



redesigning the american high school

the nga center for best practices honor states grant program PHASE TWO

The National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) is offering a second phase of grants to states for high school redesign under the NGA Center for Best Practices Honor States Grant Program. These grants are made possible with the generous support of a coalition of national funders (i.e., BellSouth Foundation, The Michael & Susan Dell Foundation, The GE Foundation, The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, Lumina Foundation for Education, The Prudential Foundation, State Farm Insurance Companies).

The NGA Center for Best Practices Honor States Grant Program builds on the momentum created by the 2005 National Education Summit on High School and two related state resources: *The Action Agenda for Improving America's High Schools* and *Getting it Done: Ten Steps to a State Action Agenda*. Both of these resources are available on-line at <http://www.nga.org>. Additional copies are available upon request.

This second phase of The NGA Center for Best Practices Honor States Grant Program offers governors the opportunity to develop and begin to implement state strategies to improve high school graduation and college readiness rates. All states, including those that have received Phase One grants, are eligible to apply.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The grant period will be November 2005 – October 2007. Proposals must be received from the governor's office by September 15, 2005. The grantees and award amounts will be determined by a selection committee that is independent of NGA based on the proposals submitted in response to this request. A numerical score will be assigned to each application per the proposal selection criteria. Based on numerical score ranges (on a scale of 100), some states may be granted "conditional acceptance." These states will receive site visits or requests for additional information in October. Awards will be announced in November 2005.

Decisions of the selection committee are final. Prior to the selection committee's full review of state applications, a single state application will be randomly selected as a prototype. A conference call will be convened to review how individuals scored the application to ensure that the selection committee consistently applies the criteria and assigns numeric scores. State applicants who do not receive an award may request access to the scoring rubric, the state's scoring sheet, the transcript from the site visit (if applicable), and a briefing about how their proposals were considered.

The NGA Center may withdraw or modify this RFP as it deems appropriate. However, at this time the schedule is as follows:

DATE	ACTION
July 15, 2005	Phase Two RFP and Blueprint released to states
September 15, 2005	Deadline for submission of Phase Two grant proposals
November 2005	Grant awards announced





NATIONAL SELECTION COMMITTEE

The NGA Center will manage the RFP process but will have no role in the selection of state grantees. The NGA Center will convene an independent selection committee that will make decisions about grant awards to states. The selection committee will meet to review the grant proposals in October. The committee will include foundation representatives and national experts with multi-state experience changing high school and postsecondary state policies. Final decisions of the national selection committee will include the quality of state responses to this RFP (total points earned out of 100); the extent to which the governor and his/her staff participates actively in NGA and is in good standing with the organization; and factors valuing diversity (e.g., balance of proposed state activities described in the Action Agenda; geographic and partisan representation). Decisions of the national selection committee are solely within its discretion and are not subject to challenge.

SUPPORT TO APPLICANTS

During the application process, teleconferences for states interested in applying will be held on July 22, 2005 from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m. EDT and on August 9, 2005 from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m. EDT. During these meetings, the NGA Center will lead a discussion of how to use the Blueprint for an Action Agenda (Attachment A) to develop a strong application, review state requirements, and answer questions about the specific strategies (Attachment C). States interested in participating in one of the conference calls should contact Ilene Berman at iberman@nga.org or 202/624-5378.

Throughout the grant period, the NGA Center will host workshops to help state teams meet their goals and objectives. It is expected that grantee states attend these workshops as well as send representatives to the annual Governors Education Policy Advisors' Institutes to be held November 2005 and November 2006.

ALLOWABLE GRANT-FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Grants can be used to fund the following types of activities directly related to the activities described in the state's proposal. Examples of allowable expenses include:

- Paying for time and travel expenses for consultants and experts;
- Covering travel and meeting expenses for meetings with consultants, technical assistance providers, officials in other states, and/or stakeholders in the state;
- Producing relevant publications and on-line resources; and
- Developing communications materials, including public service announcements for example, that promote high school redesign to the general public.

Grant funds cannot be substituted for on-going program expenses, including personnel expenses. Grant funds cannot be used for lobbying. Grant funds may not be used for purchasing equipment (e.g., computers), except for approved equipment under the "Expand AP Participation" strategy.

MATCHING REQUIREMENT (APPLIES ONLY TO THE “INCREASE COURSE RIGOR” AND “EXPAND AP PARTICIPATION” STRATEGIES.)

States applying to develop and implement the “Increase Course Rigor” strategies and “Expand Advanced Placement Participation” are required to make a \$40,000 and \$500,000 in-kind match, respectively (see Attached C). Funds provided for a match must be used to support the project and must be in addition to, and therefore supplement, funds that would otherwise be made available for the stated program purpose. The matching funds can be cash or in-kind contributions (personnel costs) from state, federal, and private sources.

Timing: Matching contributions need not be applied at the exact time or in direct proportion to the expenditure of grant funds. However, the full matching share must be expended by the end of the grant period.

Records: Grantees must maintain records that clearly show the source, amount, and timing of all matching contributions.

Documentation: Contributions (cash and in-kind) shall be accepted for cost sharing or matching purposes when such contributions meet the following criteria:

- Are verifiable from the grantee’s records;
- Are necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient accomplishment of project objectives; and
- Are allowable under the applicable federal cost principles as detailed in OMB Circular A-87.

AWARDS

The NGA Center will enter into a sub-grant agreement with grantee states. The agreement will be for one year (November 2005 – October 2006). Upon satisfactory progress of the state toward its goals and continued support to the NGA Center by the coalition of national funders, an amendment to the sub-grant agreement will be issued for an additional one year period (November 2006 –October 2007). Each grantee state agrees to participate in an independent evaluation (e.g., provision of state and district data).

REPORTING AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Upon execution of the sub-grant agreement, 25% of the year 1 award amount will be advanced to the state. On a quarterly basis (February 15, May 15, August 15, and November 15), a detailed report is due from the state detailing the state’s progress toward its goals, tasks undertaken, and expenses compared to budget. An invoice should be submitted with the progress report. Once the state has expended its 25% advance, additional funds will be released as the state expends the funds and submits an invoice in the prescribed format. For grants requiring a match, documentation of the required matching funds from the state for at least 75% of the requested funds must accompany the invoice. Following the execution of the year two amendment, 25% of the year two award amount will be advanced to the state. As in year one, a quarterly progress report and invoice should be submitted. If applicable, the November 15, 2007 invoice must include documentation for ninety percent of the



state's in-kind match, and the final report must include documentation for the full amount of the state's in-kind match. Ten percent of the year two funds will be retained until a final report has been submitted by the state and accepted by NGA Center.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The state will grant NGA Center and the coalition of funders a nonexclusive, worldwide, royalty-free license to (i) use, copy, and modify all final products of the grant and (ii) publicly perform or display and distribute (directly or indirectly) copies of the final products or any modified final products to further the charitable purposes of NGA Center or the coalition of funders. The final products of the grant include all reports, drawings, studies, specifications, estimates, maps, computations, computer programs, and other data (writing, sound recordings, or other graphic representations) prepared by or for the state under the terms of the grant. If this grant provides for the development of systems analysis products, models, electronic data processing systems, software and related services, the methods, material, logic and systems developed under the grant may be used as NGA Center and the coalition of funders see fit including the right to re-use and republish the same without limitation.

REQUIRED PROPOSAL CONTENT AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Governors' offices are invited to submit a proposal for the second phase of The NGA Center for Best Practices Honor States Grant Program that addresses the selection criteria below. Proposals may be no longer than twelve (12) pages, excluding attachments. Proposals should be written in 11-point font and single-spaced. **Required elements must be addressed to be considered for funding.** States may choose to submit a single application that addresses all the strategies a state chooses to employ in the Honor States Grant Program Phase Two OR a state may submit individual applications for each selected strategy.

- **Cover Page (Required).** The cover page of the application should include: State name; name and contact information (name, title, address, phone, email, fax) for the application point of contact, team leader and fiscal agent; state strategies selected; amount of funding requested per state strategy; total amount of funding requested.
- **Summarize Strategies for Meeting Core Expectations (Required).** All states receiving funding are required to implement a number of core activities that will help build the political and public will for high school redesign. The state should explain how it intends to:
 1. Commit to adopting a longitudinal, 4-year cohort high school graduation measure that tracks individual students and permits valid comparisons among states. See *Graduation Counts: A Report of the National Governors Association Task Force on High School Graduation Rate Data* for recommendations. The report may be accessed at <http://www.nga.org>.
 2. Demonstrate an on-going commitment to an aligned governance structure for P-16 education. This entity should have gubernatorial leadership, or leadership accountable to the governor, and should have explicit responsibility for a discrete number of objectives.

3. Commit to actively participate in the Data Partnership initiative, including use of the SchoolMatters.com website, sponsored by Standard & Poor's, and other secondary data sources to complement the state's information system for high schools. Good data can better inform state policymaking and future reform efforts. The Data Partnership has made significant investments to provide Standard & Poor's school data and analysis tools for all 50 states. Describe how the state will make use of the available data to inform the NGA Center for Best Practices Honor States Grant Program and related high school reform efforts.
 4. Create and execute a communications plan to build and sustain public will for high school redesign. States will finalize their plans after participation in an NGA-sponsored communications workshop, where common messages learned from national research will be shared.
- **Describe Team Leadership and Membership** (25 points). Participating states must create an interdisciplinary policy team, including a representative from the governor's office, to implement this project, and must designate a team leader and fiscal agent. Please provide letters of interest and commitment from team members, including the governor, a legislative leader, the chief state school officer, the chief higher education executive officer, and a key business leader (letters of commitment will not count toward the 12-page maximum for proposal submissions). Also, please describe the following: How does membership of the proposed team reflect the key people who can move (or stop) a high school redesign agenda in the state? Does the team's composition support bipartisan leadership? How will local school district personnel, higher education, and youth development organizations be involved in this process? What knowledge, skills and influence does the team leader have to successfully implement the project?
 - **Complete the Blueprint for An Action Agenda** (25 points). The Blueprint (Attachment A) is intended to guide state teams through the five major strategies of the Action Agenda for Improving America's High Schools, both in terms of the current status of state policy and the state's plan for future action. State responses to the Blueprint should be submitted as an attachment to the state's proposal.
 - **Describe the State's Two-Year Work Plan** (30 points). In its Blueprint for an Action Agenda, the state identified the types of changes it plans to make over the next ten years. Based on those plans, what does the state want to accomplish over the next two years using the strategies selected?

With explicit references to its Blueprint responses and all relevant empirical evidence, the state should:

1. Describe the goals the state seeks to achieve through the development and implementation of the selected state strateg(ies) to improve high schools and provide indicators or measures the state will use to demonstrate progress toward the state's goals. Acceptable indicators may include:
 - increased dropout recovery;
 - increased high school graduation rates;



- increased readiness of high school graduates for college, work, and citizenship;
 - increased college-going rates; and
 - increased college retention and timely degree completion rates.
2. Identify the proposed activities the state will pursue to reach these goals over the 2005-07 project period using the information in Attachment C: State Strategies for High School Improvement. For each activity, describe:
- the state's objective for implementing this activity and how the effort relates to strategies in the Action Agenda and priorities identified through the Blueprint self-assessment;
 - responses to the questions included in Attachment C for each strategy selected;
 - a month-by-month implementation timeline with persons/groups responsible;
 - policy changes required to sustain efforts beyond the current governor's term (e.g., legislation, executive order, regulatory change);
 - strategies for building public support for the policy action and how the major stakeholders will be engaged; and
 - the budget, including how in-kind resources (if applicable) will support each proposed activity. States applying to receive grants to address more than one strategy should distinguish in the project budget how funding will be allocated for each activity.
3. Describe how the state's participation in The NGA Center for Best Practices Honor States Grant Program Phase Two will complement other on-going activities and opportunities in the state (including Phase One and other foundation-funded initiatives). States applying to implement more than one strategy should describe how the multiple strategies will complement one another.
4. Describe indicators or measures the state will use to demonstrate progress that results from the funded activities. Acceptable indicators may include:
- gains in public understanding of and support for high school redesign and improved graduation rates;
 - increased press coverage across the state on graduation and drop out rates;
 - expanded number of authorized providers of charter high schools;
 - realigned federal and state funds consistent with the state's plan for high school redesign;
 - fewer 8th and 9th grade course failures and higher rates of promotion of 8th to 9th grade and 9th to 10th grade;
 - increased numbers of schools offering rigorous college-preparatory curricula;
 - increased number of college-level credits earned by high school students and transferred to a postsecondary institution;
 - increased number of low-performing high school students receiving intervention services;

- increased number of high school students with an individualized graduation plan that includes 8th grade, high school, and college readiness data;
 - increased number of teachers receiving adolescent literacy and high-level mathematics and science content knowledge training;
 - increased number of principals receiving high-quality leadership training and support;
 - improved data systems for tracking achievement and attainment of individual students, teacher qualifications and characteristics, and classroom impact on student achievement;
- **Demonstrate readiness for change** (20 points). How have the governor and other policymakers demonstrated their commitment to address the policy challenges and actions outlined for this project (e.g., Executive Order or public pronouncement of the issue)? To what degree has the state demonstrated a commitment to change by implementing innovative policies and practices that positively support high school completion and college and work readiness (e.g., any aspect of the Action Agenda or Ten Steps)? Have the team members worked successfully together in the past and/or are they currently working together on an initiative? How well is the state positioned politically for implementing the proposed activities? How has the state been involved with NGA and/or made use of NGA Center expertise and assistance?
 - **A budget detailing the state's plans for spending the grant** (Required). States may apply for grant funds for each state strategy selected. The budget should be presented in the format outlined in Attachment B and include documentation of how the state will meet the in-kind match requirement (if applicable). States may choose to submit a separate budget for each strategy or a total budget that indicates how the state plans to spend the grant on each selected activity (strategy). A budget narrative must accompany the budget.
 - **Additional considerations** (Required). How has the governor and key policy staff been engaged in NGA and NGA Center activities? To what extent is the state in good standing with NGA?

TOTAL POINTS—100

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Governors' offices must submit their proposal packages by 5:00 pm Eastern Daylight Time on Thursday, September 15, 2005. Paper or electronic submissions will be accepted. Applications should be submitted to:

Cardella Mingo
 National Governors Association Center for Best Practices
 444 North Capitol Street, Suite 267
 Washington, DC 20001-1512
 202/624-5313 (fax)
 cmingo@nga.org



Attachment A: Blueprint for an Action Agenda

To be eligible for a grant award, each state first must provide data and conduct a self-assessment related to the strategies outlined in the Action Agenda for Improving America's High Schools, the document produced by the NGA Center and Achieve, Inc. for the National Education Summit on High Schools. This blueprint guides states through an examination of the Action Agenda's five interconnected strategies. In each strategy, the governor or designated team leader, is asked to convene teams of key stakeholders (e.g., the governor, legislative leaders, statewide K-12 and higher education leaders, college presidents, employers, high school principals and teachers, youth development experts, and deans of education) to complete the Blueprint.

State responses to the Blueprint may be any length or format and should be submitted as Attachment A to their grant application.

BASELINE STATE DATA

Key stakeholders are asked to review the state's comparative data profile at http://www.2005summit.org/en_US/interactive/stateProfile_content.html. The state may cite relevant, state-specific data as it deems appropriate. Additional data the state may include could address:

- How many public high school options (e.g., public charter high schools) exist in the state? What percentage of the public school population do these schools serve? What is the demographic profile of students served by these high schools?
- How many students graduate with an industry-recognized credential or other work-ready certification?
- In what industries and occupations are jobs projected to grow in the state? What are the skill requirements of these jobs?

WHAT DOES THE ACTION AGENDA LOOK LIKE IN THE STATE?

The following sections describe key major strategies of the Action Agenda for Improving America's High Schools—restore the value of a high school diploma; redesign high schools; give students the excellent teachers and principals they need; set goals, measure progress, and hold high schools and colleges accountable; and streamline and improve education governance. *For each of the five major Action Agenda strategies, the state should describe:*

1. the current status of state policy, programs, or practices;
2. what the state plans to do to change or improve current policies, programs, or practices over the next ten years;
3. how the state will measure progress over a ten-year period; and
4. the challenges the state faces in implementing planned reforms.

States are encouraged to use the assessment that follows to help answer these four questions for each of the major strategies.

RESTORE THE VALUE OF A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

In every state today, students can meet the requirements for high school graduation and still be unprepared for success in college or the workplace. States need to re-examine their academic standards, curriculum requirements for graduation, and assessments to assure that the expectations of high school match the real world students will enter after graduation.

1. To what extent has the postsecondary education system (or institutions) defined “college ready” standards—the knowledge and skills necessary for entry and success in credit bearing college courses? To what extent has the state aligned high school standards with these college ready standards?
2. What types of assessments comprise the state’s current high school assessment system? Specifically, does your high school assessment system include: a) college-ready measures; b) high school graduation exams; c) end-of-course exams; d) diagnostic exams; e) culminating projects; and/or f) other exams for school accountability?
3. What courses are currently required for high school graduation in the state? To what extent does this requirement match the courses required of the postsecondary education system for admission? The ACT, the Center for State Scholars, or the American Diploma Project-recommended curriculum? How does the state address the quality and consistency of courses across the state? Does the state provide districts and schools with the flexibility to package content in different ways (e.g., Algebra I, Integrated Math I, etc.)?
4. Does the state’s career and technical/vocational pathways meet the standards for postsecondary study and/or meaningful career opportunities? Do students following this pathway obtain industry certifications?

REDESIGN HIGH SCHOOLS

High schools were designed to graduate approximately 1/3 of all students ready for postsecondary education. While there is no one-size-fits-all model for the high schools we need, states should support different high school design approaches that graduate all youth ready for further education, and empower students and their families to select the one that best addresses their interests. Particular attention needs to be paid to chronically low-performing high schools, where as many as 60 percent of students fail to graduate within four years.

1. How many high schools in the state have been identified as in need of improvement? What are the reasons for their being identified?
2. How does the state support these low-performing high schools? Does the state use any proven high school models when intervening in these schools? How well is this working?
3. Are there any high schools or programs in the state that are especially effective at graduating students prepared for college or that have long waiting lists? What are the characteristics of schools desired by students and their parents?



4. Does the state or any of its districts currently allow students to select the public high school they wish to attend? What types of high school options do students in the state currently have? How many students take advantage of these options? Are there high-quality alternatives for students that have dropped out, been adjudicated or are at-risk? Has the state assessed the demand and potential supply for additional high school options? What is the state doing to support the development and sustainability of local efforts to offer high quality and standards-based options to students who are dropping out or have dropped out?
5. How does the state provide college-level learning opportunities for high school students (e.g., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, early college high schools)? How pervasive are these opportunities for all students?
6. How does the state identify low-performing students? Are there any state programs designed to help these students meet the state's high school standards? If so, how are students targeted and supported? What evidence does the state have that these strategies are working?
7. Does the state require an individual learning plan for all high school students? For all low-performing students? If so, how well are these plans used by teachers, guidance counselors, youth-serving organizations and families?
8. Does the state provide literacy supports for low-performing students? If so, what is the process for screening students who perform below proficiency on literacy measures and providing research-based literacy intervention matched to the student needs?
9. How does the state reach students who are at risk of dropping out? How are the resources of other systems (workforce, etc.) and communities maximized to ensure struggling students are identified early and do not become lost in the system?
10. Does the state support specific programs and schools designed to meet the needs of highly at-risk students, including immigrants, those in foster care or the juvenile justice system and/or those that have had a significant interruption in their education?

GIVE STUDENTS THE EXCELLENT TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS THEY NEED

State and local education leaders must do a better job of recruiting and preparing outstanding teachers and principals and deploying them to the schools where they are most needed. Effective teachers and principals are critical to helping all students meet higher standards and leave high school ready for college and work.

1. Do the state's standards for teacher knowledge and skills reflect the higher level content knowledge and instructional strategies teachers need to help all students complete a college- and work-ready curriculum? How does the state know?
2. How do the state's teacher preparation programs use the teacher standards? How do they ensure the teachers they produce have acquired the needed knowledge and skills? How does the state hold programs accountable for the quality and supply of teachers they produce?

3. How does the state ensure professional development funds are used for effective professional development focused on deepening teacher content knowledge and content-based instructional strategies?
4. How is the state preparing new teachers and training veteran teachers to help high schools students who are struggling readers develop stronger literacy skills?
5. How does the state specifically help low-income, high-minority, low-performing (or hard-to-staff) schools recruit and retain effective teachers? How well are the incentives that are offered working and how does the state know?
6. How is the state addressing teacher retention? Has the state changed teacher compensation, provided high-quality new teacher induction, considered how to improve teacher working conditions—including improved leadership, use of time, ability to collaborate, assignment of extra duties, condition of facilities, availability of materials? If so, how well are these efforts working and how does the state know?
7. How has the state defined the knowledge and skills principals need to effectively lead high schools with higher expectations for all students? How does the state train and support new and veteran principals to be effective leaders of such high schools?
8. What policies or programs does the state have for recruiting and retaining principals, particularly for hard-to-staff high schools?
9. What authority does the state give principals to make building-level decisions about budget and personnel? And how, in turn, are principals held accountable and rewarded for performance?

SET GOALS, MEASURE PROGRESS, AND HOLD HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES ACCOUNTABLE

For high school transformation to occur, state leaders must set goals for improvement, measure progress, and hold high schools and postsecondary institutions accountable for student success. Goals should include a variety of indicators, including increased test scores, high school graduation rates, college preparedness, and college graduation rates. Tracking these indicators will likely require states to rethink the means by which they measure certain outcomes and upgrade systems for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data

1. How does the state define its high school graduation and dropout rates? What plans does the state have to improve this measure over time?
2. What are the state's goals for improving the performance of high schools and colleges and universities? Has the state set benchmarks for measuring progress toward these goals? If so, what are they? How does the state track progress on these benchmarks and adjust policies and programs to ensure success?
3. What are the capabilities of the state's data systems (e.g., to gauge effectiveness of high schools preparing students for college)? What is the status of developing individual student identifier, longitudinal data systems that can follow students over time? In what ways are the state's K–12 and higher education systems linked?

4. To what extent are data used to make decisions in the state, districts, schools, and colleges? How effectively are data analyzed by school personnel and state policymakers? How accessible is it to the public?
5. How does the state hold high schools accountable? What are the state's primary purposes for this accountability system (e.g., improve public information about performance)? How does this system of accountability include and coordinate school accountability with accountability for students and teachers? What indicators does the state use?
6. How does the state decide which schools can benefit from targeted, aggressive technical assistance? What are the consequences for schools that fail to improve on their own? How does the state decide which ones need to be reorganized or closed? How does the state work to provide or ensure the provision of effective technical assistance and educational interventions, including how the state works with districts, regional entities, and strategic partners?
7. Do postsecondary institutions share data on first-year college performance with sending high schools? How do the schools use these data? How does the state use these data for accountability purposes?
8. How does the state hold colleges and universities accountable for the college-readiness of public high school students? How well does the statewide accountability system influence the behavior of institutions?
9. How does the state hold postsecondary institutions accountable for student access, achievement, and attainment?

STREAMLINE AND IMPROVE EDUCATION GOVERNANCE

In almost every state, the K-12 and postsecondary education sectors are governed, financed, and operated independently and sometimes inefficiently, and they are often overseen by different boards or legislative committees. Further, oversight of higher education can be highly decentralized, making it very difficult to get institutions to convey uniform messages about college-readiness to students, parents, teachers, and administrators.

1. What are the defined roles of the state board of education, the state K-12 agency, and the state higher education agency? How is their leadership selected? How well does this work?
2. Does the state have a permanent, statewide P-16 council? Is its chair and membership representative of the key stakeholders who can move (or stop) policies that improve high school outcomes? What authority, financial resources, and staffing does it have? Is its mission clear and its progress publicly reported?
3. What authority does the statewide higher education governing or coordinating board have to coordinate institutional efforts for improving high schools, including the preparation of teachers?

OTHER

This section gives a state the opportunity to describe any related issues it may wish to assess and prioritize. The examples of other issues states may address are meant to be illustrative; any issue may be addressed in this section.

1. **Finance:** What is the state's per pupil expenditure for high school students? What percentage is provided by the state? How are resources allocated to districts and schools and to alternative high school models, including public charter high schools? How do cost-benefit analyses influence resource allocation decisions?
2. **Out-of-School Youth:** How many, and which, youth are dropping out at what point in their education? What is the state doing to ensure more full and accurate accounting of dropping out across districts and communities? What is the state doing to support the reconnection of dropouts to educational opportunities? Has the state reviewed and rationalized eligibility and reporting requirements and performance measures across the multiple agencies and systems that work with this population of youth (e.g. child welfare, TANF)? How are nontraditional educational routes supported (e.g. alternative pathways, including competency-based educational alternatives, referral and reenrollment options, better alignment of workforce development and education)?
3. **Community Engagement:** How does the state measure student and parent satisfaction with their high schools? How does the state provide information to students and parents about options for selecting high schools? How does the state ensure that all stakeholders have the opportunity to contribute ideas for improving high schools and increasing student achievement? How does the state communicate its expectations, goals, and proposed strategies to stakeholders? How does the state board and state education agency communicate expectations and goals and solicit ideas and feedback from local boards and districts?
4. **Career and Technical Education:** How many high school students are enrolled in career and technical education (CTE) programs and how does the composition of CTE students differ from the state's high school population as a whole? How many students complete their vocational programs, graduate, score proficient or above on state assessments? What steps has the state taken to raise academic performance for CTE students, modernize technical programs, and strengthen the connection between secondary CTE and postsecondary programs?

Attachment B: Budget Template

	PROJECT BUDGET			MATCHING				
	Activity One	Activity Two	Activity Three	TOTAL	Activity One	Activity Two	Activity Three	TOTAL
PERSONNEL								
Salaries	X	X	X	X				0
Fringe Benefits	X	X	X	X				0
Indirect Cost	X	X	X	X				0
(per approved rate)								
Total Personnel	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	0
CONSULTANT								
TRAVEL								0
MEETING EXPENSES								0
SUPPLIES								0
OTHER EXPENSES:								0
_____								0
_____								0
_____								0
TOTAL REQUEST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Attach a budget narrative detailing the items in each activity and cost
 All expenses must be consistent with state fiscal guidelines.
 Meals are not reimbursable unless the participants are on out-of-town travel status.

Attachment C: State Strategies for High School Improvement

The following descriptions provide information about the activities and outcomes expected of states that choose to take on specific state strategies to improve high school graduation and college readiness rates. Also included with the descriptions are questions states must answer in the *Describe the State's Two-Year Work Plan* section of the grant application. States should reference data and information included in the Blueprint as it relates to the specific strategies states propose to implement through these grants. States may choose to apply for grant funding to implement one or more of the following strategies. States may apply for multiple grants in a single application or submit separate applications for each strategy selected.

State Strategy	Estimated Number of Grants	Grant Amount	Match or Eligibility Requirements
Increase Course Rigor	3	\$140,000	\$40,000 Match Required
Expand Advanced Placement Participation	6	\$500,000	\$500,000 Match Required
Use Virtual Learning to Advance High School Improvement	4 – 8	\$50,000 to \$100,000	Eligible States: AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN
Turn Around Low-Performing High Schools	3	\$200,000	
Improve Teacher Knowledge and Skills and/or Recruitment and Retention	4	\$100,000	
Develop a Statewide Longitudinal K-16 Data System	2	\$150,000	States must have submitted an application for a federal Statewide Longitudinal Data System Grant
Streamline Education Governance	3	\$50,000	



INCREASE COURSE RIGOR

NUMBER OF GRANTS: 3

AMOUNT OF EACH GRANT: \$140,000

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: \$40,000 state match required. (See p. 3 for more details about match requirements)

DESCRIPTION: The selected three states will work with NGA and ACT on a district and school-level pilot project promoting high-level college-oriented content. Competitive states will commit to partnering with 2 districts within each state (one urban and one rural), and 3 high schools within each district to offer ACT's Model Course Syllabi for college preparatory courses (in English, mathematics, and science) in the sophomore year. Building on lessons learned from ACT's *On Course for Success* study, states will work in partnership with NGA and ACT to create the conditions for improved college readiness in high schools. Specifically, the partnership will:

- Evaluate the match between state high school standards, college placement standards, and ACT's Model Course Syllabi in English, mathematics, and science. ACT's syllabi are derived from data analyzed from over 69 high-performing, high-poverty and high minority classrooms that are producing students who are meeting and exceeding national college readiness standards. A full description of the ACT Course Rigor Evaluation Process ("audit") follows.
- Host a series of curriculum improvement and assessment workshops for teachers that focus on certifying course quality and improving instruction and develop an instructional resource bank for teachers containing sample instructional activities tied to the Model Course Syllabi.
- Host quarterly statewide meetings of gubernatorial and legislative staff and state-level K–12 and higher education leadership to discuss state policy implications of the audits (e.g., guidance and financial aid for students, professional development, teacher assignments, virtual coursework, regular audits of course quality). This statewide group will commit to delivering a report with recommendations to the governor and legislature at the conclusion of the grant period.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES: As a result of this work, expected outcomes include the following:

- More teachers will be able to use student assessment data and the professional development offered by ACT and NGA to revise the curriculum so that the courses are taught consistently and at an appropriate level of rigor across the schools involved in the project in that state.
- More students will be enrolled and successful in the college preparatory core curriculum in the participating schools.
- The state will demonstrate a commitment to expanding college preparatory course-taking statewide.
- Sophomores enrolled in the course across the participating schools will demonstrate improved proficiency in the three audited subjects, as measured through the ACT's periodic mid-course assessments; the mid-course assessments will also demonstrate a decrease in the proficiency gap between white and non-white students.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN *DESCRIBE THE STATE'S TWO-YEAR WORKPLAN*:

1. With which districts (one urban and one rural) will the state partner to offer ACT's Model Course Syllabi for college preparatory courses in at least three of their high schools? Describe why these districts have been selected (e.g., level of commitment, representativeness, numbers of participating students).
2. What will the state do to assure that the major public higher education system faculty has validated the college readiness standards in the college readiness assessments?
3. How can college readiness data be systematically used in high school accountability systems at the state, district, and school levels? How can the data be integrated into individual college-ready high school graduation plans?
4. How can assessment data about the college potential of disadvantaged students be shared with state and local early outreach and financial aid programs?

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS: ACT Course Rigor Evaluation Process (see pages 18 — 19)

ACT COURSE RIGOR EVALUATION PROCESS

The ACT Course Rigor Evaluation process provides educators an electronic tool to help them evaluate the rigor of their courses. High school teachers can select a course from among eleven different high school core courses and the web-based tool allows teachers to compare their course objectives for that course to a set of empirically based, rigorous course content standards that ACT has identified through its classroom based research in high-performing high schools. These course content standards have been validated by practicing secondary teachers from across the nation and comprise the ACT Model Core Course Syllabi. For additional information, see: <http://www.act.org/path/policy/reports/success.html>.

Through the web-based tool, teachers are asked to review an extensive set of course standards and asked if each standard represents knowledge and skills that are essential (students must be proficient in the knowledge and skills by the end of the course), optional (knowledge and skills may be taught to enrich the course but proficiency is not required), or not applicable (knowledge and skills are unimportant, inappropriate, or not taught in the course).

After teachers provide the information asked for in the web-based tool, they receive a summary report that contains the following information:

- Level of agreement among teachers in the same school/district on the course content standards (indicator of consistency/agreement within a school/district as to what is being taught in a specific course)
- Comparison of a school's/district's results with those from a national survey of teachers of the same course (indicator of how the school/district's course content compares with the content taught by other high-performing teachers nationally)
- List of the rigorous content standards not identified by the teachers of the same course in a school/district (indicator of rigorous course standards missing from a specific course)
- List of content standards that are taught/not taught that are necessary for college readiness (indicator of whether a particular course is covering the rigorous content needed for college readiness)
- Match of the teacher's course objectives to the (state) curriculum framework, thereby identifying which course objectives are reflected in state standards (indicator of coverage of state standards by a particular course)

After receiving the report, ACT and the NGA Center will conduct a staff development workshop wherein the teachers within the pilot schools will meet to review the reports and reach consensus on those content standards where practice and opinions differ. In this session, teachers will also be exposed to and discuss instructional strategies tied to the rigorous course standards and models of best practice that illustrate how the more challenging standards have been addressed in the classroom.

PROGRESS ASSESSMENTS

To help teachers gauge the progress of their students in meeting the rigorous core objectives, the participating school districts will be provided interim course assessments and end-of-course assessments based on the Model Course Syllabi. Teachers may use the interim course assessments to gauge unit-level progress, and the end-of-course assessments will be used to evaluate student progress throughout the courses. The participating schools will be asked to review and offer input into the assessment process and they will be provided student-level results through reports that will help them make targeted educational interventions with those students who may be having difficulty with course concepts. The assessment results will be reported according to course objectives to help maximize the value of the information to instruction.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Resources will be provided to support the improvement of these core courses in high schools and districts during the 2006-07 year, including professional development workshops for each course that will focus on critical college readiness skills, a resource bank containing effective instructional activities focused on these skills, and consultation focused on the vertical integration of the redesigned courses across grades 9-12.



EXPAND ADVANCED PLACEMENT PARTICIPATION

NUMBER OF GRANTS: 6

AMOUNT OF EACH GRANT: \$500,000

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: \$500,000 state match required (see page 3 for more details about match requirements)

DESCRIPTION: The selected six states, in partnership with the College Board and the NGA Center will work to improve disadvantaged students' access to, and success in, college-level Advanced Placement (AP) courses. The expectation is that states will pursue two activities simultaneously: 1) Development of a statewide AP expansion strategy that includes the implementation of programs and policies that increase student preparation for and success in AP courses—and that prepares many more teachers to teach AP; and 2) The implementation of an intensive AP expansion effort in one urban and one rural public school district, whereby a number of innovative AP expansion strategies can be field-tested and evaluated. The goal is to then use the lessons learned and experiences gained in the urban/rural districts to accelerate the AP expansion work across the state.

Competitive states will identify a partnering urban public school district, or one urban and one rural public school district, that will commit to add one to three new AP courses per high school in the 2006-07 academic year, as well as increase disadvantaged students' participation in existing AP courses and performance on related exams. The size of the district is not as significant as other factors, such as the level of commitment from the administration and faculty, a demonstrated willingness to have "open admission" to AP, a willingness to refine/revise the middle school and junior high curricula to reflect higher standards needed for success in AP, and a genuine commitment to equity as reflected by special support services for underrepresented students--such as tutoring, extra help sessions, mentors, etc.

Building on lessons learned from the successful statewide Florida Partnership and district-level AP partnerships in New Mexico, North Carolina, and Texas, the six states and their identified districts and high schools will work in partnership with the NGA Center and College Board to identify and enroll disadvantaged students in AP courses taught by qualified teachers. Through the NGA Center/College Board partnership, participating states will:

- Provide resources to add AP courses to select high schools and districts during the 2006-07 year, including the support of professional development (for administrators, teachers, and AP Program coordinators); classroom supplies; lab equipment; college-level textbooks; and support activities for students.
- Implement sequential professional development events—at minimum, a weeklong AP summer institute and a one-day fall workshop—for each AP subject area, supported through the grant funding.
- Implement a number of programs and strategies at the middle grades and junior high levels that increase the academic preparation of all students for enrollment and success in AP courses by the time they reach 10th, 11th and 12th grades.

- Participate in a learning laboratory for teams of policymakers and educators from the six states that will be co-hosted by the NGA Center and the College Board. The learning laboratory will help states and district leaders learn how to use the PSAT/NMSQT and AP Potential tools to identify at-risk students with the potential to succeed in AP coursework; use AP Instructional Planning Reports to help teachers address weaknesses in their curricula; conduct professional development institutes for AP faculty and pre-AP faculty; create a system of school, teacher, and student-level incentives for enrolling in AP courses, as well as for demonstrated proficiency on AP exams; and expand successful partnerships statewide.

The College Board can provide extensive guidance to states and districts as they work to expand AP participation. For example, the following link offers strategies to districts and schools that are attempting to start or significantly expand their AP programs:

<http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/program/0,,150-0-0-34482,00.html>

EXPECTED OUTCOMES: As a result of this work, expected outcomes include the following:

- Increases in AP course offerings by schools, increases in the number of students (particularly disadvantaged students) enrolled in AP courses, the number of students taking the AP exams, and the number of students scoring well on the exams.
- More teachers prepared to analyze and apply PSAT/NMSQT and AP results, offer AP and pre-AP courses and provide academic support to prepare at-risk students for college preparatory coursework in the schools involved in the project.
- A demonstrated a commitment to expanding state and district partnerships that increase college preparatory course-taking statewide.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN *DESCRIBE THE STATE'S TWO-YEAR WORKPLAN:*

1. With which districts will the state partner to offer one-to-three new AP courses per high school in the 2006-07 school year? How does the state propose to encourage and gauge commitment from the administration and faculty in these schools to offer more AP courses and establish an "open admission" policy? Describe why these districts have been selected (e.g., level of commitment, representativeness, numbers of participating students).
2. What will the state do to ensure that middle school and junior high curricula reflect higher standards needed for success in AP courses? What programs (e.g., academic support, professional development, financial incentives) will be offered in middle school and junior high schools as well as high schools to prepare and encourage more disadvantaged students to enroll in AP and pre-AP courses?
3. How can college readiness data be systematically used in high school accountability systems at the state, district, and school levels? How can the data be integrated into individual college-ready high school graduation plans?
4. How can assessment data about the college potential of disadvantaged students be shared with state and local early outreach and financial aid programs?



USE VIRTUAL LEARNING TO ADVANCE HIGH SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

NUMBER OF GRANTS: 4 - 8

GRANT RANGE: \$50,000 - \$100,000

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: Eligible States: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee

DESCRIPTION: Under this grant, states will elect to use virtual learning to meet goals defined in the *Action Agenda for Improving America's High Schools* or *Getting it Done: Ten Steps to an Action Agenda*. States may want to explore the creation or expansion of a statewide virtual high school as a means of expanding opportunities to more rigorous course offerings and/or advanced placement courses. The funded states will have to show a clear and convincing strategy for expanding the opportunity for virtual learning to low income and minority students.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES: Expected outcomes for states using virtual learning strategies may include:

- Establishment and/or increased participation in on-line college and work-readiness assessments;
- Increased opportunities for students to take virtual, college-preparatory or AP curriculum;
- Additional teachers trained to offer or support on-line rigorous coursework; and
- Increased number of students taking on-line rigorous courses.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN DESCRIBE THE STATE'S TWO-YEAR WORKPLAN:

(Answer only questions that apply to the state's plan to use technology for high school improvement.)

1. What will the state do to assure the availability of on-line courses is rigorous and aligned to college readiness expectations?
2. How will the state increase the number of virtual courses offered by highly qualified teachers in hard-to-staff schools?
3. How will the state target the neediest students when expanding access to virtual learning?
4. What standards will the state use to measure the quality of virtual courses, teachers and instruction?

TURN AROUND LOW-PERFORMING HIGH SCHOOLS

NUMBER OF GRANTS: 3

AMOUNT OF EACH GRANT: \$200,000

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: None

DESCRIPTION: These grants will support three states with strategies for identifying and prioritizing low-performing high schools and providing incentives, resources and assistance for them to improve. Across the nation, an increased focus on standards-based reform and school accountability has resulted in initiatives at the state and local levels to identify and improve the lowest performing schools. As part of this reform, state leaders have spearheaded initiatives to motivate improvement efforts, support low-performing schools, and build capacity for effective instruction. With the federal implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, states have faced even greater urgency to devise strategies to improve their weakest schools and offer other education options. Targets for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) embedded in this policy have highlighted gaps in achievement among groups of students and schools, and large numbers of high schools consistently failing to meet AYP targets are beginning to be identified for restructuring. Governors can pursue the following strategies to improve the performance of high schools failing to meet AYP targets:

- *Create a strategy for targeting the lowest-performing high schools.* Using the state's accountability system and fine tuned assessments of instructional programs and internal capacity, states can target and tailor assistance to the weakest capacity high schools.
- *Create a program for intensive support for low-performing high schools.* Evidence from leading states suggests that intensive support is critical to turning around low-performing schools. States, though, often need to partner with external providers and districts to adequately provide systemic strategies for instructional improvement and capacity-building.
- *Develop incentives to encourage highly qualified and effective teachers and principals to teach and lead in low-performing high schools.* Financial incentives and improved working conditions can keep more teachers in schools whose poor performance is often exacerbated by high teacher turnover. In addition, states can consider reforming their systems of licensure, preparation and professional development to build the capacity of these educators.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES: Expected outcomes for the strategies pursued under this grant include:

- Additional students and schools receiving intensive support matched to their needs;
- Established system to track performance of students receiving intensive support;
- Increased number of highly-qualified teachers in low-performing schools; and
- Establishment of a state training program that targets low-performing schools.



QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN *DESCRIBE THE STATE'S TWO-YEAR WORKPLAN*:

1. What professional development opportunities will the state provide to support struggling students (e.g., adolescent literacy instruction, proven high school improvement model)? What evidence exists that this professional development will lead to increases in student achievement?
2. What state policy changes might be required to identify and provide support to low-performing students? Who will provide this extra support to students and/or schools? How is this plan consistent with existing school improvement efforts?
3. What incentives will the state provide to attract and retain effective teachers to low-performing schools?

IMPROVE TEACHER KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS AND/OR RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

NUMBER OF GRANTS: 4

AMOUNT OF EACH GRANT: \$100,000

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: None

DESCRIPTION: To improve high school graduation rates and college and work readiness among graduates, high school teachers need content knowledge aligned with student standards and instructional strategies for helping all students meet higher standards. Further, students in low-performing, hard-to-staff schools need greater access to effective teachers. States must play a role in ensuring high school teachers have the knowledge and skills they need and in ensuring that all high schools can recruit and retain qualified, effective teachers for every classroom.

Strategies could include efforts to improve teacher preparation (through alternative or traditional routes), upgrade teacher professional development to address specific instructional needs, provide high school teachers with skills to help struggling adolescent readers, recruit qualified teachers to hard-to-staff high schools or subject areas, or better retain effective teachers in hard-to-staff high schools.

Preparation strategies might include creating a new program approval system to hold institutions that prepare teachers—traditional and alternative—accountable for the quantity and quality of the teachers they produce. Recruitment and retention strategies might include creating pilot programs to test new models of teacher pay, conducting a teacher working conditions survey and using the survey data to create and implement policies to improve working conditions, or ensuring quality induction programs for new teachers in hard-to-staff high schools.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES: Expected outcomes for states addressing high school teaching quality would be based upon the state's strategies and goals and may include the following:

- Development or expansion of effective teacher preparation programs that align with high school standards for students that promote college and work readiness;
- Additional teachers receiving training and professional development to deliver effective instruction (e.g., adolescent literacy instruction, extra-help curricula, assessment analysis, college preparatory curricula);
- Creation of new measures of teacher capacity and/or improvements in measures of teacher capacity and student learning; and/or
- Improved teacher recruitment and retention in low-performing, hard-to-staff high schools.



QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN *DESCRIBE THE STATE'S TWO-YEAR WORKPLAN*:

(Answer only questions that apply to the state's chosen approach to improve teacher knowledge and skills and/or recruitment and retention.)

1. How will the state's proposed activities improve teacher knowledge and skills aligned to college and work-ready standards and curricula for students and/or improve teacher recruitment and retention in hard-to-staff high schools?
2. How will the state work with teacher preparation institutions to ensure that their programs prepare teachers to deliver high quality instruction linked a college- and work ready-curriculum?
3. How will the state determine which teacher training, recruitment, and retention programs are most effective in attracting and retaining high quality teachers to hard-to-staff schools and content areas? What incentives will the state offer programs and teacher candidates?
4. How will the state offer teachers the professional development necessary to meet the needs of their struggling students? In what ways will the state identify student needs and prioritize professional development delivery?

DEVELOP A STATEWIDE LONGITUDINAL K-16 DATA SYSTEM

NUMBER OF GRANTS: 2

Amount of Each Grant: \$150,000

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: To be eligible, states must have applied for a federal Statewide Longitudinal Data System grant.

DESCRIPTION: These grants will support two states with well-conceived plans to build an integrated student data system across elementary, secondary and postsecondary education systems. Specifically, each selected state will build an individual student-unit, longitudinal data system that connects K–12 and postsecondary data systems, as recommended in strategy #4 of the National Governors Association’s Action Agenda for Improving America’s High Schools.

Objectives for this work include:

- ensuring technical quality of data and data systems to maximize the validity, reliability, and accessibility of statewide cross-sectional and longitudinal data;
- ensuring the interoperability of statewide data according to voluntary standards;
- promoting timely generation of accurate data for local, state, and federal reporting requirements;
- promoting linkages across states to allow sharing of historical data on individual students, especially when students move between states; and
- facilitating analysis and rigorous research to evaluate the effectiveness of programs to improve student learning and academic achievement, and close achievement gaps.

Selected states will participate in a learning lab in Florida. Florida’s statewide, longitudinal, K–16 data system is recognized as the nation’s strongest data system and can thus serve as a model for state study and adaptation. The lab will be open to all Phase One and Two-funded states.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES: Short-term outcomes for the two state grantees (the 2005-07 grant period) will include :

- a unique, permanent student identifier assigned by the state or through a process coordinated by the state;
- an enterprise-wide data architecture that includes a data model, data dictionary, business rules, and quality assurance procedures;
- procedures for protecting the security, confidentiality, and integrity of data, and for ensuring the accuracy and timeliness of data; and
- the vertical integration of local, institutional, and state data collections, including plans for requiring participation in the statewide data system and an electronic infrastructure to transfer large data files.



Long-term outcomes for the project (a 5-year period) include:

- a data warehouse or comparable means for managing and storing longitudinally linked data and making it accessible and useful to key stakeholders, especially K–12 and higher education faculty, administration, and governing boards;
- capacity to support research on student academic growth and retention;
- capacity to exchange data across institutions within the state and potentially among states; and
- capacity to support state policymaking based on evidence of cost-effective strategies for improving high school graduation, college readiness, and success rates, particularly for disadvantaged students.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN *DESCRIBE THE STATE'S TWO-YEAR WORKPLAN*:

1. What stakeholders has the state identified to develop standards for and a data system that meets the objectives listed above? How will the state manage the data system development process that will meet the needs of education and policy stakeholders across the P-16 education system?
2. How does the state plan to engage the commitment of institutions across the P-16 system to gather data necessary to develop the data system?
3. What questions should the data system be designed to answer (e.g., evaluate program effectiveness, student performance across the state education system)?

STREAMLINE EDUCATION GOVERNANCE

NUMBER OF GRANTS: 3

AMOUNT OF EACH GRANT: \$50,000

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS: None

DESCRIPTION: These grants will support three states that want to streamline education governance, as recommended in strategy #2 of Getting it Done: Ten Steps to an Action Agenda. Currently, statewide education governance is often fragmented. In almost every state, state boards and agencies for K–12 and postsecondary education operate independently and are not held accountable for common goals or education outcomes. Most states also lack a way to coordinate policies for high schools with those for public two- and four-year postsecondary institutions. Consequently, high school students, their parents, and educators receive conflicting and vague messages about what students need to know and be able to do to transition to the next education level. Governors can pursue three strategies to improve statewide education leadership and governance.

- *Create a single governance system for kindergarten (or early childhood) through postsecondary education.* A single education governance system with authority over the entire system can improve the coherence of policy development and implementation across and within all levels.
- *Create a permanent statewide education commission.* Political or cultural circumstances in a state may prevent consolidating education governance. However, governors can create a permanent commission that brings together educators, policymakers, and business leaders to develop common goals, performance benchmarks, and education policies for the state's entire education system.
- *Strengthen statewide governance or coordination of higher education.* In addition to creating a statewide education roundtable representing the different levels of education, governors can strengthen the state's capacity to coordinate the policies of individual colleges and universities with state-level governing or coordinating boards that have budgeting, policymaking, and data collection authority.

To support the states with plans to streamline education governance in one of these ways, the NGA Center will host a governance institute for funded states to learn from policymakers and educators in states that have at least one of these governance structures (e.g., California, Georgia, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, North Carolina). "Mentor states" will be invited based on the best match with the needs and interests of funded states.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES: Expected outcomes for this project include:

- Establishment of a P-16 system with common goals and benchmarks;
- Development of policies across secondary and post-secondary systems (e.g., common course numbering, college readiness assessment agreement); and



- Development of a data system or mechanism to share data (e.g., budget, student performance) across the P-16 education system.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN *DESCRIBE THE STATE'S TWO-YEAR WORKPLAN*:

1. What challenges currently exist to the state's ability to establish policy, share data and information across the P-16 education system and how will the proposed education governance structure address these challenges?
2. How will the proposed strategy lead to the development of policies that will raise high school graduation and college readiness rates (e.g., development of common course agreements, establishment of a single college readiness assessment)?
3. How does the state propose to engage the stakeholders necessary to establish a streamlined governance structure?