

now have access to data from the new Growth Professional Evaluation System that will elevate the quality of this report.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	18	18	
(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Applicant will revise their current approach to professional learning options for professionals and provide expanded opportunities for teacher and administrator development through a system of eight regional networks and virtual learning communities. More details would be helpful describing the professional development focus for capacity building at the LEA level in data-based instructional decision making.				
Total	138	123	123	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	8	8	
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Applicant's Revised Statute 160.346 enables Department of Education to intervene in persistently low-achieving schools and determine intervention direction from continuum of intervention programs. During the past several years over 600 schools received state intervention and have been held accountable for school improvement. In 2008, the Assist and Support School Improvement Success Teams Program was created. However, applicant acknowledges that present efforts have yielded incremental results that are not sufficient for these schools to meet future state student learning expectations. Therefore, applicant has increased its commitment and expectations with a new more centralized program for identified Educational Recovery Schools that will become part of state District 180, a Department of Education realignment program, that will provide school audits which will determine what schools will receive expanded educational recovery services.				
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	34	34	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4	4	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	30	
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Applicant will provide expanded support through Centers for Learning Excellence which will serve as intermediaries between the Department's District 180 team which will target selected schools through an audit process and identify them for special support as Educational Recovery Schools. Applicant's plan is well presented and creative. Applicant provides flexibility in choice option for models. Applicant's SAM support system is a sound practical idea. Applicant's increased commitment to expanding partnership with Teach America will provide additional quality educators for these schools.				
Total	50	42	42	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
--	-----------	--------	--------	------

(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	8	8	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Applicant's funding of public education in the last 2 financially challenged years has bucked the national state-wide trend that has resulted in funds for public education being cut. In 2009 46.5% of total state revenues were dedicated to education as compared to 43.6% of revenues in 2008. Applicant has a successful track record for equitable state funding of education across state through adopted funding formula that is part of the Support Education Excellence in Kentucky (SEEK) Program which ensures schools in high-need receive higher proportional funding than low-need schools.				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	10	8	
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Applicant has 174 LEAs, 144 (83%) have only one high school and 134 (77%) have only one middle school. As a result of the state's rural nature, debate regarding charter schools has received minimal attention (outside of Jefferson County) in Kentucky. Applicant makes a case that they have developed a "charter-like" structure that has created an environment for all public schools to become innovative and autonomous through the establishment of a school-based decision making (SBDM) form of school governance. Applicant make no mention of changing SBDM model.				
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2) Applicant clarified that there are no plans in the future for charter school legislation. However, the applicant's ability to operate innovative, autonomous public schools was reinforced.				
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4	4	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Applicant notes several reform conditions beyond the inception of KERA in 1990. They include: Partnership with Wallace Foundation, universal administration of the ACT, landmark Senate Bill 1, and Kentucky Center for School Safety.				
Total	55	22	20	

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) Applicant initiated a STEM Task Force in 2007 that produced a comprehensive plan, Kentuck's STEM Imperative - Competing in the Global Economy that has created a vision and has provided direction for state's STEM initiative. Applicant currently has several STEM programs in place that create increased access to a rigorous STEM driven culture. Noteworthy examples of programs are Advance Kentucky, nationally recognized Project Lead The Way, UTeach, regional Science Centers and Math and Science partnerships.				
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	
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Applicant has clearly communicated its commitment and actions in addressing all of the education reform areas. Clearly stated are plans for the adoption of internationally benchmarked standards and assessments. Clearly stated are the establishment of a professional evaluation program that will include performance-based student growth and achievement indicators as part of the evaluation criteria for teachers and principals that is supported by statewide longitudinal data warehouse system. Clearly stated are the expanded efforts of a comprehensive approach to improve practices and results in low-achieving schools.</p> <p>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2) Dr. Holliday's response to the question of how high school students and classrooms will be different in five years as a result of embracing the four components of the RTT program demonstrated the quality of his significant leadership in making comprehensive school reform happen and the accountability he puts upon himself to make it happen.</p>				
Total		0	0	
Grand Total	500	424	426	

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

The state has an exciting and innovative plan to turnaround its persistently low achieving schools. It reflects the models specified in RTTT. The state has a history of working with needy schools and has some noteworthy successes over the years. The states new plan is a leap forward. Building on its experiences with intervention teams, a new model or design has emerged. The model begins with the state identifying a school in need of assistance. The school is designated a Recovery School. Next an intermediary state group, District 180, conducts an extensive audit of the schools challenges and strengths and creates an action plan for its improvement. A regional educational center follows up with the requisite support e.g. providing an Educational Recovery Leader, a Team of Educational Recovery Specialists, and numerous professional development activities that are job embedded within the context of a professional learning community. The state will also place a School Administration Manager (SAM) in each of its identified schools. This manager will take care of managerial operations so that the Recovery Team Leader can focus solely on instructional leadership. The district will identify a "principal in waiting" and place him or her in the school as preparation to become the regular principal once the intervention has been fully implemented. Succession in leadership is one of the most significant factors in sustaining school reform and Kentucky's plan for a smoothe transition is truly exemplary.

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

Because of its rural nature Kentucky will in most cases (by default) choose the transformational model when intervening in its lowest achieving schools. Larger districts will have more options and decisions will be made in consultation between the SEA and LEA.

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 percentage of total revenue used to support education grew by 2.9% between 2008 and 2009. State policies and budgeting formulas lead to equitable school funding.				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	8	8	
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Kentucky has no charter school law. The state facilitates site-based decision-making and school autonomy. As mentioned in the application, the state has been viewed as a pioneer in school reform and innovation for many years, but receives no points because it has no charter school law.				
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Kentucky's reform agenda dates back to 1990. The conditions for reform are very favorable. Numerous innovative ideas flow through out this application. The application is inspiring and a real learning opportunity for the nation to discover all of the creative and thoughtful ideas Kentucky has put forth to advance its school reform agenda.				
Total	55	23	23	

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)				
A great number of STEM related ideas and initiatives are mentioned throughout the application. What appears to be lacking is an overall design process for implementing them. Participants will need to clearly know the basic purposes of STEM related activities. They will need to have a picture of what it will look like if STEM outcomes are realized and they will need a step by step action plan for getting there. Finally, participants need to know what their roles will be in implementing the various STEM initiatives.				
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)				
The application comprehensively and coherently addresses all four of the reform area specified in the ARRA. State success factors demonstrate a very strong commitment from stakeholder groups and a well conceived plan to make school reform happen.				
Total		0	0	
Grand Total	500	423	423	

(E)(2)(i) The applicant describes the process by which the state will identify its persistently lowest-achieving schools. The state will begin by selecting all schools that meet the federal definition of persistently lowest-achieving, then add all schools who have student scores ranked in the bottom 5% in proficiency, in Math and ELA combined across all student subgroups, for three consecutive years. Also added to the list will be those schools who have a persistent graduation rate of less than 60%. This process allows the state to intervene in all of its lowest-achieving schools regardless of Title I status without penalizing schools for their Title I status. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points) (E)(2)(ii) The applicant describes a four-part plan to turnaround the lowest performing schools. The schools will be required to relinquish control to the state, at which point the state will: fundamentally change the operations model of the school, using one of the four intervention models specified in the RTTT application; develop a cadre of support providers; and appropriate the funding necessary to create a successful educational recovery. To implement this plan, the state will create: "District 180", a specific single statewide office for educational recovery services focused only on providing services to the lowest-performing schools; regional Centers for Learning Excellence, which will serve as intermediaries between District 180 and the Educational Recovery Schools; and teams of Education Recovery Leaders and Specialists, who will coordinate turnaround efforts in individual schools. In addition, the state will create certification and endorsement providers for Recovery Leaders and Specialists, and take necessary legislative action to support the creation of the school turnaround structure described above. The applicant indicates that over 200 schools have fallen into one of three tiers of state assistance categories since 2002; the state has been successful in improving conditions in all but 5 of those schools. In addition, the applicant provides data on specific turnaround models implemented by the state since 2003, and the numbers of schools turned around through each model. Finally, the applicant provides ambitious yet achievable targets for the state's school turnaround efforts for the duration of the grant. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (35 points)

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)				
<p>(F)(1)(i) The applicant includes state financial data documenting that, while total state revenues declined from FY 2008 to FY 2009, the percentage allocated to public education (elementary, secondary, and postsecondary) increased from 43.6% to 46.5% of total state revenues. In addition, this increase in percentage also translated to a real dollar increase of \$15 million for public education in the state, even as total state revenues declined by over \$500 million. This significant increase in percentage and dollars of funding devoted to public education, especially in a time of fiscal crisis, earns the applicant full points on this criterion. (5 points) (F)(1)(ii) The applicant indicates that the state uses the Support Education Excellence in Kentucky (SEEK) program to ensure equitable funding between high-need and other districts in the state. All LEAs in the state start from an equal funding base; however, this base is adjusted based on poverty (poorer districts get more funds), and on the number of Special Needs and ELL students (the larger the number, the more funds received). The state also requires a minimum property tax levy for all school districts; this amount is subtracted from the calculated per-pupil SEEK amount for districts. By making up the difference between tax levies and SEEK rates, the state guarantees equal funding across districts, with additional funding for high-need districts. Also by state law, districts allocate funding on a strict per-pupil basis to their schools. Thus schools are funded on the basis of size of student population served, not on need status, ensuring equitable per-pupil funding across high-need and other schools. The applicant provides dollar amounts of per-pupil funding as supporting evidence. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points)</p>				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	8	8	

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

(F)(2)(i) The applicant indicates that the state has no charter school law, thus no charter schools. The applicant earns no points on this criterion. (0 points) (F)(2)(ii) The applicant indicates that the state has no charter school law, thus no charter schools. The applicant earns no points on this criterion. (0 points) (F)(2)(iii) The applicant indicates that the state has no charter school law, thus no charter schools. The applicant earns no points on this criterion. (0 points) (F)(2)(iv) The applicant indicates that the state has no charter school law, thus no charter schools. The applicant earns no points on this criterion. (0 points) (F)(2)(v) The applicant indicates that through the establishment of a school-based decision making form of school governance, state legislation allows all public schools to become innovative and autonomous. Thus the rules governing all public schools in Kentucky are very similar to the ones governing charter schools in other states. Schools have chosen to exercise this authority by developing magnet schools or programs focused on specific subject areas, career training areas, and methods of instructional delivery. Magnet school models in the state are varied and include, but are not limited to: career academies; structured schools-within-schools, and Montessori programs. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (8 points)

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

5

5

5

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

(F)(3) The applicant describes a variety of other conditions established by the state that are favorable to education reform and increasing student achievement. These include: the state provision of preschool to all children; Extended School Services, providing additional instructional time for at-risk students; Family and Youth Resource Centers, providing wrap-around services to all schools, especially those in high-need areas; universal administration of the ACT college entrance exam; Graduate Kentucky, fostering stakeholder conversations about best practices in dropout prevention; the Kentucky Center for School Safety, ensuring a safe school environment for all children; and Achievement Gap teams, focused on identifying and disseminating best practices in closing the achievement gaps between student subgroups. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points)

Total

55

23

23

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)

The applicant stresses a STEM focus throughout the application, making clear indications as to how work in three of the four ARRA reform areas – standards and assessments; teacher and principal effectiveness; and school turnaround – will apply specifically to STEM instruction. The applicant also provides a summary, in the competitive priority section, of their STEM plan. In this summary, the applicant describes state STEM initiatives by reform area, including information about which of the competitive priority areas are addressed by each initiative. In the area of standards and assessments, the applicant briefly describes four initiatives detailed in Section B: Advance Kentucky, Project Lead The Way, Student Technology competitions, and Science Centers. In the area of teacher and principal effectiveness, the applicant briefly describes three initiatives detailed in Section D: UTeach, the Mathematics and Science Partnership, and the Partnership Institute for Mathematics and Science Education Reform. In the area of school turnaround, the applicant briefly describes one initiative detailed in Section E: the coordination of STEM initiatives in turnaround schools (this includes references to the implementation of two other initiatives, Advance Kentucky and Project Lead the Way, in low-performing schools). Since points for the STEM Competitive Priority are awarded as all or nothing, and the applicant presents a multifaceted plan for inclusion of STEM priorities in its state education reform agenda, the applicant earns 15 points on this criterion. (15 points)

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 absolute priority is addressed by the applicant throughout the application. All four ARRA reform areas are comprehensively and coherently addressed, and 100% LEA participation and commitment is demonstrated. The applicant describes how the state's plans will translate to increased student achievement, decreased achievement gaps across subgroups, and increased graduation and college-going rates. The applicant meets the absolute priority.

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

Grand Total	500	441	436	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--

(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools

35

20

26

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

i. From 2010 through 2012, the state will use the federal definition of persistently lowest achieving school to identify schools for turnaround. In the fall of 2012, the state will expand the definition to include all schools that fail to meet the state's new accountability standards. From this group the state will identify schools whose student scores have ranked in the bottom 5% of proficiency in math and reading/language arts combined for the all students category for three consecutive years. The state will also include any high school that does not meet the above definition but has a graduation rate of less than 60 percent. The state's plan meets the criteria described in the notice. 5/5 ii. The recent turn around history of the state has positive aspects. The state will not continue to use its most recent approaches. Instead it will create a new approach and structure. The first step will be to subject all designated schools to a two phase audit. This will provide data for an SEA decision regarding what entity will be manage the each school's turn around. Some will be managed by the state through it's to-be-created District 180 management office. Others will be managed by the LEA (as opposed to the sitting principal and school council) and others will be managed by the council (apparently after removal of the sitting principal). The managing agent will identify a model to pursue. After this, how a school turns around and on what schedule is unclear. The primary focus of the state's plan is on creating a state level supervisorial office ("District 180") and three pilot regional offices called Centers for Learning Excellence. None of these entities currently exist. A primary function of each pilot Center is "liaison" between District 180 and the manager(s) of the identified schools. The Centers are to facilitate of the development of a series of external supports and supplementary programs for each school (e.g. parent training, after school program, dual credit programs at high schools). Another focus of the plan is the investment in the expansion of several existing, free-standing programs that will provide specialized services to identified schools. A third focus is the creation of new certification programs which will certify administrators and teachers to be recovery leaders and teacher coaches. A "recovery team" consisting of a certified recovery leader, one or more recovery specialists (i.e. teacher leader/coaches), and a school administrative manager will be placed in each identified school to lead it. The turnaround specialists will be available after 2011 when the first cohort of such persons completes certification. This series of activities are not knit together to represent a coherent approach to turning schools around. Accordingly, the plan is not of the highest quality. 20/35

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

The presentation clarified how turnaround schools will be identified. The criteria are sophisticated and will become more so during the life of the grant. The same data that make the analysis more sophisticated will assist those charged with a turnaround in analyzing the needs of the school identified. The presentation also clarified the nature of the audits that precede the selection of a turnaround model and why responsibility for turnarounds will be given to different agents (i.e. SEA, LEA, school site council) depending on the audit. These clarifications and explanations raise the quality of this aspect of the state's plan. Therefore, additional points are awarded. 26/35

Total

50

35

41

F. General

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

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

i. The state increased funding to public education from 2008 to 2009. -5 sub points ii. The state's policies result in (a) equitable funding between high need LEAs and other LEAs and (b) between high poverty schools and others within each LEA. -5 sub points

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	8	8
--	----	---	---

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

i. The state does not claim to have a charter school law. 0 sub points ii. N/A-0 sub points iii. N/A-0 sub points iv. N/A-0 sub points v. The state mandates that each public school be governed by a local school council whose autonomy is analogous to or the equivalent of the autonomy typically given charter schools in other states. 8/8

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

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

Since 1990 the state has supported a variety of reforms and innovations designed to increase student achievement and graduation rates and to narrow achievement gaps. The state orchestrated a state wide overhaul of its entire K-12 system with the Kentucky Education Reform Act in 1990. Since then, legislation and policy changes have led to new standards and assessments, school and district intervention authority, modifications to make funding more equitable. The state also established state wide preschool, extended school services and instruction time for at risk students, and created family and your Resource Centers. Most recently the state has formed an ongoing partnership with the Wallace foundation to pilot reform including increasing the effectiveness of teachers/principals, instituted the universal administration of the ACT, and passed Senate Bill 1 in 2009 which foreshadowed the state's development of this reform package. The state has also created a Center for School Safety which provides evaluations, support, and a report to the public all of which foster improved school climate and safe environments for the state's school children. The state's over-all focus on achievement has been the impetus for the increased high school graduation rate, the increased college matriculation, and the gains experienced in student achievement since the early 1990's.

Total	55	23	23
-------	----	----	----

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)

i. The state's plan has embedded in many initiatives activities that can increase the availability of rigorous courses of study in the STEM areas. Foremost among them are the recurring of Teach for America teachers and teacher preparation programs that identify promising teacher candidates and focus their preparation on subjects and locations where it is most difficult to staff such course. A proven activity that will be enhanced to increase the availability of rigorous courses is the expansion of the state's virtual school includes several existing or planned STEM initiatives that meet the three criteria: access to rigorous courses of study, collaboration with STEM-capable community partners, and preparation of more students for advanced study and careers. ii. The state's approach to reforming education hinges on the implementation of new common standards in math and science in grades K-8. Because these standards, along with those for English/language arts will be the vehicle for the induction of all teacher into the processes of assessment and evaluation, and because the plan relies heavily on technology both as a teaching and a working tool for teachers, the plan is highly likely to prepare all teaching to do more integration of STEM content across the grades. iii. Increasing the supply of effective teachers in the STEM disciplines is likely to increase the preparation of more students for advanced study and careers in the STEM disciplines. Because several of the teacher preparation programs are focused on placing the teachers in areas where the taking of advanced courses and the attending of college is not common, the placing of these teachers will also touch

underrepresented students and women with the message that they can succeed at both—hard courses and college.

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 state has a long history of acting statewide to improve public education. The state faces unique problems centered on the dispersal of its school as dictated by its geography and the poverty of a very high percentage of its students. In addition to its historical achievements, the state has taken recent steps to initiate another, pervasive statewide reform. The state's leaders have organized to closely monitor their schools, and they have coalesced around this proposal for systematic change. The support for the plan is broad, and the successful implementation of the core reforms in standards, assessment, use of data, and an intense effort to turnaround failing schools will greatly benefit the students, families, and educators of the state. Concerns are raised in the comments about the viability of the proposed system of delivery for professional development. Given the state's geography and resources, the proposal to create multiple networks involving many people might well be the best adaption to both the strengths and challenges facing the state's educators. As noted, uneven implementation of the multiple initiatives is likely to occur in any large, people-based system. The good that could be accomplished by these reforms even if partially implemented or implemented over a longer time than planned will still have highly beneficial effects. For all these reasons, the state has met the ultimate priority.

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

Grand Total	500	365	380
-------------	-----	-----	-----

(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	27
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>According to the narrative, Kentucky's will use the federal definition of "persistently lowest-achieving" to identify the schools for turnaround. These schools will be called Educational Recovery Schools and will ultimately include all schools that fail to meet the state's new accountability measures. Students with scores that have been ranked in the bottom 5% of proficiency in math and reading/language arts combined for the ALL students category for three consecutive years. In addition, the state will also identify any high schools that do not meet the before mentioned definition but have a graduation rate of less than 60%. Kentucky's plan to turn around the lowest-achieving schools in the state seems to meet the criterion but given the many entities that will be involved in providing support to these schools, it is not very clear who will ultimately be leading the effort to turnaround these schools and who will be responsible for their success. Moving forward, Kentucky has set a goal of turning around low-achieving schools to have at least 50% combined proficiency in math and reading in all student categories by 2012. To reach this goal, Kentucky plans to use the definition for 'persistently low-achieving' schools to identify those schools that need to turnaround. The state will also create "District 180", a specific office for educational recovery services that will focus only on the schools and districts identified for educational recovery. This office will provide support and assistance to Centers of Learning Excellence (intermediaries between schools, districts and District 180) and educational management organizations contracted to manage recovery schools. This unit will also conduct audits by October 2010 to determine who will make decisions about which turnaround option to employ for each chronically low-achieving school. It is not clear from the plan that Kentucky provides whether or not they have a turnaround model, similar to the four provided in the Race to the Top guidance, in mind for their strategies moving forward.</p>		
Total	50	42

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In FY 2008, Kentucky used 43.6% of its total revenue for education. In FY 2009, the state used 46.5% of its total revenue for education. Thus, Kentucky has increased its proportional spending on education by nearly 3 percentage points. Kentucky is committed to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs and within LEAs, between high-poverty schools and other schools. As per the narrative, the Support Education Excellence in Kentucky funding helps to ensure not only equitable funding across districts but even increased funding for high-need LEAs so they have sufficient resources to serve all students well.</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>According to the narrative, Kentucky does not have any charter school laws in the state and this prevents them from meeting any of the charter school requirements for this section of the application. Kentucky has created an environment where all public schools can become innovative and autonomous through the establishment of a school-based decision making form of school governance.</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

Kentucky has demonstrated other significant reforms in education in the past years. Among some of these reforms is a partnership with the Wallace Foundation to pilot key elements of reforms to increase teacher and principal effectiveness and a universal administration of the ACT that begun in 2008. The state also established the Kentucky Center of School Safety in 1998 that according to the narrative has produced measurable progress in school safety.

Total	55	23
-------	----	----

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments:

Kentucky has been working since 2007 to develop a statewide strategic action plan to accelerate Kentucky's performance within the STEM disciplines. Since then, Kentucky has established partnerships and initiatives to further progress in STEM fields. Kentucky has done good job of addressing this STEM priority throughout the RTT application. As a part of the standards and assessments reform effort under RTT, Kentucky has initiatives with Advance Kentucky, Project Lead the Way, Student Technology competitions and Science Centers to address all three of the STEM goals. As a part of the Great Teachers and Leaders reform effort under RTT, Kentucky's initiatives with UTeach, The Mathematics and Science Partnership and Partnership Institute for Mathematics and Science Education Reform address the STEM goal of working with industry experts, museums and other community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grade levels and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction and in offering applied learning opportunities for students. Finally, as for turning around the lowest-achieving schools, Kentucky will address all three STEM goals through their Centers for Learning Excellence that will manage the implementation of programs like Advance Kentucky and Project Lead the Way to ensure that teachers are trained in, and students participate in rigorous STEM courses.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments:

Kentucky has done a very good job in laying out a comprehensive and coherent plan that addresses all four of the education reform areas specified in ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that Kentucky and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The state has 100% LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals its plans. Kentucky has also set some clear goals around increasing student achievement overall and by subgroup, decreasing achievement gaps across student subgroups and increasing graduation rates and college enrollment rates.

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

Grand Total	500	414
--------------------	------------	------------