. DC is a clear leader in supporting charter schools and in taking aggressive action with persistently low-performing schools.

Total			0	0
Grand Total	500	418	418	

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	9
<p>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: The District envisions an Individualized Professional Development Platform that will link to IMPACT and provide a self-service platform for access to a variety of professional development from online streaming to scheduling a mentor. This is a very positive vision, but will entail enormous work to correlate the PD to all the standards, levels of effectiveness and other requirements. The PD platform will be developed by DCPS and aligned to their evaluation system, but the charter teachers will be able to use it as well, even though their evaluation systems do not sync either by technology or by definitions. This is an unfortunate weakness. There is no mention of principals for this system, but the Education Leadership Degree addresses this area slightly. Another admirable vision is Professional Learning Communities for Effectiveness. These collaboratives, anchored by high achieving schools, can lead to transfer of best practices, collaboration across sectors, and provide consulting/mentoring opportunities to highly effective teachers. Principals are not mentioned in this effort either, although there is no reason why principals could not participate in the collaboratives. The PD platform data system will be able to match all this and interface with IMPACT to provide data on the effectiveness of the professional development. This is a huge leap of faith for both the data system and for those who will monitor the data.</p>		
Total	138	84

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: Both the Mayor and the Public School Charter Board have the authority to intervene directly in schools and LEAs.</p>		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The District has identification rubrics and has identified schools for turnaround. Three of these are for graduation rate underperformance and seven in the bottom 5%. Addressing both high schools with graduation rate problems and underperforming schools is commendable. The District has strong and detailed plans for each of the schools targeted for intervention and in some cases the work is under way. There is strong support and smart coordination with other efforts (e.g. modernization of buildings) which should help make the interventions successful.</p>		
Total	50	50

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The percentage of total revenue for elementary, secondary and public higher education as a whole increased from 2008 to 2009 by two different measures. The District's policies lead to equitable funding throughout the District.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	40
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The District has a very supportive charter school law. There are 57 charter LEAs and 96 charter campuses serving 38% of public school students. Forty-two and a half percent of DC public schools are charters. The District has rules and guidelines regarding all aspects of charters mentioned in the application, and the PCSB has closed charters and had charters relinquished. The District's funding formula ensures equal funding for every student, regardless of the type of LEA. Charters also are equally eligible for Federal funding. The District has gone far beyond the minimum in ensuring there is funding and funding mechanisms for facilities. The District operates innovative, autonomous schools now and has a mechanism to increase this number.</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: The Proposal outlines three major initiatives in support of school reform that the District has created – universal pre-kindergarten, special education interventions, and a college graduation initiative. All three look to be strong programs with diverse and significant support.</p>		
Total	55	55

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0
<p>Competitive Reviewer Comments: The District has a number of STEM activities underway. However, STEM does not seem to have been an overall strategy for the district, but it has evolved as a part of other initiatives. For example, McKinley Tech Senior High School was a turnaround school that reopened as a STEM school. In July, 2009 the District announced 13 Catalyst Schools, six of which happened to be STEM schools. The fact that these are comprehensive schools (open to all students) is positive. Another turnaround school will become a STEM school. A major concern is that virtually all the effort for STEM is at the secondary level, yet capturing the imagination and enthusiasm of students for STEM in the elementary grades can go a long way to provide greater interest in STEM subjects and careers later in life. Finally, there is an absence of any plan; the summary is just a listing of activities, most of which are underway already.</p>		
Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments: The District has made significant strides in the past few years. The proposal reflects those strides, and it addresses all four education reform areas. Charter schools and turnaround experience and efforts are particularly strong. Areas of concern include the lack of support from the WTU; the infancy of some</p>		

of the data systems, and especially the linkages between the charter schools and DCPS; and the lack of detail and clarity in the plans in the Great Teachers and Leaders section.

Total		0
-------	--	---

Grand Total	500	355
-------------	-----	-----