

(E)(1) Utah law enables the State to use investigation, corrective action, monitoring, and the withdrawal or reduction of funds to individual schools or LEAs who act "inconsistent with state law, administrative rule, or the express purpose of the program" of a school or LEA." Chartering authorities are also able to intervene in the schools they charter, and terminate the charter if the school "fails to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management, or for other good cause shown." While Utah states that its state's laws allow its State Board of Education to intervene in persistently low performing schools, there is nothing mentioned in the application that explicitly or tacitly suggests that the state can intervene in schools for reasons related to poor student achievement. As a result, all points were withheld for this section.

<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>17</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	2
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	15
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>(E)(2)(i) Utah presents a summary of a plan for identifying its persistently lowest performing schools. The plan is tied to using the Title I School Improvement Process for schools who are identified as persistently low achieving after four years of failing to meet state benchmarks in reading and math. However, there were no plans or targets for identifying or addressing the needs of Utah's lowest performing schools. (E)(2)(ii) Utah says it will use a turnaround model for its lowest performing schools and cites an example of a school in a tribal community that was closed and restructured, and shortly thereafter, student achievement rose significantly. However, while Utah states that it will pursue this route for its most persistently low performing schools, the approach that is most discussed is using the Title I school improvement process. The Title I School Improvement Process (SIP) has been in place for two decades. Over that time period, the Title I process yielded very few significant results for within the lowest performing schools. Generally, more interventions are required in such schools than the SIP process involves. Utah further states that it does not have many Title I schools. They also share that they have non-Title I schools that have lower AYP scores than Title I Schools. Nevertheless, Utah projects it will intervene using the turnaround model in 10 schools in 2011-12, including the non-Title I schools. Since 2004, it has turned around just one school. There is no mention of how it will support LEAs in turning around such schools. From the story Utah told about the school it turned around, they clearly stated that they were inexperienced at turning around schools when the issue with the tribal school was addressed. Utah also stated that they decided not to close the school based on concerns that loomed in the Indian community about closing their school. The decision was motivated by community interest, not via a sound monitoring and evaluation process by the State or LEA. Considering this, Utah is not presenting any plans for significantly building the capacity of SEAs or LEAs to address these concerns more proactively and strategically in the future.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>17</b>

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>(F)(1)(i) The state funded education at 59.2% of its total budget in FY2009 compared to 53.7% of its budget in FY2008. Utah is receiving full points for this sub-criterion. (F)(1)(ii)(a) Utah has an equalization formula that is highly recognized nationally as one of the most equitable systems for funding schools in the nation. Approximately 70% of funding for education is paid for by the State, with 23% of funding coming from local funding and 7% from federal funds. Through its equalization formula, the state spends proportionally less funds on high tax/high net worth LEAs than on LEAs with high concentrations of poverty. The funds disbursed are "equalized" so that schools are funded at relatively</p>		

the same level in the State. Utah is receiving full points for this sub-criterion. (F)(1)(ii)(b) In terms of equalization of funding between high poverty and low poverty schools within an LEA, sufficient evidence is not presented to determine that this is required or occurring in Utah. Utah shares a state statute that discusses how local communities are to share in the cost of educating children with the State, but there is no definitive statement made that LEAs are required to ensure equitable funding between high poverty and low poverty schools in their Districts. As a result, points are being withheld for this sub-criterion.

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

**40**

**24**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(2)(i) Utah places no limits on the number of charter schools that can operate in its State, but the State does define within its charter school law a maximum number of students that can be enrolled in charters. The law states that beginning in 2009-10, charter schools may grow (in enrollment) "by 1.4% of the total school district enrollment by October 1" annually. Notwithstanding, this policy still presents an obstacle that could limit charter growth. As a result, points have been withheld. Utah also indicates that at the time its RTTT application was submitted, there were 994 public schools in the State, of which 72 were charters (7.6% of all schools). Utah further states it only charters "quality" charter schools. Considering the RTTT criteria only ask about caps on the number of charter schools in states and not about caps on students, Utah is receiving the full points for this sub-criterion. (F)(2)(ii) Utah shared a copy of its charter school law, which clearly indicates that charters are to be approved, monitored, and held accountable achieving the goals and benchmarks of their charter. There is not mention of student achievement being a factor in whether or not a charter school remains open or closes. Only one charter school has been terminated in the State and another school voluntarily gave up its charter. Since 2005, Utah has chartered fewer schools while its denial rate has stated relatively the same. In 2009, Utah received 12 charter school applications. They approved two schools and denied 10, mostly on the basis of "lack of readiness to open" or "poor and unfocused applications." Utah's law, nor its application, speaks to the need to serve student populations that are similar to their local school districts. Points have been withheld for this sub-criterion because of the lack of clear accountability for student achievement in the State's charter school law. (F)(2)(iii) Utah states that it provides equitable funding for charter schools, and that charter schools are supported through federal, state, and local funding. State law speaks to the need for equitable funding of charter schools in the State. Utah has received medium points for this sub-criterion because no data tables, budget number or other evidence is presented that clearly articulate the funding levels of charter schools and traditional public schools. (F)(2)(iv) Utah does not appropriate facilities funding for its charter schools. It does, however, operate a 10% local replacement fund and provide a state-funded revolving loan fund to assist charter schools with facilities acquisition. Points are being withheld as a result. (F)(2)(v) Utah share several examples of how LEAs are able to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools. They describe career and technical education programs, early college high school programs, year-round schools, and International Baccalaureate schools as examples. Utah is receiving full points for this sub-criterion.

**(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions**

**5**

**3**

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(3) Utah presents six different state laws that demonstrate how the state has created, through law, regulation, and policy, other conditions favor to reform or innovation. However, Utah does not indicate if these reforms and innovations have improved student achievement, increased graduation rates, or resulted in other important outcomes. As a result, points have been withheld.

**Total**

**55**

**33**

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	0
<p>Competitive Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Utah has not completely met the Competitive Priority as it did not share a high quality plan for addressing STEM education in its application. Utah states that it will provide more rigorous math and science classes, will offer extra pay to math and science teachers, and provide professional development to educators, and develop partnerships with businesses that provide internships to teacher leaders in STEM fields. However, Utah does not explain in any detail how it will do things. They provide statements of intent with no clear evidence or "detailed plans" for (a) offering rigorous courses of study in mathematics, science, technology and engineering, or (b) "how" (with the exception of teacher internships) Utah will cooperate with industry experts, universities or research centers to prepare and assist teachers with integrating STEM content across grades or disciplines. Utah's STEM Plans also do not explain how the State will support LEAs, or how LEAs themselves, will prepare more students for advanced study and careers in STEM fields. As the plan for this section is not clear and has many holes, all points are being withheld from this section.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	15	0

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		No
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Utah has not presented a comprehensive or coherent RTTT Plan that effectively addresses all four areas specified in the American Recovery &amp; Reinvestment Act (ARRA) or State Success Factors in its application. While Utah reported significant LEA participation, very little information was shared throughout the document for how the state will recruit, support, and develop great teachers and leaders or teach them how to lead and teach in a more rigorous environment. There were a number of activities proposed, but the activities lacked sufficient detail that expressed how things will get done. There were also several typos in the proposal and several of the Appendices numbers do not match the Appendices table of contents. In summary, Utah provided too little information for its initiatives, did not present a comprehensive approach that tied back to its stated vision and goals, and has not made it clear that student growth and achievement will indeed be a factor in school, principal, and teacher accountability in the near future. As a result, Utah did not meet the absolute priority.</p>		
<b>Total</b>		0
<b>Grand Total</b>	500	276

Turning around the persistently lowest achieving schools 30 All Title 1 schools identified as persistently low achieving will immediately begin one of the four school intervention models. In the past, the state's System of Support has been very effective in preventing Title 1 schools from reaching the persistently low-performing schools designation through research-based strategies that lead to increased achievement. For those schools that do not respond by implementing one of the 4 intervention models. They plan the same for their non-Title 1 secondary schools. They will require LEAs to allow identified schools to create the conditions for reform by providing them with flexibility and autonomy in selecting staff, implementing new structures for the school day, control the school budget, provide comprehensive services to high need students, and actively engage families. Utah has had only one intervention since 2004 and they used a turnaround model that yielded positive results. Their plans seem solid and fairly aggressive, however they have yet to intervene in a high school and they have 10 possible schools for intervention in 2 years and 9 of them are high schools. This will be new and challenging territory for them.

Total	50	35
-------	----	----

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

### (F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(1)i The % available in 2009 to support education was greater than or equal to the % available to support education in 2008 5 The percent available in 2008 was 53.7% and in 2009 it was 59.2% which shows that Utah's support of education grew from 2008 to 2009. (F)(1)ii State policies lead to equitable funding: a) between high need LEAS and other LEAS 3 Utah is one of only 5 states where no court case challenging the equity of the state's education finance system has ever been filed. The GAO found Utah to be one of only two states where on average, per pupil funding is the same in wealthy as in poor districts and that no income related funding gap exists. Revenues from LEAs in wealthy income tax areas are distributed by a formula to LEAs in areas with lower than average income taxes. b) within LEAS between high-poverty schools and other schools 0 There are recommendations in both the state code and constitution that districts provide at least a "minimum program." But they list no particular efforts to encourage districts to do something about intra-district inequity.

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>26</b>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-----------

### (F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

F2i The state has a law that does not prohibit the number of high performing charter schools 6 The state has no cap on charter schools, though it does have a cap on the number of students that can enroll in charter schools (32,921). They currently have 72 charter schools, which is 7.2% of Utah's public schools. F2ii The state has laws or guidelines regarding how authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, close charter schools, in particular, using student achievement as an important factor, encourage charter schools that serve high needs students, and have closed ineffective charters 3 They have guidelines for how authorizers approve applicants, seeking quality schools that meet reasonable management and preparation requirements. Though they have specific purposes outlined for certain types of charter schools, there is no effort to attract schools that serve high needs students. Only one school has had its charter terminated, though Utah has a law allowing it to intervene in underperforming charter schools. They don't explain why this school was closed. Two schools are being closely watched. They list the number of applicants and reasons for denial (lack of readiness, poor application, financial difficulties, applications withdrawn.) F2iii The state's charter schools receive equitable funding 5 Utah charter schools receive equitable funding compared to other public schools. They receive their commensurate share of federal funding, an annual state appropriation divided among all charter schools on a per student basis and a portion of local school district revenues

determined by the number of district students that leave traditional schools to attend charter schools. School districts are encouraged by the Utah Board of Education Rules to authorize charter schools locally by allowing locally chartered school students to receive equal funding to student attending traditional schools in the district. Though they mention these funding policies, they don't provide evidence of the amount of funding passing through to charter schools per student or how they compare to traditional public school per-student allocations. F2iv The state provides funding, access and levies for facilities 4 Utah law does not provide charter schools with funding specifically for facilities. 10% of local replacement funds must be used for facilities, however. Utah law does not impose any facility related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools. F2v. The state enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charters 8 Utah has education programs for children in custody, adult education programs for those who did not complete high school, early college high schools, IB schools, year round schools, and an electronic (virtual) high school with 35,000 students enrolled.

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b> In the past few years, Utah has laid the groundwork to for conditions favorable for education reform through activities that promote the 4 key areas (see A2 and A3)as well as passing laws that attempt to improve education for all students, especially some of the most disadvantaged, including programs for incarcerated youth. They have also worked to extend innovative programs to more students, including career and technical education programs, adult education programs, early college high school, international baccalaureate programs, and electronic high schools. These multiple pathways to graduation illustrate ways the state is reaching disaffected students.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>39</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments:</b> The application addresses STEM concerns throughout.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments:</b> The application is coherent and comprehensive in its efforts to address the 4 education reform areas. They have convened broad support for the plan. They have long standing initiatives that support each of the 4 reform areas and believe these sustained efforts have helped improve student achievement and reduce achievement gaps. They have a robust data system that will help them tie their efforts to increasing student achievement, they plan to include student growth to their teacher and principal evaluations and they have shown a commitment to funding education.		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>403</b>
--------------------	------------	------------

accompanying table. (E)(2)(ii) Only one school, since school year 2004-2005, was restructured using the turnaround model. In the performance measures, the expectation is that 10 schools will utilize the intervention models in 2011-2012. There is a very low incidence of intervention in the state to turn around schools. With this low record of turning around schools, it seems overly ambitious to expect 10 schools to undergo this process within the SY 2011. Credible evidence should be supplied as to the possibility of this actually taking place.

<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------

**F. General**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (F) (1) (i) Documentation for this section is presented showing an increase in the education budget as a percentage of the State Budget. The increase was 5.5% over the previous year. (F)(1)(ii)(a) The USOE has demonstrated through this section that equitable funding pervades the school systems. The state has on the books a law called the Minimum School Program Act that insures districts received their fair share of state funds for education. (F)(1)(ii)(b) As mentioned previously, the Minimum School Program Act provides equitable funding for schools. This section includes information related to Utah Code 53A from the Utah State Constitution as evidence of policies leading to equitable funding. (F)(1) (ii)(c) Evidence for this is contained in (F)(1)(i).		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>24</b>
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (F)(2)(i) While the narrative states that there is no limit to the number of charter schools in Utah, the Code governing charter schools does define the maximum number of authorized students in charters. It does provide for an annual increase in charter schools equal to 1.4% of total school district enrollment as of October 1 of the previous year. This does seem to set limits upon student enrollment and needs to be clarified. (F) (2) (ii) There is a need in the narrative to show how the state will encourage the development of charter schools relative to high-need students. (F)(2) (iii) Equitable funding is provided for charter schools. (F)(2)(iv) Utah law does not provide charter schools with funding specifically for facilities. (F)(2)(v) This section shows significant offerings for innovative and autonomous schools.		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (F)(3) This section provides information found in the Appendix that cover the legal authority for a majority of innovative programs listed in the previous section.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>39</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>
Competitive Reviewer Comments:		

There is only a slight mention throughout the application to technology and engineering which are central to the STEM program. The plan needs more detail to ensure that it can be successfully expanded and extended to students throughout the state.

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

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>

**Absolute Reviewer Comments:**

Utah has addressed the four ARRA areas. Substantial work has been done prior to this grant notice in the four areas covered by ARRA and the reform plans for funding under this grant explore these areas in depth. The application sets forth four areas comprised of 15 projects. These areas are noted below:  
 1. Adopting Standards and Assessments that Prepare Students to Succeed in the Workplace; 2. Building Data Systems that Measure Student Growth and Success, Inform Teachers and Principals about How They Can Improve Instruction; 3. Recruiting, Developing, and Retaining Effective Teachers and Principals, Especially Where They Are Needed Most; and 4. Turning Around Lowest Achieving Schools. The approach is system wide and proposes to use RTTT to meet a series of goals found under each area. Specific timelines for completion are listed and projects identified as well as the reform areas these projects address that lead to meeting those goals which include new directions for the areas in question. In addition, the state will expand on successful practices that have been in operation for a considerable length of time. This approach has been followed in each of the reform areas. As support for this submission, some projects although not all, include a rationale to support the capacity to carry out the design of the project. In doing so, they provide a history over time of previous work in the specific area. The narrative points to previous target dates set by the state for accomplishing a project and indicates a number of times in this section and throughout the application that with RTTT funds these targets can occur sooner or at a faster pace. From the evidence provided throughout the application this appears as a comprehensive and credible design that has been clearly articulated throughout the application.

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

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>396</b>
--------------------	------------	------------

achievements as well as key areas of school quality highly related to student achievement. The applicant draws upon relevant research work being conducted within the state, at Utah State and Brigham Young University. The USOE will be contracting with an outside reviewing agency (not specifically named) to study the effectiveness of these supports, to be done on an annual basis, with a focus on continuing improvement of student achievement. This evaluation work was described only in the most general terms, and only in a very brief paragraph, for such an important piece of work. Furthermore, the work seemed to include two totally different evaluation agendas -data from implementation and effectiveness of program activities that will be useful feedback to teachers and principals, and work from the outside evaluator to evaluate the overall system.

<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>85</b>
--------------	------------	-----------

### E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The proposal does not explicitly declare that the State has legal, statutory or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action.		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>26</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	21
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: To its credit, Utah is proposing a new more accurate procedure that they feel places more rigorous emphasis on longitudinal data, compared with the current method recommended by the US DOE. Such a procedure will allow them to identify many of the lowest performing schools in the state that are in fact not Title I schools. The technique also proposes to use a four-year average, rather than two consecutive years of not achieving AYP, and to factor in graduation rate for determining low performing high schools. Utah has been effective to date in preventing Title I schools from reaching the persistently low performing schools designation. The proposal presents two projects addressing turning around persistently lowest achieving schools, System of Support for Title I Struggling Schools, and Preventing Low-Achieving Secondary Schools. Of note, the latter project proposes a more proactive strategy for tackling low achievement schools, and grants not only training and support, but requires LEAs to allow identified schools greater flexibility and autonomy in selecting staff, creating new structures for the school day, control the school's budget, and other aspects of the school's operation. The proposal does not specifically discuss in detail any of the four intervention models listed in the Notice that they propose to use. No thoughtful plan is provided to accompany their declaration that they plan to reach 10 schools by the end of SY 2011-12, in their performance measures table.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>26</b>

### F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		

The State of Utah increased its support for public and higher education from 2008 to 2009 in terms of percentage of state budget (although not in actual dollars.) The actual 2008 education budget for education was 53.7% in 2008 and 59.2% in 2009. Utah has sufficiently adequate laws and policies that lead to equitable funding between high-need LEAS and other LEAs, and between high-poverty schools and other schools. When measured by the GAO, it was one of only two states that had basically no income-related funding gap between wealthy and poor districts. It did not provide specific information as to how state policies led to equitable funding within LEAs, between high-poverty and other schools.

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

**40**

**23**

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Utah has a number of successful conditions in place for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools. There is no limit to the number of charter schools in Utah. There are now 72 charter schools in Utah (7.3% of schools), serving 6% of public school age population. There are 70 Charter school LEAs, with a wide range of types listed in the proposal (e.g., core knowledge; classical education; arts; back to basics, science and technology.) The main structural constraints deal with a combined maximum student capacity for students, that annually increases by 1.4% of student enrollment per year, to facilitate the Legislature's financial planning. ii – The state has appropriate laws, etc. regarding how charter schools are approved, authorized, and held accountable, and if charters fail, including failing to serve lowest performing students who fail to make AYP. Only 1 charter school has been terminated, while another two are being closely monitored. The proposal did not indicate that State encourages charter schools to serve high-need student populations. iii – No evidence is provided as to how state law ensures that Utah charter schools receive equitable funding compared to other public schools. iv – Utah does not provide charter schools with funding specifically for facilities. It does provides assistance through such things as availability of state-funded revolving loans. It does not impose any requirements that are stricter than those applied for traditional public schools. v – The state enables LEAS to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools, and has a number in operation, including early college high schools, IB schools, and the Utah Electronic High School, coordinated by the Utah State Board of Education.

**(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions**

**5**

**3**

**(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The proposal lists several of Utah's laws that allows the State Board of Education to waive rules that they are convinced inhibits innovation, efficiency and productivity in schools, and encourages innovative, autonomous public schools and programs. Connections between these laws and ways in which they have increased student achievement and graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes were not fully discussed in the proposal.

**Total**

**55**

**33**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<p><b>Competitive Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Utah offers a reasonable plan incorporating various educational elements concerning STEM, including creation of rigorous and relevant math courses and lesson plans, implementing a K-6 math initiative and algebra initiative; professional development in mathematics, and promoting information for students and parents on STEM career and college pathways. It also will be using its USTAR program to extend teacher pay for STEM educators, and its PEJEP program for recruiting and retaining teachers in STEM. It also plans to cooperate with STEM-capable community partners to provide internships for teacher leaders.</p>		

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

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Utah's proposed Promises to Keep reform effort features 15 projects addressing the four ARRA reform areas. They have secured widespread LEA commitments (94.6% of all LEAS in the state), as well as good statewide capacity and a broad range of stakeholders. Regarding standards and assessment, it is participating in the 48-state Common Core State Standards CCSO Consortium and in multiple multi-state consortia addressing state standards. It has presented six projects to help schools make the transition to enhanced standards and assessments, and two projects addressing the use of state data, and local instructional improvement data systems. The state has multiple alternative routes to earn licensure, and methods for identifying areas of teacher shortage and ways. It has a general system in place for measuring student growth that can be linked to a student's teacher, and proposes four projects dealing with teacher evaluation and effectiveness, including efforts to link teacher effectiveness with teacher credentialing programs. The proposal also outlines projects to address turning around persistently low-achieving schools.</p>		
Total		0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>379</b>

<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> The State has the legal, statutory or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools and LEAs; however, the link to student achievement growth and the specific implementation steps are not specifically identified.		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>31</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	26
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> E2i – The state has clearly identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools. E2ii – The plan has identified the possible intervention models (that are in compliance with the definitions of the notice) for turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools and indicated which ones were appropriate for individual schools; however, what is described for use is only the restructuring model. There is a plan that articulates goals, activities, timelines and responsible parties, but there is a strong reliance on outside parties with expertise in turnaround efforts, without detailed information about what the implementation plans would be. The description of the WINS program effort is ambitious, but if implemented could have an impact on student achievement. Evidence of state implementation of turnaround measures is documented, but very limited. Given the State's limited experience, the goal of turning around seven secondary schools is optimistic.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>36</b>

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> F1i – The plan indicates that education expenditures, as a percentage of state budget, appropriated in 2009 (59.2%) exceed the actual expenditure in 2008 (53.7%) F1ii – The State policies as described in the plan includes some provisions for redistribution of funds but do not ensure equitable funding for high needs schools.		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> F2i - The State has charter school laws do set some limits to the maximum number and annual increases for students in charter schools. F2ii- The State application describes the laws and regulations regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor and close schools but does not include a provision for ensuring that the population of the school is similar to that of the district in which it resides. Student achievement progress is a factor in closing a school, but the definition of student achievement is meeting AYP goals, not as defined in the notices. The state has closed one ineffective charter school. F2iii - The application describes that Utah has statutes that intend for charter schools to be funded equitably in comparison to traditional public schools; however, it also states that the Utah BOE rules only encourage school districts to allow charter school students to receive equal funding, and does not provide assurance. F2iv - The State does not provide facilities funding for charter schools; however, it does not impose any facility related requirements that are stricter than for traditional public schools. F2v - The application describes wide latitude for LEAs to operate innovative and autonomous schools other than charter schools.		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: The application cites eight current Utah Education codes or legislation that have allowed Utah to encourage innovative autonomous public schools and programs.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>41</b>

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
Competitive Reviewer Comments: The plan adequately addresses (i) offering rigorous STEM courses, (ii) cooperating and collaborating with community and higher education partners, and providing incentives for teachers; however, additional description of how criteria (iii) (preparing more students for advanced study and careers in STEM and addressing the needs of underrepresented groups) would have strengthened the application.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
Absolute Reviewer Comments: The application presents a comprehensive and plan for addressing each of the four required reform areas that present a systemic approach to improving student achievement. However, the coherence of the plan could be strengthened by organizing the presentation of the programs, rationale, activities in a more coherent fashion; as presented it was somewhat difficult to follow.		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>413</b>