Appendices to

"State Policymaking under Executive Federalism: Obama's Race to the Top Initiative"

A   CODEBOOK FOR RTTT AND CONTROL POLICIES

To code the state applications, copies of each state's RttT application in each year for which it applied were downloaded from the DOE website in October 2013. Only the information contained in each state's application and associated appendices was used to complete coding (media reports, inter/intra state or state-federal communication, reviewer comments, or other documents available on the DOE website were not consulted). We coded only application requirements that were clearly defined and could be tracked objectively. For example, sections awarding points for the overall comprehensiveness of states' applications or the merits of states' specific application promises were not coded.

To code the state legislative histories, we started by using two general sources: the state's application (for many variables, states explicitly cited the state legislation that satisfied the variable requirements), or a secondary source such as a report written by an organization tracking states' progress on a specific policy over time (e.g., reports from the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, Center for Education Reform, Education Counts, etc.). Where necessary, media reports on state legislation were used to fill in gaps. Finally, we used the online state databases and the LexisNexis Academic database to confirm that the text of the legislation met the requirements for the variable definition and when the legislation was passed.

A.1   State Application Coding Values

For each state application, each variable was assigned a value of 1 if the application met the requirement(s) as stated and 0 otherwise. Each variable was coded for the past, meaning the policy described by the variable was already in place, as clearly stated in the application, as well as future, meaning the application makes a commitment to put the policy in place if the state has not yet done so. If a state already had a policy in place and made no mention of discontinuing it, it was automatically assigned a value of 1 for the future.

Plans were not judged on their quality or detail, other than whether they met the requirement as stated. For example, some plans sounded dubious, but if it was noted in the application that the plan or policy met the stated criteria, it was awarded a 1. The coders could not objectively judge whether the policies were likely to succeed in their intended missions. In addition, if states did not provide many details about a policy but the application stated that it met the criteria, we assumed the application to be honest and the variable was given a 1. However, if a state's application did provide details and the policy clearly did not meet the criteria, they were given a 0. We did not seek out and verify specific state statutes until the legislative history coding phase.

A.2 Legislative History Coding Values

Each variable was assigned a value of 1 if the policy was in place in the state by December 31st in a given year, and 0 if it was not in place in the state, was only in place in a limited form (such as a pilot program), or was in place in some areas (such as individual schools or districts) but not statewide.

For each variable, it was noted when the statute enacting the policy was passed ("statute date") and the date the policy went into effect ("effective date"). The latter was only applicable when the statute explicitly stated that the policy would go into effect in a year other than the year in which the statute was passed.

A.3 Application Breakdown

The application was broken down into the smallest component parts for which the application awarded points. Some subparts were assigned their own points, and sometimes points were specified for sections as a whole. For example, for requirement A3, subpart (i) and subpart (ii) were broken down into two different variables:

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps (30 points)
The extent to which the State has demonstrated its ability to –

(i) Make progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms (5 points)

(ii) Improve student outcomes overall and by student subgroup since at least 2003, and explain the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed to – (25 points)

  (a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA

  (b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA and

  (c) Increasing high school graduation rates.

However, the entirety of requirement B2 was coded as only one variable:

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (10 points)
The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State's participation in a consortium of States that –

(i) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) and

(ii) Includes a significant number of States.

In some cases, a requirement was broken down further than its point components, to better facilitate coding. For example, requirement D1 was broken into two variables – one to track parts (i) and (ii), because both have to do with routes to certification, and one to track part (iii), which is a separate policy issue. Yet it is important to note that RttT graders considered all parts together when awarding points, as indicated in the guidance:

(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 points)
The extent to which the State has –

(i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education

(ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use and

(iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

A.4   Codebook Key

The codebook that follows contains the following information:

Variable Name
Name of variable we used to track this application section for coding.

Application Section
The portion of the official RttT application that corresponds to this variable, in its original language.
Italicized text represents the portion of the section relevant for this variable's coding, if different from entire section (some sections were broken down into more than one variable; portions of some sections were not coded because they were too subjective or difficult to track).

Working Definition for Coding

Our translation of the official RttT language into more easily trackable parcels.

Notes

Any interpretations or changes made by researcher when completing the coding. Also, any aspects of the variable definition or coding rules that differ between state application coding and state legislative history coding.

Sources for Legislative Coding

The sources used to verify state policies for coding states' legislative histories.

A.5   Variable-Specific Coding Guidance

Application Category B: Standards and Assessments

1. **Variable Name**: standards_consortium

   Application Section

   (B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards (40 points)

   The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) –

   (i) *The State's participation in a consortium of States that – (20 points)*

      (a) *Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and*

      (b) *Includes a significant number of States;*

   (ii) (20 points)

      (a) For Phase 1 applications, the State's high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or

      (b) For Phase 2 applications, the State's adoption of a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the

State in a high-quality plan toward which the State has made significant progress, and its commitment to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way.

Working Definition for Coding

Is the state a member of a consortium of states (that is) working to develop common; college- and career-ready; internationally-benchmarked K-12 standards (three separate subparts)?

Notes

Due to difficulties in defining this objectively, group decided that the only acceptable consortium for a state to earn a 1 is the Common Core.

2. **Variable Name**: standards_adopt

   Application Section

   (B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards (40 points)

   The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) –

   (i) The State's participation in a consortium of States that – (20 points)

       (a) Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and

       (b) Includes a significant number of States;

   (ii) (20 points)

       (a) *For Phase 1 applications, the State's high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or*

       (b) *For Phase 2 applications, the State's adoption of a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State in a high-quality plan toward which the State has made significant progress, and its commitment to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way.*

   Phase 2 applicants addressing selection criterion (B)(1)(ii) may amend their June 1, 2010 application submission through August 2, 2010 by submitting evidence of adopting common standards after June 1, 2010.

Working Definition for Coding

Will the state have adopted common K-12 standards by 2010?

Notes

We define "consortium" to mean the Common Core, as that is the only active consortium to meet the standards put forth in the application at the time.

3. **Variable Name**: common_assessments

Application Section

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (10 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State's participation in a consortium of States that –

    (ii) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice); and

    (iiii) Includes a significant number of States.

Working Definition for Coding

Is the state a member of a consortium working to develop assessments aligned with a common set of K-12 standards?

Notes

Until 2010, we only count membership in ADP. From 2010 on, we only count membership in SMARTER and PARCC.

Application Category C: Data Systems to Support Instruction

4. **Variable Name**: long_data

Application Section

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points)

The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state have a longitudinal data system that meets the following requirements (from the America COMPETES Act):

1. A unique identifier for every student that does not permit a student to be individually identified (except as permitted by federal and state law);

2. The school enrollment history, demographic characteristics, and program participation record of every student;

3. Information on when a student enrolls, transfers, drops out, or graduates from a school;

4. Students scores on tests required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act;

5. Information on students who are not tested, by grade and subject;

6. Students scores on tests measuring whether they're ready for college;

7. A way to identify teachers and to match teachers to their students;

8. Information from students' transcripts, specifically courses taken and grades earned;

9. Data on students' success in college, including whether they enrolled in remedial courses;

10. Data on whether K-12 students are prepared to succeed in college;

11. A system of auditing data for quality, validity, and reliability; and

12. The ability to share data from preschool through postsecondary education data systems.

Notes

Variable not coded for legislative histories. For Race to the Top application coding, variable received a 1 if state had all twelve elements of America COMPETES Act and received a 0 otherwise. However, variables related to particular subsets of the America COMPETES Act were coded. Please see variables data1 and data8 below for further description.

5. **Variable Name**: data1

   Application Section

   (C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points)

   The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

   Working Definition for Coding

   Does the state have a longitudinal data system that includes a unique identifier for every student (except as permitted by federal and state law)?

   Notes

   This variable corresponds to the first element of the America COMPETES Act in state applications for

Race to the Top. States were given a 1 if they had a unique identifier for every student K-12, omitting higher education or workforce due to ambiguity in the application definition. In addition, those states that had only voluntary systems were coded as 0 in application coding. Finally, those states that did not yet have unique student identifiers but instead had unique teacher identifiers were coded as a 0 in application coding.

6. **Variable Name**: data8

   Application Section

   (C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points)

   The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

   Working Definition for Coding

   Does the state have a longitudinal data system that meets the following requirements (from the America COMPETES Act): A way to identify teachers and to match teachers to their students?

   Notes

   This variable corresponds to the eighth element of the America COMPETES Act in state applications for Race to the Top. To dispel any confusion, this is identical to element 7 as outlined under the Race to the Top variable guidance for the America COMPETES Act. For the sake of consistency we chose to use the numbering as used by states in their applications. This variable was coded for only K-12, omitting higher education and workforce.

7. **Variable Name**: data_instruction

   Application Section

   (C)(3) Using data to improve instruction (18 points)

   The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan to –

   (i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;

   (ii) Support participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development

to teachers, principals, and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and

(iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (e.g., students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).

Working Definition for Coding Will the state make data from instructional improvement systems AND statewide longitudinal data systems available to researchers? (see GLOSSARY for specific definition of "instructional improvement system").

Notes

Variable not coded for legislative histories.

Application Category D: Great Teachers and Leaders

8. **Variable Name**: pathways_routes

   Application Section

   (D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 points)

   The extent to which the State has –

   (i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;

   (ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and

   (iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

   Working Definition for Coding Does the state legally allows and currently use alternative routes to teacher certification?

   Notes

   In the Race to the Top guidance, alternative routes to certification are defined as having five criteria:

   a. Can be provided by various types of qualified providers, including both institutions of higher education and other providers operating independently from institutions of higher education;

b. Are selective in accepting candidates;

c. Provide supervised, school-based experiences and ongoing support such as effective mentoring and coaching;

d. Significantly limit the amount of coursework required or have options to test out of courses; and

e. Upon completion, award the same level of certification that traditional preparation programs award upon completion.

States were inconsistent in whether they addressed the above criteria in the applications. If they addressed them, we assessed whether they met the criteria (some states said that they did not meet the criteria). If the state said they had alternative routes and did not address the criteria, then they were assumed to meet them and received a 1.

For the purposes of state legislative history coding, this variable has been split into three of the five criteria for alternative pathways under RttT. The other too were too hard to interpret objectively.

pathways_1.1 – Diversity of Providers: Whether the state allows programs that are not part of an institution of higher education.

pathways_1.2 – Selective: Received a 1 if the state has a GPA threshold for ALL alternative pathways.

pathways_1.3 – Mentoring and Coaching: Whether the state requires mentoring for ALL alternative pathways.

9. **Variable Name**: pathways_monitor

   Application Section

   (D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 points)

   The extent to which the State has –

   (i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;

   (ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and

   (iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

   Working Definition for Coding

   Does the state have a process for identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and preparing teachers and principals to fill those areas?

Notes

Variable not coded for legislative histories.

10. **Variable Name**: measure_growth

    Application Section

    (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

    The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

    (i) *Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)*

    (ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

    (iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

    (iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)

       (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, instruction support, and/or professional development;

       (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

       (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

       (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

    Working Definition for Coding

    Does the state have a system to measure student growth (defined as changes in student achievement between two or more points in time) for each individual student?

Notes

Rather than looking for a commitment by a state to use a specific type of system to measure student growth (i.e., value-added, vertical scale model, student percentile model), assessed whether a state had a clear and defined system or plan in place to measure student growth as defined in the RttT Glossary.

11. **Variable Name**: eval_system1

    Application Section

    (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)
    The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

    (i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

    (ii) *Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor,* and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

    (iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

    (iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)

        (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

        (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

        (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

        (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

Working Definition for Coding

Does the application outline an educator evaluation system to use multiple (three or more) rating categories to differentiate effectiveness for teachers AND principals?

Notes

Defined "multiple rating categories" as 3 or more for the coding of this variable. Rating systems with only dichotomous scales of educator effectiveness such as "effective" and "ineffective" were coded as a 0.

In RttT applications, nearly zero states mentioned whether they had a previous rating system unless the system already had multiple (3+) measures of effectiveness. In addition, from RttT literature and NCTQ reports there appears to be a significant push to have rating systems that are informative about teacher effectiveness, which requires more than a simple binary effectiveness scale.

Note that part b was not included in this variable.

12. **Variable Name**: eval_system2

    Application Section

    (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)
    The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

    (i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

    (ii) *Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)*

    (iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

    (iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)

        (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

(c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

(d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

Working Definition for Coding

Does the application outline an educator evaluation system that takes into account student growth data for teachers AND principals?

Notes

As long as a state explicitly required teacher and principal evaluations to include student growth data, this variable was coded as a 1. A commitment by states to use student growth data to inform teacher or principal evaluations did not factor into the coding of this variable.

13. **Variable Name**: annual_evals1

    Application Section

    (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

    The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

    (i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

    (ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

    (iii) *Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)*

    (iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)

(a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

(c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

(d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state conduct annual evaluations of teachers AND principals?

Notes

The application must specifically state that evaluations will occur annually for both groups of teachers and principals. States that allowed exceptions for high performing teachers and principals (i.e., evaluated only every other year if rated "highly effective") or states that only evaluated non-veteran teachers annually were coded as 0 for this variable.

14. **Variable Name**: use_evals1

    Application Section

    (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

    The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

    (i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

    (ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

    (iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth

for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

(iv) *Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)*

    (a) *Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;*

    (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

    (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

    (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

Working Definition for Coding

Are annual evaluations used to make decisions on professional development/support for teachers and principals?

Notes

Evaluations must be explicitly used to inform professional development or support of teachers and principals.

15. **Variable Name**: use_evals2

Application Section

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

  (i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

  (ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

(iv) *Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)*

    (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

    (b) *Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;*

    (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

    (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

Working Definition for Coding

Are annual evaluations used to make decisions on compensation for teacher and principals?

Notes

This variable originally read: "Are annual evaluations used to make decisions on compensation, promotion and retention of teacher and principals?" For legislative tracking, promotion and retention were eliminated due difficulty finding reliable resources. Instead, states were evaluated on whether they had pay-for-performance programs or other compensation systems that were informed by teacher and principal evaluation systems.

16. **Variable Name**: use_evals3

Application Section

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

(iv) *Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)*

   (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

   (b) *Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;*

   (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

   (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

Working Definition for Coding

Are annual evaluations used to make decisions on providing opportunities for highly effective teachers to gain additional responsibilities?

Notes

"Additional responsibilities" was defined narrowly: whether highly effective teachers were given roles as mentor teachers, master teachers or consulting teachers.

17. **Variable Name**: use_evals4

   Application Section

   (D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

   The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

(iv) *Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)*

    (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

    (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

    (c) *Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and*

    (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

Working Definition for Coding

Are annual evaluations used to make tenure decisions for teachers?

Notes

If a state removed tenure or did not previously allow tenure for teachers, the variable was assigned a value of 1. Infrequently, states used different terminology for tenure (i.e., probationary or non-probationary teachers); such cases were evaluated individually. Principal tenure was ignored, as most states did not have existing or proposed tenure systems for principals.

18. **Variable Name**: use_evals5

Application Section

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice),

has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

(iv) *Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)*

    (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

    (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

    (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

    (d) *Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.*

Working Definition for Coding

Are annual evaluations used to make decisions on removal of ineffective teachers and principals?

Notes

States were evaluated based on whether evaluations were used to remove ineffective educators, not on having a policy in place that allowed teachers or principals to be terminated.

19. **Variable Name**: use_evals6

Application Section

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) –

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 points)

(iv) *Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding – (28 points)*

(a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

(c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

(d) *Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.*

Working Definition for Coding

Are annual evaluations used to make decisions on removal only after ample opportunity to improve?

Notes

This variable was coded for legislative histories only. States were assessed on whether they provided instructional improvement plans informed by evaluations for teachers and principals that are rated as consistently low performing or ineffective before removal is considered.

20. **Variable Name**: equitable_dist

Application Section

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to –

(i) *Ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice)* and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students; (15 points)

(ii) Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA. (10 points)

Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state have a plan to ensure that students in high-poverty schools have equitable access to highly-effective teachers AND principals? And does the state have a plan to ensure students in high-minority schools have equitable access to highly-effective teachers AND principals?

Notes

Application must mention that teachers are effective. Plan can be targeted to high-minority OR high-poverty schools. Simply recruiting new teachers with high credentials was not sufficient. Simply tracking teachers effectiveness was not sufficient; states needed a concrete plan to address distribution. Variable not coded for legislative histories.

21. **Variable Name**: target_placement

    Application Section

    (D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 points)

    The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to –

(i) Ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students; (15 points)

(ii) *Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA. (10 points)*

Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state have a plan to increase both the number of effective teachers in STEM areas, special education, language instruction, and other areas as defined by the state?

Notes

Applications were not required to satisfy the percentage component, as it became difficult for coders to determine how a plan that only mentioned numbers would affect the percentage of effective teachers when it was not explicitly discussed. See Glossary for definition of "effective teachers." Variable not coded for legislative histories.

22. **Variable Name**: prep_program

    Application Section

    (D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)

    The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to
    –

    (i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

    (ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state have a plan to link student achievement data AND student growth data to individual teachers? ... and to link that information to the teachers' credentialing program?... and to publicly report that data for each credentialing program in the state? And does the state have a plan to expand the most effective credentialing programs?

Notes

State must not only show linkages between these programs, but demonstrate that it is using those data linkages to make decisions about which programs to expand.

This variable was split into four parts for the purposes of legislative coding: prep_1 – Does the state link student achievement data and student growth data to individual teachers?
prep_2 – Does the state link student achievement and growth data to the teachers' credentialing program?
prep_3 – Does the state publicly report that data for each credentialing program in the state?
prep_4 – Does the state have a plan to expand the most effective credentialing programs?

These variables are not independent – that is, if a state does not link achievement data and student growth data to individual teachers and principals, then it cannot satisfy the other three. Or, if a state does not link the information to credentialing programs, it cannot satisfy the other two.

23. **Variable Name**: prof_dev

Application Section

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals (20 points)
The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to –

(i) *Provide effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded.* Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high-need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes; and

(ii) *Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to im-*

prove student achievement (as defined in this notice).

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state have a policy to provide professional development AND coaching AND induction AND collaboration/planning time for teachers AND principals that is data-informed? Does the state have a plan to provide data-informed collaboration time for teachers and principals? And does the state have a strategy to measure and improve the above plans?

Notes

State must meet all four criteria for teachers, but must mention providing only professional development and coaching for principals. Variable not coded for legislative histories.

Application Category E: Turning Around Lowest-Achieving Schools

24. **Variable Name**: lowachieve_intervene

    Application Section

    (E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 points)

    The extent to which the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

    Working Definition for Coding

    Does the state have the authority to intervene directly in the lowest-achieving schools? And does the state have the authority to intervene in LEAs that are in either "improvement" or "corrective action" status?

    Notes

    The definition of "persistently low achieving" includes "improvement or corrective action status", so if a state's application only mentioned the authority to intervene in LEAs and schools that are persistently low achieving, then the state was assigned a 1. It was not necessary to say explicitly that the state can intervene in LEAs that are in "improvement and corrective action status."

    The application had to mention the ability to intervene in both LEAs and schools, specifically "persistently low achieving" schools and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

    States discussing "persistently lowest-achieving schools" had to note that their definition was either the same as or inclusive of the RttT definition, or say nothing but use the precise term. If they had their own definition and did not mention that it was more expansive than the RttT definition, it was not

counted, as it was too time-consuming for coders to read through states' unique definitions to assess whether they matched RttT's.

"Intervene" was understood to mean compelling schools to enact changes in the spirit of a turnaround model. For legislative history coding, the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" was simplified to mean either being among the lowest 5 percent schools in improvement or corrective status as defined by AYP or having a high school graduation rate lower than 60 percent. The ability to intervene in schools that are in need of improvement satisfied the definition, as persistently lowest-achieving schools are a subset of those schools. Similarly, the ability to intervene after two years of failing to meet AYP met the criteria.

25. **Variable Name**: turnaround

Application Section

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools (40 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to –

(i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; (5 points)

(ii) *Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). (35 points)*

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state have a plan to turn around its lowest-achieving schools using one of the four sanctioned intervention models?

Notes

The described turnaround plan must meet the substantive criteria of one of the four Obama models, even if it is not explicitly named (Turnaround, Transformation, Restart, Closure). And to receive credit, application needed to use the words turnaround, transformation, closure, and restart. Variable not coded for legislative histories.

Application Category F: General (55 points)

26. **Variable Name**: edfundingpriority_rev

    Application Section

    (F)(1) Making education funding a priority (10 points)

    The extent to which –

    (i) *The percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008; and*

    (ii) The State's policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.

    Working Definition for Coding

    Did the state reduce the percentage of state revenue that was used to fund public education from FY 2008 to FY 2009? (If so, variable was coded as 0.)

    Notes

    Variable not coded for legislative histories.

27. **Variable Name**: edfundingpriority_equit

    Application Section

    (F)(1) Making education funding a priority (10 points)

    The extent to which –

    (i) The percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008; and

    (ii) *The State's policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.*

    Working Definition for Coding

    For application coding: Does the application give proof that the state funding formula takes into

account high-need LEAs AND high-need schools within LEAs in its funding distribution?

For legislative history coding: Does the state funding formula take into account high-need LEAs AND high-need schools within LEAs in its funding distribution?

Notes

Applications had to explicitly mention school and LEA-level funding distributions to receive credit; equal per-pupil funding was not sufficient, as it does not necessarily imply equal funding across LEAs and within them as the prompt demands.

For legislative history coding, we used a measure of school finance inequity as a percentage of total spending for the years 2008 to 2012 from a database from the New America Foundation. This variable was defined as follows: "School finance inequity reflects the average percentage difference in per-pupil spending among school districts across a given state according to a definition contained in Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act. The per-pupil expenditure for every school district is compared to the average per-pupil expenditure for the state and weighted according to size and poverty level."

28. **Variable Name**: innovativeschools_number

    Application Section

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

    The extent to which –

    (i) *The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;*

    (ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

    (iii) The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

(iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

(v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state have a charter school law that does not prohibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools?

Notes

A strict interpretation of a charter cap was applied: states with a cap of any kind, even one that was unlikely to be reached, received a value of 0. Wisconsin, for instance, caps the number of charters authorized by UW-Parkside, and this was coded as 0. States that had any limit on charter school enrollment were also coded as 0. If a state did not have a cap in place, but a small number of its school districts did (e.g. Nevada (3), Pennsylvania(1)), this was coded as 1. If the state had no charter law, it was coded as 0.

29. **Variable Name**: innovativeschools_auth

    Application Section

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

    The extent to which –

     (i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;

     (ii) *The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor,*

among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student popula-
tions that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students
(as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

(iii) The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

(iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

(v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state have laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines requiring that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in renewal?

30. **Variable Name**: innovativeschools_equit

Application Section

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools (40 points)
The extent to which –

(i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;

(ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

(iii) *The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;*

(iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

(v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

Working Definition for Coding

Do charter schools receive a funding amount equitable to that of public schools, and equitable shares of local/state/federal revenue streams?

Notes

States needed to explicitly state that funding was fully equitable (100% equal). If they did not specify this, variable was coded as 0. Variable not coded for legislative histories.

31. **Variable Name**: innovativeschools_build

Application Section

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

The extent to which –

(i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;

(ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

(iii) The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

(iv) *The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports;* and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

(v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

Working Definition for Coding

Does the state provide charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports?

Notes

The following actions did not qualify under this definition: giving charter schools authority to issue bonds (tax-exempt or otherwise); giving schools the right of first refusal (if they must still rent or otherwise pay to use the facilities); publishing a list of vacant buildings each year that charters could use; requiring districts to lease available public buildings to charter schools at fair market value; and providing funding for facilities maintenance but not acquisition or building. If the state had no charter law, the variable was coded as 0. If a state's charter school law satisfied the definition but was subject to annual appropriations, the variable was still coded as 1; thus, in two states (Alaska and Maine), the law satisfied the definition but was not followed in practice.

The final part of the application prompt – "and does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools" – was ignored, as few states addressed this issue and data was hard to find.

32. **Variable Name**: innovative_schools

   Application Section

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

   The extent to which –

   (i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the

number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;

(ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

(iii) The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

(iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

(v) *The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.*

Working Definition for Coding

Are LEAs allowed to operate autonomous public schools other than charter schools?

Notes

Variable not coded for legislative histories.

Competitive Preference Priority

33. **Variable Name**: stem

Application Section

Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority – Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). (15 points, all or nothing)

To meet this priority, the State's application must have a high-quality plan to address the need to (i) offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering; (ii) cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other STEM-capable community

partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students; and (iii) prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Working Definition for Coding Are STEM courses being offered? Is there a policy in place to coordinate between schools and industry experts? And is there a policy to reach out to underrepresented groups in STEM?

Notes

Variable not coded for legislative histories.

Variables Coded Only In Legislative Histories

34. **Control Policy 1**

    Variable Name: testing_exitexam

    Working Definition for Coding

    Is there an exam in place that students must pass in order to graduate from high school?

    Notes

    States received a 1 if they have if they had a high school exit exam in place or end of course exams which students were required to pass to graduate. The exam had to have consequences for graduation; being required to take the test was not enough, though exemptions for students with disabilities were allowed.

35. **Control Policy 2**

    Variable Name: testing_3rdgrade

    Working Definition for Coding

    Is there an exam in place that students must pass in order to leave third grade?

36. **Control Policy 3**

    Variable Name: taxcredit2

    Working Definition for Coding

    Does the state allow tax credits for companies and/or individuals who donate to nonprofit organizations that provide private school scholarships?

A.6 Sources for Legislative History Coding

Alabama Withdraws from Both Testing Consortia. Education Week. (2013). Retrieved at: http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/curriculum/2013/02/alabama_withdraws_from_both_te.html.

Alaska leaves Common Core consortium. The Free Patriot. (2014). Retrieved at: http://freepatriot.org/2014/01/15/alaska-leaves-common-core-consortia/.

Charter School Funding: Inequity Persists. Individual State Profiles. Ball State University. Retrieved at: http://cms.bsu.edu/academics/collegesanddepartments/teachers/schools/charter/charterfunding.

Consortium watch: Kansas drops out of SMARTER Balanced testing group. Education Week. (2013). Retrieved at: http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/curriculum/2013/12/consortium_watch_kansas_drops_.html.

Georgia the latest state to back out of K-12 PARCC tests. NPR. (2013). Retrieved at: http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=205548324.

How Common Core disintegrated in Indiana. (2014). Retrieved at: http://www.indystar.com/story/news/education/2014/03/29/common-core-disintegrated-indiana/7051891/.

K-3 Reading Proficiency and Early Literacy. National Conference of State Legislatures 3 Feb. 2014.

Missouri voted in favor of the Common Core Standards. (2010). Retrieved at: http://www.examiner.com/article/missouri-voted-favor-of-the-common-core-standards.

Nebraska educators await moment of truth on Common Core. (2013). Retrieved from: http://www.omaha.com/article/20130804/NEWS/130809587.

Oklahoma to opt out of PARCC Common Core tests. Education Week. (2013). Retrieved at: http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/curriculum/2013/07/oklahoma_to_quit_common-core_testing_consortium.html.

Pence pulls Indiana out of PARCC. Truth in American Education. (2013). Retrieved at: http://truthinamericaneducation.com/common-core-assessments/pence-pulls-indiana-out-of-parcc/.

Race to the Top Assessment Program: Application for New Grants. (2010). Retrieved at: http://www.edweek.org/media/sbac_final_narrative_20100620_4pm.pdf.

State High School Exit Exams: A Challenging Year. Center on Education Policy. Washington, DC (2006).

State Profiles for Exit Exam Policies Through 2011-2012. Center for Education Policy. Retrieved from http://www.cep-dc.org/page.cfm?FloatingPageID=79.

Utah withdraws from Smarter Balanced assessment consortium developing Common Core tests. Huffington Post. (2012). Retrieved at: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/07/utah-withdraws-from-smart_n_1752261.html.

Achieve: American Diploma Project. Achieve's ADP Assessment Consortium Shows Value of States Working Together to Prepare Students for Success.

Achieve: American Diploma Project. ADP Assessments.

Achieve: American Diploma Project. Algebra I & II End-of-Course Exams. 2008.

Achieve: American Diploma Project. Algebra II End-of-Course Exam Fact Sheet. 2009. Retrieved at: http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/policyoperations/adpfactsheet.pdf.

Achieve: American Diploma Project. American Diploma Project Defines What High School Graduates Need To Know, Says Many Fall Short. (2010). Retrieved at: http://www.achieve.org/american-diploma-project.

Batdorff, M., Maloney, L., May, J., Doyle, D., & Hassel, B. (2010). Charter school funding: Inequity persists. Ball State University. Muncie, IN (2010).

Center on Great Teachers & Leaders Database (AIR). Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies. (2013). Retreived from: http://resource.tqsource.org/stateevaldb/.

Center on Great Teachers & Leaders Database (AIR). Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies. (2013). Retrieved from: http://resource.tqsource.org/stateevaldb/.

Chudowsky, N., Kober, N., Gayler, K. and Hamilton, M. State High School Exit Exams: A Baseline Report. Center on Education Policy. Washington, DC (2002).

Common Core State Standards Initiative. Standards in your State. (2014). Retrieved at: http://www.corestandards.org/standards-in-your-state/#alaska.

Consoletti, Alison. Charter school laws across the states, 12th edition. Center for Education Reform, Washington, DC (2011).

Consoletti, Alison. Charter school laws across the states. Center for Education Reform, Washington, DC (2012).

Cunningham, Josh. Charter School Facilities. National Conference on State Legislatures. Washington, DC (2011). Retrieved at: http://www.ncsl.org/documents/educ/CharterSchoolFacilities.pdf.

Dietz, S., et al. State High School Tests: Exit Exams and Other Assessments. Center on Education Policy. Washington, DC (2010).

Education Commission of the States (ECS) State Policy Database, retrieved March 19, 2014.

Education Commission of the States. Retrieved at: http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/mbquestU?SID=a0i70000000XkHm&rep=CS24&Q=Q2224.

Education Commission of the States. Retrieved at: http://mb2.ecs.org/reports/report.aspx?id=88.

Education Counts database from Education Week. Retrieved at: http://www.edweek.org/rc/2007/06/07/edcounts.html?intc=intst. Found variable tracking exit exams under graduation, under exit exams.

Florida Department of Education. Governor Rick Scott Announces Path Forward for High Education Standards & Decision to Withdraw from PARCC. 2013. Retrieved at: http://www.flgov.com/2013/09/23/

governor-rick-scott-announces-path-forward-for-high-education-standards-decision-to-withdraw-from-parcc/.

Kuhn, Jennifer. Assessing California's Charter Schools. California Legislative Analyst's Office, Sacramento, CA (2004). Retrieved at: http://www.lao.ca.gov/2004/charter_schools/012004_charter_schools.htm.

LegiScan: Bring People to the Process. LegiScan. (2013). Retrieved at: http://legiscan.com/.

McIntosh, S., et al. State High School Exit Exams: A Policy in Transition. Center on Education Policy. Washington, DC (2012).

Mead, Sara. Recent State Action on Teacher Effectiveness: What's in State Laws and Regulations? Bellwether Education Partners. (2012). Retrieved at: http://bellwethereducation.org/sites/default/files/legacy/2012/08/RSA-Teacher-Effectiveness.pdf.

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. How State Charter Laws Rank Against The New Model Public Charter School Law. Washington, DC (2010). Retrieved at: http://www.publiccharters.org/publications/state-charter-laws-rank-model-public-charter-school-law/.

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Measuring Up to the Model: A Ranking of State Charter School Laws. Washington, DC (2010). Retrieved at: http://www.publiccharters.org/publications/measuring-model-ranking-state-charter-school-laws-2/.

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Measuring Up to the Model: A Ranking of State Charter School Laws. Washington, DC (2012). Retrieved at http://www.publiccharters.org/publications/measuring-model-ranking-state-charter-school-laws-2012/.

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Measuring Up to the Model: A Ranking of State Charter School Laws. Washington, DC (2013). Retrieved at http://www.publiccharters.org/publications/measuring-model-ranking-state-charter-school-laws/.

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Measuring Up to the Model: A Ranking of State Charter School Laws. Washington, DC (2014). Retrieved at: http://www.publiccharters.org/publications/state-ranking-2014/.

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Measuring Up to the Model: A Tool for Comparing State Charter School Laws. Washington, DC (2014). Retrieved at: http://www.publiccharters.org/get-the-facts/law-database/.

National Conference of State Legislators. School Choice: Scholarship Tax Credits. (2014). Retrieved at: http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/school-choice-scholarship-tax-credits.aspx100.

National Council on Teacher Quality. 2007 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: National Summary. (2008). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2007_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. 2008 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: What States Can Do to Retain Effective New Teachers - National Summary. (2009). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/

2008_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_National_Summary_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. 2009 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: National Summary. (2010). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2009_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_National_Summary_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. 2009 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: National Summary. (2010). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2009_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_National_Summary_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. 2010 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: Blueprint for Change – National Summary. (2011). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2010_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_National_Summary_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. 2010 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: Blueprint for Change – National Summary. (2011). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2010_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_National_Summary_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. 2011 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: National Summary. (2012). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2011_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_National_Summary_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. 2012 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: Improving Teacher Preparation – National Summary. (2013). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2012_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_National_Summary_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. 2013 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: National Summary. (2014). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/2013_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_National_Summary_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. State of the States 2012: Teacher Effectiveness Policies. (2012). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/State_of_the_States_2013_Using_Teacher_Evaluations_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. State of the States 2013: Connect the Dots: Using evaluations of teacher effectiveness to inform policy and practice. (2013). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/State_of_the_States_2012_Teacher_Effectiveness_Policies_NCTQ_Report.

National Council on Teacher Quality. State of the States: Trends and Early Lessons on Teacher Evaluation and Effectiveness Policies. (2011). Retrieved at: http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/State_of_the_States_Teacher_Evaluation_and_Effectiveness_Policies_NCTQ_Report.

National Governors Association (NGA). Forty-Nine States and Territories Join Common Core Standards Initiative. (2009). Retrieved at: http://www.nga.org/cms/home/news-room/news-releases/page_2009/col2-

content/main-content-list/title_forty-nine-states-and-territories-join-common-core-standards-initiative.html.

New America Foundation. Federal Education Budget Project. (2014) Retrieved at: http://febp.newamerica. net/k12/.

onecle: Law and Legal Research. onecle. (2013). Retrieved at: http://law.onecle.com/.

Open State: Discover Politics in Your State. Open States. (2013). Retrieved at: http://openstates.org/.

PARCC Proposal for RttT funds: http://www.fldoe.org/parcc/pdf/apprtcasc.pdf.

Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers: New Mexico. (2014). Retrieved at: http://www.parcconline.org/new-mexico.

Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers. About Us. (2014). Retrieved at: http://www.parcconline.org/about-parcc.

Rose, Stephanie. Third Grade Reading Policies. Education Commission of the States, 2012. Web. 11 Mar. 2012.

Rotherman, Andrew. Smart Charter School Caps. Education Sector, Washington, DC (2007). Retrieved at: http://www.educationsector.org/sites/default/files/publications/Appendix.pdf.

SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium: Member States. (2014). Retrieved at: http://www.smarterbalanced. org/about/member-states/.

South Carolina State Department of Education. South Carolina joins other states in adopting Common Core math, reading standards. (2010). Retrieved at: http://ed.sc.gov/news/more.cfm?articleID=1600.

Sullivan, P., Yeager, M., Chudowsky, N., Kober, N., O'Brien, E., and Gayler, K. States Try Harder But Gaps Persist: High School Exit Exams 2005. Center on Education Policy. Washington, DC (2005).

Virginia Department of Education. Board of Education reaffirms support for SOLs; Opposes imposition of national standards. (2010). Retrieved at: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/news/news_releases/2010/jun24. shtml.

Workman, Emily. 2013 Legislative Session – P-3 Policies. Education Commission of the States, 2013. Web. 11 Mar. 2014.

Zhang, Y. State High School Exit Exams: Trends in Test Programs, Alternative Pathways, and Pass Rates. Center on Education Policy. Washington, DC (2009).

B ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table B1. Effects of Prior Policy Implementation and Future Commitments on Application Score.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Prior implementation of policy	7.288***	5.431**	7.084***	7.172***	6.482***	7.607***	
	(1.092)	(2.561)	(0.892)	(0.981)	(1.256)	(1.178)	
Future commitment to policy	0.411	5.829***	0.156	0.203	0.075		2.198***
	(0.453)	(1.442)	(0.308)	(0.371)	(0.504)		(0.544)
Constant	69.220***	70.928***	69.521***	66.624***	73.300***	69.619***	72.036***
	(3.092)	(18.423)	(2.463)	(2.741)	(3.340)	(2.876)	(2.892)
R^2	0.076	0.721	0.071	0.069	0.065	0.076	0.020
N	658	47	1078	574	504	658	658

Notes: Unit of analysis is policy by state in an application round (1 or 2). Standard errors are clustered by state. The results are from a linear regression model where the dependent variable is the score awarded to a state by RttT application judges and the independent variables are the sum of binary indicators for policies within a section that a state has already implemented in the past, as well as the sum of binary indicators for policies within a section that the state has committed to implementing in the future. Policies are aggregated to the level at which the application was scored (e.g. B1). Column 1 reports results with scores aggregated at the subsection level, where the dependent variable is percentage of the maximum score a state could have earned on that section. Column 2 reports results from aggregating to the entire application level, where the dependent variable is the total points earned by a state on only coded sections and the independent variables are sums of binary indicators for policies previously implemented and future commitments across the entire application. In columns 1-2, observations are selected from the last round (of 1 and 2) in which a state applied. Column 3 reports results with scores aggregated at the subsection level as in Column 1, with observations pooled from Phases 1 and 2. Columns 4-5 repeat this analysis with only observations from phases 1 and 2, respectively. Columns 6 and 7 repeat the analysis in Column 1 (taking the observation from the last round in which a state applied, aggregated at the section level), estimating effects of past implementation and future commitment separately.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B2. RttT Policy Mentions in State-of-the-State Speeches among Winners and Losers.

	(1a) RttT Policies	(1b) Control Policies	(2a) RttT Policies	(2b) Control Policies	(3a) RttT Policies	(3b) Control Policies	(4a) RttT Policies	(4b) Control Policies
Won RttT (up to time t)	3.508**	0.086	3.508**	0.086	-1.357	-8.574***	0.761	5.675
	(1.315)	(2.166)	(1.318)	(2.171)	(3.029)	(1.858)	(13.776)	(9.931)
Applied and lost RttT (up to time t)	4.156***	1.400	4.156***	1.400	1.920***	-6.985***	4.090	7.336
	(1.190)	(2.140)	(1.193)	(2.145)	(0.447)	(0.470)	(13.186)	(9.899)
State education revenue per capita							3.534	11.826
							(10.600)	(11.137)
Democratic governor							2.486	-1.378
							(1.731)	(1.696)
Democratic majority, both chambers							-0.968	-0.748
							(1.749)	(1.283)
Right to work state							-1.000	-3.255**
							(1.444)	(1.606)
Constant	1.569	3.805*	-4.205**	3.669	-5.038***	6.899***	-12.431	-17.596
	(1.261)	(1.952)	(1.631)	(2.595)	(1.392)	(1.700)	(21.788)	(23.193)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Policy fixed effects	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.003	0.007	0.116	0.030	0.142	0.104	0.143	0.106
N	4232	1472	4232	1472	4232	1472	4232	1472

Notes: Per capita state revenue is in thousands of dollars. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B3. Linking Words Devoted to RttT Policies in State-of-the-State Speeches to Application Promises, 2010-14.

	(1)	(2)
Won RttT (up to time t)	-3.434	-3.528
	(2.623)	(2.595)
Promise * won	-0.862	-0.876
	(0.954)	(0.953)
Promise * applied and lost	-0.816	-0.828
	(1.082)	(1.081)
State education revenue per capita		4.913
		(14.686)
Democratic governor		3.343*
		(1.909)
Democratic majority, both chambers		-1.050
		(1.662)
Right to work state		-1.217
		(1.662)
Constant	-3.817**	-6.141
	(1.706)	(12.275)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes
Policy fixed effects	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.144	0.146
N	3979	3979

Notes: Per capita state revenue is in thousands of dollars. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.10$.

Table B4. Average Treatment Effect on the Treated, Gubernatorial Speeches Exact Matching on Year and Policy, Nearest Neighbor Matching on Section Score.

Comparison 1: 2010-11, treated observations include Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations include all others

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	0.020 (0.058)	0.022 (0.075)	-0.008 (0.093)
N	760	478	394

Comparison 2: 2012-13, treated observations include Phase 3 winners and untreated observations include applicants that never won

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	-0.105 (0.080)	-0.039 (0.076)	-0.086 (0.117)
N	456	340	278

Comparison 3: 2012-13, treated observations include Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations include all others (including Phase 3 winners)

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	-0.024 (0.048)	-0.031 (0.061)	-0.042 (0.056)
N	760	488	396

Notes: Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B5. RttT Policy Enactment among Winners and Losers, 2002-2008.

	(1a) RttT Policies	(1b) Control Policies	(2a) RttT Policies	(2b) Control Policies	(3a) RttT Policies	(3b) Control Policies	(4a) RttT Policies	(4b) Control Policies
Eventual RttT winners	0.072***	0.154	0.076***	0.155	0.054***	0.679***	-0.002	-0.314***
	(0.025)	(0.107)	(0.025)	(0.107)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.013)	(0.031)
Eventual RttT losers	0.013	-0.015	0.016	-0.015	0.086***	0.029***	-0.053	-0.338***
	(0.022)	(0.089)	(0.023)	(0.089)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.034)	(0.012)
State education revenue per capita							-0.004	-0.041
							(0.034)	(0.037)
Democratic governor							0.007	-0.011
							(0.009)	(0.009)
Democratic majority, both chambers							-0.021*	-0.012
							(0.012)	(0.031)
Constant	-0.005	0.142	-0.018	0.011	-0.009	0.182***	-0.005	0.237***
	(0.020)	(0.085)	(0.034)	(0.085)	(0.030)	(0.035)	(0.054)	(0.059)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Policy fixed effects	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.041	0.040	0.284	0.250	0.323	0.505	0.323	0.506
N	6339	1048	6339	1048	6339	1048	6339	1048

Notes: Per capita state revenue is in thousands of dollars. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

46

Table B6. RttT Policy Enactment among Winners and Losers, Logit Specification.

	(1a) RttT Policies	(1b) Control Policies	(2a) RttT Policies	(2b) Control Policies	(3a) RttT Policies	(3b) Control Policies	(4a) RttT Policies	(4b) Control Policies
Won RttT (up to time t)	1.790***	1.437**	2.602***	1.561**	1.196***	0.197	1.604**	-0.719
	(0.155)	(0.686)	(0.244)	(0.735)	(0.288)	(0.378)	(0.768)	(1.493)
Applied and lost RttT (up to time t)	0.916***	0.715	1.362***	0.766	1.451***	-0.128***	1.851***	-0.894
	(0.150)	(0.663)	(0.237)	(0.710)	(0.084)	(0.020)	(0.631)	(1.497)
State education revenue per capita							0.636	-1.097
							(1.041)	(1.587)
Democratic governor							-0.067	-0.744**
							(0.215)	(0.369)
Democratic majority, both chambers							0.263	0.323
							(0.194)	(0.351)
Constant	-0.486***	-1.259**	-1.538***	-2.248***	-1.240***	-1.866***	-2.633	0.474
	(0.115)	(0.620)	(0.347)	(0.690)	(0.335)	(0.580)	(2.318)	(3.377)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Policy fixed effects	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pseudo R^2	0.069	0.037	0.282	0.115	0.373	0.294	0.373	0.300
N	4762	689	4512	689	4512	430	4512	430

Notes: Per capita state revenue is in thousands of dollars. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.10$.

Table B7. Linking RttT Policy Enactments to Application Promises, Logit Specification.

	(1)	(2)
Won RttT (up to time t)	-0.346	-0.340
	(0.496)	(0.480)
Promise * won	1.407***	1.416***
	(0.376)	(0.375)
Promise * applied and lost	1.249***	1.260***
	(0.247)	(0.249)
State education revenue per capita		0.503
		(1.475)
Democratic governor		-0.103
		(0.252)
Democratic majority, both chambers		0.323
		(0.215)
Constant	-0.386	-1.149
	(0.356)	(2.333)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes
Policy fixed effects	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.401	0.401
N	4154	4154

Notes: Per capita state revenue is in thousands of dollars. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B8. Mean Difference between Treated Observations and Matched Controls
Exact Matching on Year and Policy Domain, Nearest Neighbor Matching on Section Score.

Comparison 1: 2010-11, treated observations are Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations are all others

	Full data	Cal=0.1 SD	Cal=0.05 SD
Section score (% of possible points)	2.897***	0.393	0.038
Past policy achievement (from application)	0.060*	0.063	0.061
Past policy achievement (from legislative history, 2008)	0.030	0.057*	0.077**
Average policy achievement on non-RttT policies in same year (from legislative history)	0.115***	0.137***	0.142***
N	936	672	652

Comparison 2: 2012-13, treated observations are Phase 3 winners and untreated observations are applicants that never won

	Full data	Cal=0.1 SD	Cal=0.05 SD
Section score (% of possible points)	1.043	0.164	-0.027
Past policy achievement (from application)	0.023	0.051	0.074*
Past policy achievement (from legislative history, 2008)	0.018	0.041	0.023
Average policy achievement on non-RttT policies in same year (from legislative history)	0.004	0.022	0.060**
N	776	632	598

Comparison 3: 2012-13, treated observations are Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations are all others (including Phase 3 winners)

	Full data	Cal=0.1 SD	Cal=0.05 SD
Section score (% of possible points)	3.092***	0.378	0.172
Past policy achievement (from application)	0.049*	0.018	0.039
Past policy achievement (from legislative history, 2008)	0.028	0.042	0.039
Average policy achievement on non-RttT policies in same year (from legislative history)	0.118***	0.153***	0.158***
N	1302	914	882

Notes: Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B9. Average Treatment Effect on the Treated
Exact Matching on Year and Policy Domain, Nearest Neighbor Matching on DOE's
Assessment of Likelihood of RttT Adoption (Section A2i).

Comparison 1: 2010-11, treated observations include Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations include all others

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	0.145*** (0.032)	0.200*** (0.055)	0.212*** (0.055)
N	936	320	320

Notes: Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B10. Mean Difference between Treated Observations and Matched Controls
Exact Matching on Year and Policy, Nearest Neighbor Matching on Section Score.

Comparison 1: 2010-11, treated observations are Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations are all others

	Full data	Cal=0.1 SD	Cal=0.05 SD
Section score (% of possible points)	3.791***	0.439	0.074
Past policy achievement (from application)	0.043	0.040	0.023
Past policy achievement (from legislative history, 2008)	0.021	0.047	0.038
Average policy achievement on non-RttT policies in same year (from legislative history)	0.097***	0.136***	0.089***
N	936	594	532

Comparison 2: 2012-13, treated observations are Phase 3 winners and untreated observations are applicants that never won

	Full data	Cal=0.1 SD	Cal=0.05 SD
Section score (% of possible points)	2.579**	0.161	-0.108
Past policy achievement (from application)	0.054	0.102**	0.095**
Past policy achievement (from legislative history, 2008)	0.023	0.024	0.039
Average policy achievement on non-RttT policies in same year (from legislative history)	-0.019	-0.040	-0.014
N	776	510	462

Comparison 3: 2012-13, treated observations are Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations are all others (including Phase 3 winners)

	Full data	Cal=0.1 SD	Cal=0.05 SD
Section score (% of possible points)	3.968***	0.358	0.220
Past policy achievement (from application)	0.051*	0.034	0.025
Past policy achievement (from legislative history, 2008)	0.031	0.074**	0.044
Average policy achievement on non-RttT policies in same year (from legislative history)	0.112***	0.162***	0.147***
N	1302	814	730

Notes: Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B11. Average Treatment Effect on the Treated
Exact Matching on Year and Policy, Nearest Neighbor Matching on Section Score.

Comparison 1: 2010-11, treated observations include Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations include all others

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	0.109***	0.125***	0.075*
	(0.032)	(0.039)	(0.041)
N	936	594	532

Comparison 2: 2012-13, treated observations include Phase 3 winners and untreated observations include applicants that never won

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	0.206***	0.192***	0.212***
	(0.034)	(0.039)	(0.040)
N	776	510	462

Comparison 3: 2012-13, treated observations include Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations include all others (including Phase 3 winners)

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	0.132***	0.096***	0.068**
	(0.025)	(0.030)	(0.031)
N	1302	814	730

Notes: Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B12. Mean Difference between Treated Observations and Matched Controls Exact Matching on Year and Policy, Nearest Neighbor Matching on All Listed Covariates.

Comparison 1: 2010-11, treated observations are Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations are all others

	Full data	Cal=0.1 SD	Cal=0.05 SD
Section score (% of possible points)	3.518***	2.074**	1.316
Past policy achievement (from application)	0.092***	0.112***	0.108***
Past policy achievement (from legislative history, 2008)	0.000	0.018	0.032
Average policy achievement on non-RttT policies in same year (from legislative history)	0.031	-0.037	-0.020
N	936	676	632

Comparison 2: 2012-13, treated observations are Phase 3 winners and untreated observations are applicants that never won

	Full data	Cal=0.1 SD	Cal=0.05 SD
Section score (% of possible points)	1.467	0.281	0.622
Past policy achievement (from application)	0.046	0.032	0.043
Past policy achievement (from legislative history, 2008)	0.021	0.023	0.022
Average policy achievement on non-RttT policies in same year (from legislative history)	-0.026	0.002	-0.028
N	776	620	556

Comparison 3: 2012-13, treated observations are Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations are all others (including Phase 3 winners)

	Full data	Cal=0.1 SD	Cal=0.05 SD
Section score (% of possible points)	3.678***	1.993**	1.317
Past policy achievement (from application)	0.092***	0.131***	0.141***
Past policy achievement (from legislative history, 2008)	0.031	0.032	0.036
Average policy achievement on non-RttT policies in same year (from legislative history)	0.025	-0.028	-0.007
N	1302	950	836

Notes: Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B13. Average Treatment Effect on the Treated
Exact Matching on Year and Policy, Nearest Neighbor Matching on All Listed Covariates.

Comparison 1: 2010-11, treated observations include Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations include all others

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	0.115*** (0.032)	0.107*** (0.037)	0.111*** (0.039)
N	936	676	632

Comparison 2: 2012-13, treated observations include Phase 3 winners and untreated observations include applicants that never won

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	0.121*** (0.033)	0.161*** (0.037)	0.108*** (0.039)
N	776	620	556

Comparison 3: 2012-13, treated observations include Phase 1 and 2 winners and untreated observations include all others (including Phase 3 winners)

	(1) Full data	(2) Cal=0.1 SD	(3) Cal=0.05 SD
ATT	0.132*** (0.025)	0.103*** (0.029)	0.081*** (0.031)
N	1302	950	836

Notes: Standard errors are clustered at the state level.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B14. Effect of Adoption of Same Policy Type in Proximate States.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Won RttT (up to time t)	0.312***	0.333***	0.304***	0.333***
	(0.040)	(0.047)	(0.051)	(0.051)
Applied and lost RttT (up to time t)	0.183***	0.203***	0.172***	0.200***
	(0.038)	(0.043)	(0.048)	(0.047)
Same policy in similar states	0.158***	0.158***		
	(0.015)	(0.015)		
Same policy in neighboring states			0.063***	0.064***
			(0.017)	(0.017)
State education revenue per capita		0.019		0.027
		(0.019)		(0.021)
Democratic governor		0.005		0.005
		(0.016)		(0.016)
Democratic majority, both chambers		-0.005		-0.007
		(0.019)		(0.020)
Constant	0.159***	0.123**	0.104*	0.053
	(0.039)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.066)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Policy fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.464	0.464	0.451	0.451
N	12101	12101	12101	12101

Notes: Same policy in similar and neighboring states and state education revenue variables are standardized, so that the interpretation of their coefficients is the change in the outcome associated with a one standard deviation increase in the explanatory variable. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.10$.

Table B15. Effect of Adoption of Same Policy in Similar States, Alternative Similarity Models.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Won RttT (up to time t)	0.336***	0.336***	0.334***
	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.049)
Applied and lost RttT (up to time t)	0.211***	0.211***	0.209***
	(0.045)	(0.045)	(0.045)
Same policy in similar states, model 2	0.257***		
	(0.013)		
Same policy in similar states, model 3		0.257***	
		(0.013)	
Same policy in similar states, model 4			0.259***
			(0.013)
State education revenue per capita	0.018	0.019	0.019
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Democratic governor	0.005	0.005	0.004
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)
Democratic majority, both chambers	-0.006	-0.006	-0.005
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Constant	0.164***	0.162***	0.162***
	(0.052)	(0.052)	(0.053)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Policy fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.521	0.520	0.520
N	12101	12101	12101

Notes: Model 2 replicates the main analysis, using an alternative similarity model that substitutes total state expenditure for education expenditure to account for the possibility that funds are fungible. Model 3 replaces overall state expenditure with overall expenditure net of education. Model 4 replaces it with a host of per-pupil spending variables (including spending on instructional wages and benefits and administrative expenditures) as a more fine-grained measure of states' education budgets. Same policy in similar states and state education revenue variables are standardized, so that the interpretation of their coefficients is the change in the outcome associated with a one standard deviation increase in the explanatory variable. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B16. Effect of Adoption of Same Policy in Similar States, by Period and Winning/Losing.

	(1)	(2)
Won RttT (up to time t)	0.105	0.139*
	(0.077)	(0.080)
Applied and lost RttT (up to time t)	-0.011	0.022
	(0.070)	(0.072)
Same policy in similar states, non-applicants, after RttT announced	0.038***	0.037***
	(0.013)	(0.013)
Same policy in similar states, winners, pre-RttT	0.071***	0.071***
	(0.008)	(0.008)
Same policy in similar states, winners, during RttT	0.089***	0.089***
	(0.007)	(0.007)
Same policy in similar states, winners, after RttT	0.151***	0.152***
	(0.012)	(0.012)
Same policy in similar states, losers, pre-RttT	0.072***	0.073***
	(0.007)	(0.007)
Same policy in similar states, losers, during RttT	0.118***	0.118***
	(0.009)	(0.009)
Same policy in similar states, losers, after RttT	0.169***	0.170***
	(0.014)	(0.013)
State education revenue per capita		0.034*
		(0.018)
Democratic governor		0.003
		(0.016)
Democratic majority, both chambers		-0.004
		(0.019)
Constant	0.254***	0.190***
	(0.037)	(0.053)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes
Policy fixed effects	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.518	0.518
N	12101	12101

Notes: Same policy in similar states and state education revenue variables are standardized, so that the interpretation of their coefficients is the change in the outcome associated with a one standard deviation increase in the explanatory variable. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table B17. Effect of Adoption of Same Policy in Neighboring States, by Period and Winning/Losing.

	(1)	(2)
Won RttT (up to time t)	0.198***	0.236***
	(0.069)	(0.066)
Applied and lost RttT (up to time t)	0.052	0.088
	(0.062)	(0.059)
Same policy in similar states, non-applicants, after RttT announced	0.018*	0.019**
	(0.010)	(0.009)
Same policy in neighboring states, winners, pre-RttT	0.055***	0.055***
	(0.012)	(0.012)
Same policy in neighboring states, winners, during RttT	0.052***	0.052***
	(0.007)	(0.007)
Same policy in neighboring states, winners, after RttT	0.084***	0.084***
	(0.014)	(0.014)
Same policy in neighboring states, losers, pre-RttT	0.047***	0.047***
	(0.007)	(0.007)
Same policy in neighboring states, losers, during RttT	0.068***	0.068***
	(0.010)	(0.010)
Same policy in neighboring states, losers, after RttT	0.101***	0.102***
	(0.015)	(0.015)
State education revenue per capita		0.032
		(0.020)
Democratic governor		0.004
		(0.016)
Democratic majority, both chambers		0.001
		(0.022)
Constant	0.147***	0.087
	(0.041)	(0.058)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes
Policy fixed effects	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.491	0.491
N	12101	12101

Notes: Same policy in neighboring states and state education revenue variables are standardized, so that the interpretation of their coefficients is the change in the outcome associated with a one standard deviation increase in the explanatory variable. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.10$.

C   CODEBOOK FOR STATE OF THE STATE SPEECHES

In order to track the discourse surrounding certain education policies, we gathered governors' State of the State speeches from 2001 to 2013. We coded the speeches for overall education-related word count, word count specific to Race to the Top policies, and details about individual mentions of a number of different education-related policies, including both RttP topics and a number of control topics. To keep track of coding, we created "criteria variables" and "general variables." Criteria variables track what kinds of policies are mentioned whether they are in line with stated RttP objectives, as well as a word count. General variables track characteristics like the date the speech was given, the name of the governor and his political party, the state's education budget in that year, and other objective information.

C.1   Description of Data

We coded 581 State of the State addresses (also known as State of the District, State of the Commonwealth, Budget Address, and Condition of the State) from 2001 to 2013, as well as several Inaugural Addresses when tagged as State of the State speeches by Pewstates.

Speeches were acquired from the Pew Charitable Trust's Pewstates database, available at http://www.pewstates.org/, except for Washington, DC speeches, which were instead acquired from DCWatch (dcwatch.com). Both of these sources noted the governor who gave the speech and the date it was given. Governor parties and term dates were checked on Wikipedia. Governors were coded as first term governors for the first speech given in their term; in instances where we are missing a speech in the year the governor was elected, we do not code the following year's speech as a first year speech. In some states, gubernatorial elections are held every other year; all such states only happened to elect new governors in a speech year during our time range, so this was not an issue.

Missing states are noted by name in section C.3.2 below and include any states not in the Pewstates or DCWatch databases, as well as two occasions in which Pewstates listed the same speech for two different years; in those instances (Kansas 2006/2007 and Pennsylvania 2008/2009) we coded the speech for the earlier of the two years listed. In addition to the missing speeches, a selection of speeches were given only in part; we coded these normally.

Missing speeches receive a coding of "." for all speech-dependent variables. Mentions which do not have an observation in a given speech receive the coding 0, 2, 2, and 0 for _m, _al, _sp, and _wc respectively.

C.2 Criteria Variables

To begin, we created eight broad categories as a way to organize the various education topics mentioned in speeches; these categories align with the criteria outlined in the RttT applications, plus one category for control topics. Within each category, we identified more specific topics, again in alignment with criteria outlined in the RttT applications. These more specific criteria, then, were given variables names and tracked in each of the speeches. A more detailed explanation of how the variables were named is in the following section.

C.2.1 Categories

Great Teachers and Leaders

Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (gtl_perform)

We coded mentions of linking student achievement to teachers, creating and implementing evaluations of teachers based on student performance, evaluating teachers and providing them with regular feedback, and using teacher evaluations to inform compensation and retention (including merit pay and performance based tenure). In addition to merit pay based on reaching a baseline, we include competitive merit pay systems, e.g. systems in which the top 10 percent of teachers receive a bonus.

Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (gtl_equit)

Mentions in this category include ensuring all areas have a fair share of high-performing and highly-qualified teachers and principals, as well as plans to increase the number of highly-qualified and high-performing teachers in underserved areas and hard-to-staff subjects, including scholarships, student loan forgiveness, and incentives.

Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (gtl_path)

Mentions here include support and funding for alternate routes to teacher certification, including programs like TFA. Also included here are plans and policies to anticipate and prepare for teacher or principal shortages.

Providing effective support to teachers and principals (gtl_support)

Here we coded support and funding for professional development and mentoring programs for teachers.

Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation program (gtl_prep)

This category would include tracking student achievement by teacher, then linking that data to teacher

preparation programs and using it to evaluate which programs are effective; no governor in our sample makes mention of this topic.

State Success Factors

Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it (ssf_lea)

As this category largely addresses a state's application rather than enumerated policy preferences, coding of this criterion were limited to a single mention (Illinois 2010) which referenced the number of LEAs which had signed on in support of the RttT application.

Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans (ssf_impl)

This category would include mentions of how a state has laid plans for implementing proposed plans; there are no mentions of this in our sample; it is by nature largely linked to RttT applications rather than an ongoing topic.

Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps (ssf_raise)

We coded all instances of mentions of average increases and decreases in gaps between subpopulations in test scores and graduation rates. This category is one of those in which we take past action, rather than future plans, into account, due to its focus on demonstrating progress. Because of the annual nature of SotS addresses, we coded only mentions of changes in the past year; reference to changes farther back were passed over. Specificity was indicated for speeches that referenced actual scores, percent increases, or relative place in the nation (i.e. "we are now the 12th highest scoring state"). We also coded mentions of test scores dropping, remaining stagnant, or gaps growing with alignment=0.

We counted student performance on national as well as state evaluations, graduation rates, dropout rates, and literacy assessments. We did not count any increases limited to a specific district, set of districts, or programs.

Standards and Assessments

Developing and adopting common standards (sa_adopt)

This mention includes any explicit mention of the Common Core, as well as mentions under the guise of "core national benchmarks" or similar; this would also include any standards adopted by a coalition of states, but no coalition other than Common Core is mentioned in our sample. We coded specificity if a specific timeline for implementation was given. We coded alignment as 0 in instances where a governor mentioned the Common Core, but urged adopting individual state standards in lieu of adopting Common Core.

Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments (sa_trans)

This category would include plans for implementation of Common Core standards.

Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (sa_impl)

This category would include any mentions of working in a consortium of states to develop high quality standards.

General Selection Criteria

Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charters and other innovative schools (gsc_charter)

We code here any policy or legislation which improves the climate for charter schools, such as increasing (or removing) caps on charter schools, streamlining the application process, and ensuring equitable funding for charter schools. We include general support for additional charter schools with the state. The mention is coded as specific, among other cases, if specific legislation is mentioned, as well as if the exact amount by which a cap is to be increased is indicated; plans to remove a cap altogether are also coded as specific. This category is coded for "other innovative schools" in response to new nontraditional or innovative schools; we excluded career academies, military schools, and other existing non-traditional school types.

Making education funding a priority (gsc_funding)

We coded all mentions of funding for education overall; alignment is coded as 1 when explicitly mentioning an increase in funding or commitment to continuing the same level of funding, and 0 when funding is decreased. Alignment is also coded as 1 for mentions of protecting the education budgets from cuts elsewhere in the budget; these mentions are coded a specificity of 1 when the exact amount of the cut that would otherwise have occurred is cited. Otherwise specificity is coded as 1 when exact budgets or changes to budgets were mentioned. Only broad funding is coded here funding for specific programs, for higher education only, or for early education only are not coded here, only "education" overall, or "K12" or similar variant. This category also includes ensuring equitable funding across schools; we code granting higher funding to high-poverty districts and schools as an alignment of 1. As with most mentions, we code only upcoming plans, rather than history mentions of "this year's budget" are almost always in reference to the budget being presented for the upcoming year, and are coded.

Demonstrating other significant reform conditions (gsc_reform)

This category is very broad, including almost any education-related policy; the examples given in the appli-

cation's Executive Summary are primarily covered under other topics we code for. Because SotS speeches, unlike RttT applications, include mentions of all education topics, not just those that are relevant, we have left this category uncoded.

Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools

Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (low_inter)

Mentions here include those of direct state interventions in failing schools. Specificity is coded as 1 when a particular plan of intervention is indicated, or a specific threshold for intervention is set.

Turning around the lowest-achieving schools (low_turn)

Mentions here include identifying low-achieving schools and implementing a model to increase achievement; low_turn includes provision of funding or help in increasing achievement, while low_inter is focused on instances in which the state takes direct control of the school.

Data Systems to Support Instruction

Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (data_long)

Mentions here include creation of a system for longitudinally tracking student data, including all levels of standardized testing.

Using data to improve instruction (data_improve)

Mentions in this category include making longitudinal data available to teachers for use in improving instruction, as well as tying student performance to the evaluation of instructional approaches.

Accessing and using State data (data_access)

This category includes mentions of making tracking data available to parents, teachers, and other school personnel; it differs from data_improve in that it does not require a specific plan to use the data.

Competitive Priority and Invitational Priorities

Competitive Preference Priority – Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) (ip_stem)

We code here all mentions of increased funding for STEM education and programs, as well as increasing the required number of credits in STEM fields.

Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (ip_early)

This category includes funding for and availability of early education programs, excluding programs that focus solely on literacy, as well as initiatives that focus solely on transition between kindergarten or preschool and higher levels of education. (these are cx_read and ip_p20, respectively). Early education is defined as up to third grade. Daycare and childcare are not included here. Specificity of 1 is coded, among other scenarios, when a plan to increase available spots or coverage in an early education is given.

Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (ip_data)

This category would include mentions of increasing the amount of information tracked in data systems; no governors in our sample are specific enough in their coverage of data tracking to be coded here.

Invitational Priority – P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment (ip_p20)

This category includes coordination between various levels of schools, higher education, and the workforce, through alignment of objectives and education requirements. We include programs such as AP and JAG, as well as programs which offer high school students the opportunity to take classes at colleges but not including joint degree ("early college high school") programs. We also include mentions of making career information available to K12 students.

Invitational Priority – School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning
(ip_schlevel)

We code here mentions of granting higher levels of autonomy to schools and LEAs in fields such as funding distribution and length of school day and year.

Controls

Teacher salary (cx_pay)

We code here mentions of increasing teacher pay across the board, rather than merit pay or incentives. We include one time salary bonuses as well as permanent increases; we also include increases to the minimum starting salary for teachers.

Distance and online learning programs (cx_dist)

This category includes all virtual instruction programs, such as online high schools and college courses offered remotely to high school students.

School construction and renovation (cx_con)

We coded here all mentions of funding and programs for school repair and construction, as well as funding new or additional buses.

Reading and literacy programs (cx_read)

This category includes all mentions of literacy and reading programs.

Foreign language programs (cx_lang)

This category includes mentions of funding or programs for foreign language instruction and immersion learning; we do not include ESL programs.

Exit exams (cx_exit)

We code here support or implementation for exit exams from high school.

Increased length of school day or school year (cx_length)

We code here increases in the length of the school day or school year, as well as policies to increase the number of instructional days – e.g., not allowing in-service days to count in the required number of days in a school year.

Elimination of traditional tenure (cx_tenure)

This category includes mentions of removing traditional tenure, rather than replacing it with merit-based tenure.

The following sections have no recorded mentions, either because the nature of the category caused us to exclude it from coding, or because none of our observed speeches touched on the topic:

gtl_prep

ssf_impl

sa_trans

gsc_reform

ip_data

C.2.2 Coding Key for Criteria Variables

Criteria variables track mentions of various education topics throughout the speech and information about them. They have several dimensions, and so the variable names follow the form:

Category_Criterion_Metric_Number

"Category" is the overarching RttT heading under which the criterion falls. In addition to the standard six headings, we include a heading for RttT's competitive and invitational priority, and a heading that comprises our own control topics:

gtl	Great Teachers and Leaders
ssf	State Success Factors
sa	Standards and Assessments
gsc	General Selection Criteria
low	Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools
data	Data Systems to Support Instruction
ip	Competitive Priority and Invitational Priorities
cx	Controls

"Criterion" refers to the specific criterion name; we followed the 19 major RttT scoring categories, as well as the competitive priority, 4 invitational priorities, and 8 control categories we define below:

perform   Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance

equit   Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals

path   Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals

support   Providing effective support to teachers and principals

prep   Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation program

lea   Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it

impl   Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain

          proposed plans

rais   Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps

adopt   Developing and adopting common standards

trans   Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments

impl   Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments

charter   Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charters and other

          innovative schools

funding   Making education funding a priority

reform   Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

inter   Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs

turn   Turning around the lowest-achieving schools

long	Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system
improve	Using data to improve instruction
access	Accessing and using State data

stem	Competitive Preference Priority – Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)
early	Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes
data	Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems
p20	Invitational Priority – P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment
schlevel	Invitational Priority – School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning

pay	Teacher salary
dist	Distance and online learning programs
con	School construction and renovation
read	Reading and literacy programs
lang	Foreign language programs
exit	Exit exams
length	Increased length of school day or school year
tenure	Elimination of traditional tenure

"Metric" represents the four variables we tracked for each mention with a category

m	(0,1) presence or absence of a mention in the category
al	(0,1) alignment of the mention with RttT priorities
sp	(0,1) specificity of the mention
wc	word count of the mention

"Number" indicates an appended number to distinguish multiple mentions of a criterion in one speech.

Each criterion also has a _wc variable without number, indicating the total word count for that category in the speech – a sum of all repeated mentions.

Example: The variable name for the word count of the second mention of "Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance" would be gtl_perform_wc2.

C.2.3 Notes on Criteria Variables Coding

Criteria variables were set up to track mentions of various education topics throughout the speech and information about them. The coding of mentions of individual criteria is addressed below, with individual rules for what counts as a "mention," what counts as "positive alignment," and what counts as "specificity" outlined for each. As a general overview, however, a mention is coded anytime the governor touches on the major components of a criterion. Mentions are restricted to future plans for almost all criteria; a mention of past support or victory in passing legislature is not counted because of the ongoing nature of these addresses, only planned actions are taken into account (certain criteria revolve around past accomplishments by their nature; these are addressed individually below).

Word counts for mentions of individual criteria generally begin when the governor begins talking about the subject, including any prelude before the criterion is mentioned in detail, and continues until a clear change of topic. Excepting strong changes of topic in the middle of a paragraph and very short mentions within short education sections, we mark the beginning and end of mentions at paragraph breaks to determine word count. This can lead to overlapping word counts, when multiple criteria come up within one paragraph, or two criteria have an intersecting section that talks about both. We employ this method because many of these circumstances actually do involve a section speaking about more than one criterion and because there is no easily applied rule to divide word counts. As a result of this, the sum of mention word counts may exceed the total Race to the Top word count.

Multiple mentions of a specific criterion are coded when there is a change of topic in between the sections regarding that criterion, whether or not the focus has changed. For criteria that can refer to multiple types of programs, such as kindergarten and preschool within ip_early, we code adjacent discussions of the subcriteria as one long mention.

Affiliation is coded as 1 when the governor is pledging support for the priorities outlined by RttT, and as 0 when she is acting in opposition to them, or her position is unclear (for our control categories, we have outlined what constitutes support in their descriptions below). As a general rule, mentions are coded with a specificity of 1 if the governor mentions a specific program or piece of legislation by name, gives a specific figure for funding, or outlines concrete steps to be taken.

C.3 General Variables

C.3.1 Coding Key for General Variables

state	state
year	year of speech
gov	governor, by name
party	governor's party: 0 = Democrat, 1 = Republican, 2 = Independent
first	(0,1) indicates if this is the first year of a governor's term
date	month/day speech was delivered
datenum	number of day (out of 365) the speech was given (e.g. Jan 1 = 1, Feb 2 = 33...)
app{1,2,3}	(0,1) indicates whether a state applied for RttT in a given round
fin{1,2}	(0,1) indicates whether a state was a finalist in a given round (round 3 had no finalists); all winners were marked as finalists
win{1,2,3}	(0,1) indicates whether a state won funding in a given round
budget1	enacted budget for FY (in millions of dollars)
budget2	budget reported for FY in following year (in millions of dollars)
budgetpctch	change in budget from previous to current year
k12	elementary and secondary education budget (in millions of dollars)
highered	higher education budget (in millions of dollars)
k12pct	elementary and secondary education as percent of state budget
higheredpct	higher education as percent of state budget
k12pctch	change in elementary and secondary education budget from previous year
higheredpctch	change in higher education budget from previous year
season	major time interval in RttT timeline in which a speech was delivered:

0	before 2/17/09	
1	2/17/09 – 11/18/09	passage of ARA
2	11/19/09 – 1/19/10	announcement of RttT priorities
3	1/20/10 – 3/4/10	phase 1 deadline
4	3/5/10 – 6/1/10	phase 1 decisions
5	6/2/10 – 8/24/10	phase 2 deadline
6	8/25/10 – 12/16/11	phase 2 decisions
7	12/17/11 – 12/23/11	phase 3 deadline
8	after 12/23/11	phase 3 decisions

wc	word count of entire speech
wced	word count of education related section of the speech
wcpcted	percentage of speech that is education related
wcrttt	word count of RttT related section of the speech
wcpctrttt	percentage of speech that is RttT related
wcpctrttted	percentage of the education section of the speech that is RttT related
rttt	number of mentions of RttT within the speech
nclb	number of mentions of NCLB within the speech

The app*, fin*, and win* variables are invariant between years.

C.3.2   Notes on General Variables Coding

The season, wcpcted, wcpctrttt, and wcpctrttted variables are derived from existing variables.

The rttt and nclb variables are simple counts of how many times RttT and NCLB are mentioned within a speech, respectively. We count only explicit mentions of the program by name – oblique references such as "the president's education initiative" and "we will leave no child behind" are left out. A count above 1 indicates addressing the criterion multiple, separate times a governor who brings up RttT and says its names twice while talking about it, for instance, scores 1 here; a score of 2 would require the program be mentioned, followed by a change in topic, and then another discussion of RttT.

For simplicity and consistency, we almost always divide sections at paragraph breaks and avoid removing

short sections that may be off topic within a larger education-focused section.

Throughout, any reference to "state" also includes Washington DC, and any reference to "governor" also includes the mayor of Washington DC.

Word Count

The word count variable excludes introductions by people who are not the governor, as well as indications of where a governor should pause, or allow for applause or laughter. Section headings are included in the overall word count, as well as the education specific word count.

The education-specific word count was obtained by going through each speech paragraph by paragraph and removing those not related to education topics; brief forays off topic, without bringing up a new focus, were retained when they occurred within an education-specific section. Short mentions and components of lists, such as a listing of accomplishments or topics at the beginning of a speech, or a recap at the end, are not included in the education word count.

Although most RttT categories are concerned specifically with early childhood education and K-12 education, we include sections on higher education in our education word count. We generally exclude sections relating to school safety, however, as they are almost always framed within the purview of homeland security or policing. We generally do not include sections referencing social intervention programs, even if it occurs at a school – after school programming which does not include an educational component, for example.

The RttT-specific word count is the total word count of all mentions of Race to the Top policies – this excludes all control topics, and may differ from the sum of the word counts of different mentions in the case of overlapping topics.

Abbreviations

RttT: Race to the Top

NCLB: No Child Left Behind

SotS: State of the States

TFA: Teach for America

AP: Advanced Placement

JAG: Jobs for America's Graduates

Missing Speeches

All speeches for all states 2001 to 2013 are present, except:

Alaska	2003
Arkansas	even years
California	2001, 2009
Connecticut	2002
Delaware	2006
Florida	2001
Illinois	2009
Kentucky	2010
Louisiana	2001, 2002, 2003, 2008, 2012
Maine	2003
Maryland	2003
Montana	even years
Nevada	2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2012
New Hampshire	2002, 2004
New Jersey	2002
New Mexico	2001
North Carolina	2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012
North Dakota	2002, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012
Oklahoma	2007
Oregon	2001, 2002, 2003, 2004
Pennsylvania	2002, 2003, 2004, 2005
Rhode Island	2002, 2010
South Dakota	2001, 2002, 2003, 2009
Tennessee	2001, 2003, 2004
Texas	even years
Utah	2002
Vermont	2002, 2010
Virginia	2006
Wyoming	2002, 2006
Washington, DC	2003, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2013