

Education TURNKEY Electronic Distribution, Inc.

256 North Washington Street
Falls Church, Virginia 22046-4549
(703) 536-2310
Fax (703) 536-3225

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 20, 2014
TO: TechMIS Subscribers
FROM: Charles Blaschke, Blair Curry, and Suzanne Thouvenelle
SUBJ: More E-Rate Opportunities Likely Under BEAR Process; Funding Opportunities for Mobile Devices Identified in ESEA/IDEA; Bipartisan Opposition to Common Core and State Waiver Renewals Growing; and Race to the Top Opportunities Using Unspent Money

The first included TechMIS Special Report outlines FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler's plan to double E-Rate funding for broadband connectivity through reducing inefficiencies; this will, not only help Priority 1 telecommunication providers, but also benefit many TechMIS clients with instructional products and services which are not E-Rate eligible as districts with pending meritorious appeals use the so-called BEAR process for refunds. In addition to increasing efficiencies and freeing up more E-Rate funds through consortia and group buys (particularly for small and rural districts and libraries), the FCC plans to generate a large portion of the \$2 billion over two years for connectivity by breaking up the "logjam" in the appeals process by speeding up applicants' flow of cash or credits for those appeals found to be meritorious while "freeing up" other withheld funds for Priority 1 services. These E-Rate refunds under the BEAR process could be sizeable (e.g., \$1.5 billion in 2001), as noted in our August 28, 2013 TechMIS Special Report, and could benefit many TechMIS clients beginning now.

The second TechMIS Special Report includes the National Title I Conference highlights and exhibitors' perspectives. In general, exhibitors were pleased with the exhibitor layout/scheduling and, in spite of conflicts with the Super Bowl, felt the exhibit manager did a good job offering refreshments and food to encourage attendees to attend exhibit hours. In general, exhibitors with RTI products or services in the area of math appeared to be more optimistic about sales this year than those with reading/ELA intervention components and services. Most teacher and some Title I administrator attendees were not aware of previously carried-over funds in Title I district reserves; however, those that were, were actively seeking information about product purchases that could be made before September 30th.

Washington Update items address the following areas:

- **Page 1**
USED Provides Examples Encouraging Districts to Use ESEA Title I (e.g., Schoolwide Programs) and IDEA Funds to Purchase Mobile Devices and Related Technology (see our April 15, 2013 TechMIS report for more examples and details)
- **Page 3**
The “School Choice Week” Washington Insiders Survey Projects Continuing Growth in the School Choice Options; Senator Alexander Has Submitted Legislation to Expand School Choice With Proposed \$24 Billion Consolidation of ESEA Funds
- **Page 4**
Unspent Race to the Top Money in 12 Initially-Funded States Could Provide Opportunities for Firms
- **Page 5**
Representative Bobby Scott (D-VA) Is Now Actively Seeking the “Ranking Member” Slot on the House Education Committee Following Announced Retirement of Current Ranking Member George Miller (D-CA)
- **Page 6**
Administration Pressures on States/Districts to Adopt and Implement Common Core Standards and Selective Waiver Renewal Provisions Draws GOP Congressional Legislative Opposition and Critical Letters from Different Quarters, Including Democrats and Civil Rights Groups
- **Page 7**
Office of Head Start (OHS) Announces Third Group of Grantees Required to Re-Compete for Funds
- **Page 8**
The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) Reports that, in 20 States Student Achievement or Academic Growth is Weighted as the Most Significant Factor in Teacher Evaluations
- **Page 8**
USED has Released Non-Regulatory Guidance Which Allows Charter Schools Which Receive Federal Charter School Funds to Conduct Weighted Lotteries in Favor of Various Groups of Disadvantaged Students
- **Page 9**
A number of miscellaneous items are also addressed including:

- a) The “Time to Succeed Coalition,” co-chaired by the National Center on Time and Learning and the Ford Foundation, is providing an interactive map with up-to-date information on state legislation and state policies concerning expanded learning time, which according to Education Week’s Time and Learning blog (January 7th) is available to educators, advocacy groups, and others promoting extended learning time.
- b) Virtually all states have laws/regulations for rapidly growing dual enrollment, some of which are being changed to improve the availability and accountability of dual enrollment programs, according to a new database report by the Education Commission of the States (ECS).
- c) On December 19th, USED announced that Michigan, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Vermont won a total of \$280 million under the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge.
- d) The National AfterSchool Association has identified several trends which, if they continue to grow in 2014, have implications for some TechMIS subscribers, especially those with STEM-related programs.
- e) The new ECS State Pre-K Funding Report finds state funding for pre-K increased by \$363.6 million to a total of \$5.6 billion, which is a 6.9% increase over last year.
- f) Chairman John Kline of the House Education and Workforce Committee has asked the Government Accountability Office to determine the impact of various special education paperwork requirements on student performance and the degree to which these requirements have been implemented over the last few years.
- g) A new "survey experiment" by the Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice reports that Americans perceive the most effective school reform efforts to be smaller class sizes, use of technology, accountability, followed by vouchers.
- h) As reported in Education Week’s Curriculum Matters blog (January 17th), according to ETS, 11 states have dropped the GED and have signed up to use the ETS HiSET.
- i) Developed by the University of Nebraska at Lincoln Extension in partnership with the Noyce Foundation, the Click2Science website is providing video professional development tools to help after-school staff working on STEM programs.
- j) USED announces SIG grants totaling \$39 million to seven states -- Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Utah, and Washington -- to continue efforts to turn around lowest-achieving schools.
- k) A new Government Accountability Office report has found that 62 of 92 Investing in Innovation (i³) program projects funded between 2010-2012 used teacher and principal professional development as the key strategy.
- l) Washington insiders provided their pessimistic perceptions that most proposals in the President’s State of the Union address would not likely be funded.
- m) E-Rate Update on Districts With “Potential” E-Rate Refunds for Purchasing Non-eligible Products and Services

Special Report:
**The FCC Plans to Double E-Rate Funding for Connectivity Which
Could Help Not Only Telecommunication Priority 1 Service Providers,
But Also Many Firms With Instructional Products and Services
Which Are Not Eligible for E-Rate
as Districts With Pending Appeals Use the So-Called BEAR Process**

*A Technology Monitoring and Information Service (TechMIS)
Special Report*

Prepared by:
Education TURNKEY Systems, Inc.
256 North Washington Street
Falls Church, Virginia 22046-4549
(703) 536-2310 / (703) 536-3225 FAX

February 20, 2014

Speaking at National Digital Learning Day, FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler identified several ways the E-Rate program would be modernized, in order to provide a \$2 billion increase over two years for Priority 1 broadband connectivity to help meet the President's stated ConnectEd goal to ensure that 99 percent of all students have access to high-speed broadband capacity within five years or sooner. The FCC would do so by taking a number of immediate steps that would apply to the "2014 Funding Year" allocations, applications for which are currently being submitted through March. Some of these changes will help not only sales of firms with eligible Priority 1 broadband, connectivity products and services, but also many small, medium, and some large firms which provide schools with instructional technology products, services, and related applications, most of which are not eligible for E-Rate refunds. This will occur, as we suggested in our August 28, 2013 TechMIS Special Report, because schools and libraries often pay the full non-discounted E-Rate prices for Priority 1 and 2 services, and then request delayed, credits or cash refunds for approved appeals under the so-called BEAR process.

In his speech, Chairman Wheeler outlined three principles to guide the FCC effort to modernize E-Rate, one of which was to ensure "sufficient resources are made available to meet our modernization goals, starting with a \$2 billion down payment on the expansion of high-speed connections over the next two years, while still meeting expectations set by the 2014 program rules. A little known fact about today's E-Rate program is that only about one half of the program's funds go for broadband connectivity." Noting that the FCC has a management challenge, he said that the FCC must improve the effectiveness with which the E-Rate is run -- cutting bureaucracy and finding ways to update the management of program. He indicated that the FCC has already identified opportunities for greater productivity for significant improvements to the way funds are deployed: "It is these improvements, for example, that will

play a major role in allowing us to double, to \$2 billion, the money to be spent on high-speed connection beginning this year.” One way, he noted, is to make sure that the Funding Year 2014 applications “that get the most students the most broadband, get moving more quickly.” Here he indicated that rural and other small districts that used consortia or joint purchasing approaches will be given a higher priority in the review process rather than delaying/penalizing them because their applications are more complex. As he stated, “We can start fixing that immediately. To those participating in the program let me be clear, we will fund all Priority 1 services in 2014; but one of the first ways to accelerate progress is to get cash that is already in the program working to support broadband projects more quickly.” He also noted that consortia purchases usually result in better prices for districts and libraries.

Most importantly, for firms with non-eligible E-Rate instructional products, professional services, and related in-classroom student use applications, he stated, “Another way to use existing resources to devote funds to high-speed broadband is to improve the efficiency of how we treat old applications -- appeals, holds, and other outstanding requests...We will get to work immediately to get those funds moving. Everything just described can begin immediately, starting with the applications in the FY 2014 program that are coming in now and will be completed by the end of March.”

Even though the total amount of E-Rate discounts, approximately \$2.4 billion annually, will not increase immediately (but may do so in the future), the increased funding for Priority 1 broadband connectivity services will certainly benefit firms that provide these “infrastructure-type” products and services -- perhaps more than doubling sales of Priority 1 E-Rate discount products and services. Also, by providing such increased sales opportunities, this initiative will reduce telecommunication carriers’ opposition to other modernization changes and will go a long way in ensuring increased fees for telephone services being collected and paid into the Universal Service Fund (i.e., the E-Rate) in the future.

Perhaps the most immediate increased opportunity for firms with appropriate technology/digital products/services which are not E-Rate eligible will be an increase in the rate of reimbursements to districts under the BEAR process because the FCC will begin reducing the number of E-Rate applications which are on hold or under appeal. When the E-Rate program began in the late 1990s, the number of applications on hold or on appeal was significant, which caused many district and other applicants to pay the full pre-discount price for requested services and then request a check or credit for the discount if and when the service in the application were found to be meritorious/approved. As we noted in our August 28, 2013TechMIS Special Report, we anticipate that there will be an increase in the use of the BEAR process beginning in “meritorious” appeals during this year on hold, all of which could provide opportunities for many TechMIS subscribers.

Even though the FCC plans to prioritize consortium/group buy applicants from small and sometimes rural districts, we anticipate that some such districts for funding year 2014 may have already decided to pay full prices and hence could provide sales opportunities as they request direct reimbursement from the SLD through the BEAR process later this year or next. Perhaps

more importantly, many of the outstanding applications from one to three years ago which remain in the appeal process will also be found to be meritorious (see related item) and districts will request E-Rate reimbursements in the form of cash, which in turn can be used to purchase non-eligible E-Rate technology and related products. In its effort to break the logjam by freeing up funds from applications on appeal which are found not to be meritorious, the FCC hopes to apply such “savings” to the \$1 billion a year increase for connectivity. As a result, some districts’ appeals, which were found not to be meritorious, may still represent good prospects.

As Education Week’s Digital Education blog (February 5th) stated, “Wheeler did not rule out increasing the overall size of the program in the future, but said the FCC will initially focus on finding money for schools’ and libraries’ needs by using savings and the shifting of money within existing programs.” He also noted that the FCC will seek comments on a range of issues and would focus on making broadband a priority and phasing out low bandwidth connections, hoping that the process would be completed before students enroll in Fall 2014.

We will continue to include quarterly reports (see related Miscellaneous Washington Update item on last two quarters) based on Schools and Libraries Division/USAC quarterly reports on district applications under appeal for certain services were found to be meritorious and the amount of funding district applicants will receive.

Special Report: National Title I Conference Highlights and Exhibitors' Perspectives

*A Technology Monitoring and Information Service (TechMIS)
Special Report*

*Prepared by:
Education TURNKEY Systems, Inc.
256 North Washington Street
Falls Church, Virginia 22046-4549
(703) 536-2310 / (703) 536-3225 FAX*

February 20, 2014

Based on our observations at the most recent Title I Conference in San Diego in early February and discussion primarily with exhibitors, we offer some of the highlights and “takeaways” for subscribers who did not attend but might want to next year in Salt Lake. While exhibitors have been critical of “exhibitor treatment” received in previous conferences such as Seattle and Washington, D.C., many volunteered positive comments about the conference which began on February 1st in the San Diego Conference Center, especially about layout, logistics, and food/drink refreshments for attendees in the exhibit area.

The exhibit area was in close proximity to meeting rooms and provided “no hassle” attendance/security checks during exhibit hours, and the exhibit area had seating next to exhibit booths in addition to dedicated “corners tables” for lunch and coffee breaks. Co-mingling of attendees and exhibitors was good in the exhibit hall. Breaks appeared to be well planned with general sessions and food service was generally good, especially fresh fruit.

During the opening exhibit session, many exhibitors expressed anxieties about the overlap at 4 p.m. Sunday with the Super Bowl and its impact on the exhibit area. Even though a large meeting room had been set up with multiple large-screen televisions adjacent to the exhibit area, after the Seattle rout of the Broncos, it became apparent many attendees gravitated back toward the exhibit area and several creative exhibitors were able to display viewing of the game or segments of it via Internet in their exhibit booth.

Beyond the conference logistics and layout, there was some good news as well as bad news as far as many exhibitors' perceptions regarding lead generation and increased sales opportunities. While the number of conference attendance was about the same as last year, many exhibitors, particularly those exhibiting for the first time, felt that the preponderance of attendees were teachers or principals rather than administrators who they would have liked to have met. As we have mentioned in our most recent TechMIS reports and in individual discussions with subscribers, when the FY 2014 budget was passed and sequester anxieties for this year and next year were allayed, many districts would be spending between now and June 30th a total of about

\$2 billion of previously carried over 2011 and 2012 Title I funds. Since Title I administrators have been keeping these previously carried over funds in the Title I district-level reserve, many principals and teachers were not aware of such funds that were available. Hence, discussions with some of the teacher/principal attendees did not ignite many sparks of interest. Indeed, our discussion over the several months or so with mid-size district superintendents indicated that most had become so frustrated with Washington and the various and sundry waivers and mid-year corrections in policies relating to Title I and other funding that they have left such matters up to their Title I administrators. In our discussions with several Title I district directors, it remains clear that those who had previously carried-over Title I funds in their reserve were planning to spend/obligate such funds in the very near future because sequestration this year and next was no longer a concern and most of the funds that were cut last year, if any, had been restored. Moreover, most of these administrators were also aware of some of the changes regarding the School Improvement Grant program, especially the availability of using “whole school reform models” or other state or district home-grown intervention models (see below).

Following the trend over the last three years more exhibitors were promoting RTI approaches in mathematics as opposed to English/language arts, with a few of the exhibitors promoting science. However, some but not all, of those firms with products and services fitting into RTI frameworks indicated a general slowdown in purchasing over the last 12 months. It is not clear whether such a slowdown was a result of districts carrying over funds because of sequestration fears or state uncertainties or ambivalence about Common Core standards and assessments and clarity regarding what types of interventions and priorities under RTI frameworks they are encouraging districts to use.

We also had an opportunity to discuss the new School Improvement Grant provision in the FY 2014 Appropriation Act which allows districts to use two alternatives to the four prescribed intervention models: a) whole school reform strategies which are “research proven” and have a “moderate level of evidence that the program will have a statistically significant effect on student outcomes”; and b) an alternative state-determined school improvement strategy that may be used by LEAs which has to be approved by the Secretary of Education. In a conference call the day after the FY 2014 budget was signed by the President, USED officials indicated that they were working out the details on or otherwise determining what constitutes a state model or a whole school reform model strategy that can be approved. In the meantime, I talked with two groups responsible for implementing whole school reform strategies that were created/identified under the School Reform Demonstration Act in 1997, also passed as part of language in a budget appropriation at that time. Officials from one of the groups said they were awaiting further guidance from USED which, however, they felt would support their current model that the group is implementing on a rather wide-scale basis. Officials responsible for implementing one of the other whole school reform models indicated that several districts have already contacted them about implementing their model as one of the alternatives, even before any official guidance comes out of USED to take advantage of recently released SIG funding for their respective states.

In discussions with a number of other school superintendents and firms which had components

which could “fit” into some whole school reform models, these groups were discussing components of an alternative homegrown model that district superintendents in their association would support, which in turn would be recommended to the state, which would propose such an alternative model to USED for approval. Without question, among a number of the exhibitors and certainly districts which have sought alternatives to the four USED SIG-approved intervention models, the opportunities under the new SIG language which became effective upon the President’s signature of the 2014 budget is important.

Our discussions with a number of exhibitors which provide English/language arts/writing interventions or type of tools that facilitate such interventions, there appears to be a growing interest in possibly teaming with firms who also provide products and services which can be used to teach keyboarding skills to third-grade and higher-level students who will be taking Common Core state assessments online tests this spring during the field test and next year. Several exhibitors on the floor also had product lines that included materials used to teach keyboarding skills. Many of these firms were not aware of the growing demand for such products as a result of Common Core online essay assessments domains.

In general, the San Diego Title I Conference, from the perspective of most exhibitors, was better than some of the previous conferences. Even though exhibitors had to compete with the Super Bowl due to scheduling conflicts, most were generally pleased and satisfied with leads and interest that were generated.

Washington Update

Vol. 19, No. 2, February 20, 2014

USED Provides Examples Encouraging Districts to Use ESEA Title I (e.g., Schoolwide Programs) and IDEA Funds to Purchase Mobile Devices and Related Technology

In a recent “reporters” conference call, USED Assistant Secretary Deb Delisle said that the Department would be publishing a “Dear Colleague” letter advising states and districts of all the ways they could use existing money to buy mobile devices and teach teachers how to use them according to [Education Week’s Politics K-12](#) blog. The next day, the “Dear Colleague” letter (February 5, 2014), designed “...to help State, district, and eligible partnership grantees better understand how they may be able to use their federal grant programs to support innovative technology-based strategies to personalize learning,” was sent. The letter coincided with FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler’s speech on modernization of the E-Rate program (see related [TechMIS Special Report](#)). The document attached to the USED letter presented examples of how funds from Title I and other ESEA programs, as well as IDEA, could be used to support the use of technology to improve instruction and for staff development.

The USED letter -- sent by Richard Culatta, Director of the Office of Educational Technology -- states that the examples do not depart from previous USED guidance, but clarifies opportunities to support digital learning, including personalizing instruction and professional learning, greater access to high-quality digital content, and facilitating

educator collaboration. The letter provides, as a major example, a school which incorporates digital learning in a Title I schoolwide program might use Title I funds to purchase devices and digital learning resources, Title II funds to help teachers improve their teaching through effective blended learning practices, and Title III funds to provide access to technology for English learners.

Additional examples were provided in the attached document, which noted that the development and acquisition of digital materials and resources for students and educators must still meet the requirements of the specific grant program, including allowable costs and supplement-not-supplant provisions.

In the area of professional development, examples highlighted included:

- Title II-A funds could be used to hire coaches to help educators learn to use selected devices, platforms, online assessments, and/or digital materials or to implement technology-supported, content-specific instructional practices based on areas identified for improvement.
- Title II-A funds can be used to help district staff create or participate in personalized digital learning opportunities in the form of blended professional learning, webinars, simulations, and online communities or practices; districts may also use Title I funds for similar purposes.

- Districts may use Title I funds to help educators manage and analyze student data in Title I schools to improve instruction and decision-making for school improvement purposes.
- Title II-A funds can be used to help districts develop performance systems to adopt digital competency-based professional development rather than relying on seat time or other input measures.

Federal funds may be used to access digital materials and support students in the following areas:

- Title IIA funds can help educators better use and share content aligned with Common Core standards, including training to find and adapt relevant Open Educational Resources (OER).
- Title III funds can be used to include English language instruction in digital learning resources and software, including materials in languages other than English.
- IDEA Part B funds can be used to support use of technology to help reduce paperwork and digitize IEPs for families and teachers.

Grantees may use Federal funds to purchase devices to help students access digital learning materials and collaborate with peers, including:

- Use of Title I funds to acquire tablets, laptops, and other devices, in addition to curriculum and professional development, as part of a comprehensive plan in a Title I schoolwide program, which can include transitioning to schoolwide blended learning or personalized learning models.

- IDEA Part B funds can be used by districts to provide specific assistive technology devices and services identified by the IEP team.

The last general example relates to the use of Federal funds by grantees to enhance collaboration and communications among educators, experts, and parents, including:

- The use of IDEA Part D funds to help all teachers to communicate with parents of students with disabilities.
- Title II-B Math/Science Partnership funds could be used to purchase software and devices that are essential to providing digital professional learning communities with practicing scientists and engineers.
- Title III funds can be used for online professional development, virtual communities of practice, and sharing of digital materials to support efforts to improve instruction for English learners.

The letter and supporting document should be provided to sales staff to share with district Title I and other Federal program directors. For each of the above examples (and additional ones approved in the document and available at: <http://www.ed.gov/edblogs/technology/>), there are specific sections of relevant legislation or regulations which allow the use of such funds for activities provided in the examples. TechMIS subscribers should be reminded that most local district officials will not be aware of the various examples and citations. Sales staff will have to point to specific allowances in the Law or regulations to develop a “comfort level” with district officials wishing to purchase their products and services using the cited funding sources in the letter and document.

The “School Choice Week” Washington Insiders Survey Projects Continuing Growth in the School Choice Options; Senator Alexander Has Submitted Legislation to Expand School Choice With Proposed \$24 Billion Consolidation of ESEA Funds

In January, Whiteboard Advisors conducted a survey of “education insiders” related to the school choice movement. Below are findings and projections regarding the movement, with which we agree with some caveats.

About 70 percent of the Washington insiders and influencers feel the school choice movement -- including public school choice, public charter schools, and private school choice options -- has gained momentum over the last five years. Public charter schools clearly gained the most significant momentum, along with increased emphasis on “course” choice (e.g., in Louisiana). While virtual and blended education which facilitates certain types of choice will continue to grow, we also agree with several Washington insiders that school choice in some states “...is beginning to lose momentum. The rhetoric is getting nastier, the data is far less impressive, and the opposition has found its sweet spot in making this about privatizing and profiteering. This year, it will be all about austerity.” In some states, opposition based on this rationale seems to be running rampant. Other observations from insiders that we feel are worth noting include:

- There will be a significant growth in public charter schools in middle class areas because Republicans are dominating governors’ offices and state legislatures.

- As public school choice options and charter school options continue to grow, traditionally assigned schools will continue to lose market share and feel threatened. Moreover, TURNKEY believes that in many school districts, especially in those participating in charter school partnership projects funded by the Gates and other foundations, “experiments” with effective practices and solutions will lead to increased adoption of such practices in some school districts.
- As one insider noted, “Changes in the direction of choice policy and practice will depend entirely on who’s in office after November 2016. What changes that may occur before then will be visible only to insiders, even if they’re important ones.”

USED non-regulatory guidance allows charter schools which receive Federal funding to continue and expand “weighted admission policies” (i.e., designed to increase the number of students with disabilities, English language learners, and other disadvantaged groups to attend such charter schools).

Senator Lamar Alexander, ranking Republican on the Senate HELP Committee, has submitted a proposal to consolidate more than 80 education programs into a giant funding stream which, in turn, would provide funding for optional school choice programs in states. The \$24 billion consolidated grant program would permit states to allocate newly consolidated funds to low-income parents, allowing them to decide how their child’s allotment of Federal dollars is spent. Money could be used to pay for private school, supplemental education, public school choice outside their

home district, and tutoring services or homeschooling materials. Each child would get an average of \$2,100 in Federal aid under the proposal, according to a January 27th article in Education Week. States would continue testing students and reporting data, but schools would not have to meet achievement goals or be subject to sanctions for interventions. If all states opted to participate, more than 11 million students would be served. The proposal, according to Education Week, would also provide Title I portability which would allow families to take Federal dollars to private schools. In addition to Senator Alexander's proposal, other public school choice legislation has been submitted by Senator Tim Scott (R-SC); and Representative Eric Cantor (Majority Leader in the House of Representatives) has also proposed Title I portability.

Unspent Race to the Top Money in 12 Initially-Funded States Could Provide Opportunities for Firms

USED audits report that some of the 12 Race to the Top states, even with an extra year no-cost extension, will likely not finish all their projects; about \$1.8 of the \$4 billion initial RTTT grants (part of ARRA) are reportedly still unspent. Some opportunities may be created as states, and particularly districts, will be under pressure to spend all remaining funds by October 1, 2015. According to the most recent USED Office of Inspector General report in its audit of five of the 12 original Race to the Top states, "...there is increasing risk that projects with delayed or compressed timelines will not be completed within the grant period or be implemented with poor quality, and that goals may become

unattainable." During the second year of the program, the percentage of projects per state that were delayed ranged from 13 percent to 54 percent. Also, as reported by Education Week's Politics K-12 blog (December 30th), as of November 1st, of the \$4 billion allocated in 2010 to the 12 states, \$1.8 billion has yet to be withdrawn by the states for actual expenditures. As we have cautioned, in many states, Race to the Top funds may have been encumbered under multi-year contracts or other arrangements, but not yet withdrawn for expenditures.

However, given the recent USED Inspector General's report and the large amount of ARRA Race to the Top funds which have not been encumbered and withdrawn, it appears that many SEAs, and certainly districts, participating in Race to the Top, will be under extreme pressure to encumber and/or spend remaining Race to the Top/ARRA funds by October 1, 2015. USED officials, including Secretary Duncan beginning in 2009-10 when the ARRA stimulus funds were appropriated, have emphasized that such funds need to be spent "quickly, but wisely." Districts with unspent Race to the Top funds will be under pressure to spend such funds under the September 2, 2009 guidance for allowable uses of Title I and ARRA funds, as reported in our September 15, 2009 analysis. In some cases, districts will allocate unspent Race to the Top ARRA funds to Title I or to SIG Priority or Focus Schools which can be designated as schoolwide programs and use such funds in the following areas:

- to purchase equipment, supplies, and instructional materials for use in a school which can remain in the school after Race to the Top projects are completed, or if the school is no longer designated as a Title I school; however, such ARRA

funds cannot be used solely to purchase equipment.

- to purchase or develop supplemental instructional materials as part of a high-quality curriculum aligned with state standards as long as the materials are aimed at improving the academic achievement of low-achieving students.
- to support implementation of an RTI model or multi-tier instructional framework to help schools identify students who are at-risk of poor learning outcomes, monitor student progress, provide evidence-based interventions, and adjust the intensity and nature of those interventions depending on the student's responsiveness.
- to rewire a school to support the use of technology to the extent that it is allowable under Title I Part A and is consistent with the definition of minor remodeling.
- to provide professional development to enable teachers to use a technology-based student assignment system which also provides capacity for use by parents and students to communicate with teachers through email.
- to purchase distance learning courses in a Title I high school as part of the strategy to upgrade a curriculum of an entire school.

Many of the allowable uses in the September 2, 2009 guidance on the use of Title I ARRA funds, of which the \$4 billion for Race to the Top was part, may be discouraged by certain states or even by state auditors. On the other hand, for districts with unspent/obligated Race to the Top ARRA funds will be under pressure to spend such funds and justify their expenditures which should be easier to do as

one can expect more detailed USED guidance to come out over the next year or so.

Representative Bobby Scott (D-VA) Is Now Actively Seeking the “Ranking Member” Slot on the House Education Committee Following Announced Retirement of Current Ranking Member George Miller (D-CA)

Bobby Scott, who hails from the Newport News, Virginia area, has a long history of interest and involvement in education policy. With a close relative having served as Title I Directors, he has been a long-time supporter of the National Association of Federal Education Program Administrators, and particularly the Virginia state affiliate. Over the last two decades, he has been very accessible to Title I advocates and their supporters in listening to legitimate ways to improve the quality and effectiveness of Title I programs. He introduced legislation that authorized the Promise Neighborhood program and in his position on the House Judiciary Committee has been a supporter of healthcare and wraparound services for students in low-achieving schools. As noted in a recent article in *Education Week's Politics K-12* blog, the Congressman is very knowledgeable on specific Title I and NCLB provisions and has been a skeptic of using standardized tests to gauge student progress, more so than his predecessor Congressman George Miller. Over the last decade and a half, Scott has been approached by several TechMIS subscribers on specific issues and, for the most part, clients have received a favorable response on different levels of support from the Congressman on issues related to improving Title I and directly-

related programs which involve some TechMIS subscribers and their products and services. Even though several other Congressmen are allegedly going to run for the ranking member position, support for Scott could result in general benefits for firms targeting Title I and related programs.

The Administration's Pressures on States/Districts to Adopt and Implement Common Core Standards and Selective Waiver Renewal Provisions Draws GOP Congressional Legislative Opposition and Critical Letters from Different Quarters, Including Democrats and Civil Rights Groups

Over the last month, a host of legislative proposals in Congress, mostly from Republicans up for re-election and other quarters, including retiring ranking House committee member George Miller and civil rights groups, have surfaced which will likely result in more guidance changes in a variety of areas being provided to states.

Most recently in Congress, Senator Lindsey Graham introduced a resolution on February 5th designed to reduce the Secretary's authority to coerce states into adopting Common Core Standards and give preference in grant competitions to states/districts that do. The resolution has been endorsed by Senator Mike Enzi (R-WY), ranking Senator on the HELP committee and Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX). According to Education Week's Politics K-12 blog, a companion version, endorsed by 40 members, has been introduced by Representative Jeff Duncan (R-SC) in the House. Two other similar bills were recently introduced by Congressman Phil

Gingrey (R-GA) and Senator Pat Roberts (R-KS), both of whom have opposition for re-election. In the Senate, Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN), ranking Republican on the HELP committee has introduced legislation which would restrict the Secretary's discretionary authority to encourage states to adopt the CCSS and has proposed additional legislation (see related Washington Update item) which would cut the Secretary's authority by converting \$24 billion Federal education grants into a consolidated school choice/voucher program.

Concurrent opposition is also coming from ranking House Democrat George Miller of California and caucuses representing Black, Hispanic, and Asian-Pacific members known as the "Tri-Caucus," which strongly oppose some of the Administration's waiver renewal guidance which now allows the use of "super subgroups"; it would allow states and districts to lump together ELLs students, special education and minority students.

A letter, dated January 17th, signed by Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA) and Representative George Miller (D-CA), also encourages guidance changes to the above but emphasizes the need for USED to "stand fast" on other issues such as:

- allowing alternative tests be used for no more than one percent of students with the most severe cognitive disabilities while doing away with the so-called "2%" alternative test;
- ensuring target graduation rates will be achieved in a reasonable time frame, which in some states in the past have ranged from four to six years; and
- ensuring that states with approved waiver renewals adopt and implement

teacher and principal evaluation requirements with appropriate implementation details spelled out.

Education Week's *Politics K-12* blog notes that some Hill Democrats are also concerned that the USED will back down on its position, initially included in state waiver renewal guidance documents, to ensure equitable access for disadvantaged students to effective teachers. In an interview, Miller stated, "We are going to be watching and paying attention to this. This is going to be a process where either the administration is serious about the civil rights of its children, or they're not." And if the Administration backs down on its civil rights protections, Miller responded, "...the department is going to get their ass handed to them by members of Congress." The blog also notes that a USED spokesperson said it "looks forward to responding" and "shares the same commitment to protecting and promoting equity for students."

Office of Head Start (OHS) Announces Third Group of Grantees Required to Re-Compete for Funds

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF), which sponsors the Head Start program, identified 103 Head Starts that will be required to compete for continued funding. This is the third group of grantees that have been identified for not meeting at least one of the seven criteria that indicates they are not meeting quality benchmarks, and must submit competitive applications as part of the Designation Renewal System (DRS).

OHS designated the grantees for competition because they had fiscal or

management issues preventing them from properly managing federal funds, or had deficiencies discovered in their on-site federal monitoring review. Any grantee that scored in the lowest 10 percent out of all Head Start programs that received a CLASS review last year must also compete.

In the first round of competition for replacing 153 grantees required to compete for Head Start funding eight new providers were selected. The other 145 made specific improvements and were re-awarded their grants, or managed to negotiate the requirement to re-compete. For the second cohort identified in January 2013, the competition for replacement grantees is ongoing.

The latest [list](#) of 103 providers released by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services spans 37 states and includes 12 organizations in Texas, eight in Louisiana, and eight in Pennsylvania (including the Philadelphia school district).

In total, we estimate that **\$516,076,786** in Federal dollars will be included in this round of competitions; and up to **67,635** children will be affected between Head Start, Early Head Start and Migrant / Seasonal slots. These numbers are based on pre-sequestration funding levels, with the (tentative) assumption that these competitive grants will be restored to 2012 levels, and potentially serve a similar number of children.

Examining the breakout by Head Start region, Region 4 (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee) and Region 6 (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas) will be hit hardest by this round of competitions. This

is similar to the trend in 2013, although Region 2 (New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) representation on the list dropped dramatically:

The programs in this third cohort are also slightly larger than the 2013 round, with an average total enrollment size of **657** (up from 622 last year). There are fewer large grantees (funded enrollment of 500 or more) pulling up the numbers, but a larger percentage of programs in the mid-sized range. Once again, Community Action Agency programs (CAA) and private nonprofits combined represented the majority of those organizations on the DRS list, with a smaller proportion of school systems and government agencies.

The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) Reports that, in 20 States Student Achievement or Academic Growth is Weighted as the Most Significant Factor in Teacher Evaluations

However, nine states do not define what is “significant.” Only ten states do not explicitly require the use of student achievement data in evaluating teachers. As reported by the New America Foundation, in 28 states multiple measures of growth and achievement are required, with 20 states allowing the use of student learning objectives as one of the multiple measures. The New America Foundation article (November 4th) also reported that 15 states require some unannounced observations but fewer than half of the states require teachers to receive feedback on their evaluation.

Similar to other reports on state teacher evaluation systems, NCTQ found that, in 23

states, districts can fire teachers for poor evaluations and six states allow districts to use such evaluations for compensation decisions; 19 states consider teacher evaluation ratings in tenure decisions. Only 20 states require that professional development be aligned with evaluations for all teachers, not just those “needing improvement” or “ineffective.” These two requirements are part of the conditions that 35 states must meet by 2016 in order to receive additional one-year waiver extensions from USED.

NCTQ also addressed district adoptions of state models. For example, of the 37 states with no required state adoption models, only in 15 states districts must have their evaluation systems approved. In the majority of states, districts have responsibility for developing and implementing their evaluation designs, which is, according to the article, a major problem in small districts which have limited capacity. Herein may lie some opportunities for outside help.

USED has Released Non-Regulatory Guidance Which Allows Charter Schools Which Receive Federal Charter School Funds to Conduct Weighted Lotteries in Favor of Various Groups of Disadvantaged Students

The new guidance states that weighted lotteries are permitted as long it is allowed under state laws to provide admission preferences for students with disabilities, migrant students, limited English proficient students, neglected or delinquent students, and homeless students. The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools in a

statement was pleased that charters could give preferences to students and notes that the new guidance is “in synch” with some state laws. Such guidance is designed to encourage expanded diversity in charter schools. In a related article in Education Week (January 29th), the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is awarding \$100,000 each to Aldine, Texas; Lawrence, Massachusetts; San Jose, California; Spokane, Washington; and Tulsa, Oklahoma to schools in these cities which are designed to foster district-charter school cooperation. Since 2010, schools in about 20 cities have been awarded similar compact grants, according to the Gates Foundation. Schools indicate they plan to use the money to support co-location of facilities, sharing of space among districts and charters, and to work with charters to develop joint programs in professional development and personalized learning.

Miscellaneous (a)

The “Time to Succeed Coalition,” co-chaired by the National Center on Time and Learning and the Ford Foundation, is providing an interactive map with up-to-date information on state legislation and state policies concerning expanded learning time, which according to Education Week’s Time and Learning blog (January 7th) is available to educators, advocacy groups, and others promoting extended learning time. For each state, the number of ELT schools with at least 30 minutes added to the school day or ten more days per year are provided. Another database on extended learning time activities in states that have received waiver approval to initiate or expand extended learning time activities using 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds is also

available at the Center for American Progress.

Miscellaneous (b)

Virtually all states have laws/regulations for rapidly growing dual enrollment, some of which are being changed to improve the availability and accountability of dual enrollment programs, according to a new database report by the Education Commission of the States (ECS). While the number of states with such laws and rules has not increased numerically over the last five years, improvement efforts have, including:

- the number of states requiring parents to pay for dual enrollment dropped from 22 to 13;
- more rigorous state requirements regarding the quality of instructors and courses have been implemented in 37 states over the last five years -- up from 29 states;
- 22 states require acceptance of dual enrollment credits to a transferring institution.

As Education Week’s College Bound blog (December 18th) reports that, in addition to dual enrollment, concurrent enrollment programs, which give high school students college credit courses, exist in 39 states. The National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) adopted national standards in 2002 related to curriculum, faculty, student assessments, and program evaluations to ensure concurrent courses are as rigorous as courses on college campuses. Currently, there are 89 concurrent enrollment programs accredited by the NACEP.

The updated database by ECS includes a state-by-state analysis, including areas such as eligibility, financing, and quality mandates, is available at the ECS website: www.ecs.org/. The National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships is available at: www.nacep.org/

Miscellaneous (c)

On December 19th, USED announced that Michigan, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Vermont won a total of \$280 million under the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge. For the most part, these states are developing reporting, monitoring, and funding "infrastructure systems" connecting state and Federal early childhood programs and reporting progress on implementation of Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS). During the last round, according to *Education Week's Politics K-12* blog, 16 states plus the District of Columbia applied for the latest round of funding. Evidently, the amount provided for the winning six states for early childhood was slightly less than originally planned, with \$120 million previously allocated going to the recently announced winners of the second Race to the Top-District competitive round and another \$89 million being awarded to previous RTTT/ELC grantees.

Miscellaneous (d)

The National AfterSchool Association has identified several trends which, if they continue to grow in 2014, have implications for some TechMIS subscribers, especially those with STEM-related programs:

- More opportunities for STEM instructor training for afterschool staff.
- More work to address the digital opportunity gap.
- Promotion of social and emotional skills necessary for success in school and life.
- Promotion and support for efforts to gain college access.
- More "age three to grade three" initiatives to promote collaboration between the early childhood and school-aged field.

The National AfterSchool Association, which is different from the National Afterschool Alliance and other groups supporting either afterschool or extended learning time, has a website: www.NAAweb.org

Miscellaneous (e)

The new ECS State Pre-K Funding Report finds state funding for pre-K increased by \$363.6 million to a total of \$5.6 billion, which is a 6.9% increase over last year. Most states have made up for losses since FY 2008-09 with a total investment of \$400 million greater than pre-recession.

While 30 states and the District of Columbia increased pre-K funding, ten of these states increased investments by over 20 percent. Decreases occurred in Louisiana, Florida, and Alaska. Of the 6.9% increase nationwide, Michigan's increase of \$65 million represented almost 18 percent of the total nationwide increase. Texas and South Carolina increased pre-K funding by \$48 and \$27 million respectively. As reported by *Education Week's State Ed Watch* blog, Massachusetts doubled its pre-K investment,

spending an additional \$15.4 million, while South Carolina increased spending by almost 80 percent over last year.

Miscellaneous (f)

Chairman John Kline of the House Education and Workforce Committee, has asked the Government Accountability Office to determine the impact of various special education paperwork requirements on student performance and the degree to which these requirements have been implemented over the last few years. In addition to traditional questions, Congress asked GAO to investigate what IDEA provisions provide the “most paperwork burden” for states and districts and why USED and districts have not utilized paperwork reduction provisions included in the 2004 IDEA reauthorization. The letter requests one very specific area which could have implications for many TechMIS subscribers. Question 4 is “How has the growth in and use of technology affected administrative and paperwork burden? How pervasive are ‘electronic’ IEPs and other innovative technologies? To what extent are these technologies interoperable? What can be expected in the future from technology?”

Ever since PL 94-142, the predecessor of IDEA, was passed in the mid-1970s, the potential use of technology to develop IEPs has been an issue criticized by some special educators because it has a potential to “de-personalize” the development and implementation of IEPs. On the other hand, an entire industry niche market has grown up in the IEP area over the last decade and is now being used in general education even though Federal requirements do not exist (e.g., encouraged personalized learning and

related tools). It is not clear what the intent is of including this question in the investigation. On the other hand, a directly-related question also relates to whether Federal student privacy protection provisions have created burdens and will also be affected by electronic IEPs and directly related electronic advances used in special education.

The complete letter is available at: www.edworkforce.house.gov under Fact Sheets and Alerts.

Miscellaneous (g)

A new "survey experiment" by the Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice reports that Americans perceive the most effective school reform efforts to be smaller class sizes, use of technology, accountability, followed by vouchers. Moreover, when presented with six different school choice options, respondents favored tax credits and least favored low-income vouchers. Based on a sample of respondents that were part of the Post-election Cooperative Congressional Election Study, the survey also found that teachers unions, merit pay for teachers, and extended learning time or longer school days were also perceived as less effective in promoting school reform.

The report was released by the Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice, a leading advocate of vouchers for more than five decades based on earlier work by economist Milton Friedman; it was conducted by Richard Carpenter, a Professor at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. In terms of the types of school choice that were preferred by respondents, one of the implications, according to

Carpenter, is "to the extent policymakers are interested in adopting new school choice legislation, tax credit programs of any kind may represent an option that finds broader support in the general population and in the courts of law. For those interested in creating new voucher programs, results showing support for universal vouchers versus low-income vouchers may indicate a reason to rethink past strategies of policy incrementalism." As Education Week's Charters & Choice blog (January 7th) notes, the most preferred types of school choice in order from most to least preferred were tax-credit reimbursement, tax credit scholarships, education savings accounts, universal vouchers, vouchers for students with disabilities, and vouchers for low-income students.

It is interesting to note that in his "going away" gathering, Dennis Doyle, a leading advocate of vouchers during the 1970s, suggested that the voucher movement is being replaced today with the emergence of charter schools as a choice option. The publication of this report by the Friedman Foundation tends to support the demise of the public's perception of vouchers as an effective means for school improvement. However, the report does indicate that further research using new data is needed because of apparent conflicting conclusions with previous studies using experimental survey designs, such as ones conducted by Moe, et. al.

Miscellaneous (h)

As reported in Education Week's Curriculum Matters blog (January 17th), according to ETS, 11 states have dropped the GED and have signed up to use the ETS

HiSET. Several states are using the ETS HiSET test exclusively for high school equivalency -- Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Iowa, Montana, Missouri, and Louisiana. Nevada, Wyoming, and New Jersey and Tennessee are using additional alternative tests or will be using HiSET for a limited time period. Three states will be offering the CTB McGraw-Hill TASC as their high school equivalency test -- New York, Indiana, and West Virginia. Wyoming, Nevada, and New Jersey will likely be using such tests which TASC exams to offer.

Miscellaneous (i)

Developed by the University of Nebraska at Lincoln Extension in partnership with the Noyce Foundation, the Click2Science website is providing video professional development tools to help after-school staff working on STEM programs. According to Education Week's Time and Learning blog (January 25th), the website will emphasize skills rather than content and will develop instructor knowledge in three areas: planning STEM learning experiences, interacting with youth doing STEM, and building STEM skills. Currently, registration on the website is free and appears to be supported by the After School Alliance which has recently released a report on the value of partnerships between STEM-rich institutions such as science centers, Federal agencies, and business. The website is at: www.click2sciencepd.org

Miscellaneous (j)

USED announces SIG grants totaling \$39 million to seven states -- Colorado, Indiana,

Kansas, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Utah, and Washington -- to continue efforts to turn around lowest-achieving schools. The January 28th announcement does not indicate whether new competitions will occur in any of these states. In the previous round announced for \$43 million, Arkansas and Kentucky will have new competitions. Receiving the \$39 million were Colorado (\$5 million), Indiana (\$8.6 million), Kansas (\$3.7 million), Massachusetts (\$7.2 million), New Mexico (\$3.7 million), Utah (\$3.1 million), and Washington (\$7.6 million). Some of these states may request amendments to their proposal based on language in the FY 2014 budget which allows for two alternative intervention models to be used (i.e., whole school reform or homegrown state-approved model) and extended funding for five years as opposed to three.

Miscellaneous (k)

A new Government Accountability Office report has found that 62 of 92 Investing in Innovation (i³) program projects funded between 2010-2012 used teacher and principal professional development as the key strategy. Moreover, GAO found that half of all i³ grant money is being spent on professional development or about \$457 million of the \$937 million grant awards

during the first two years of the program. Education Week's Politics K-12 blog (February 7th) notes that the vast majority of K-12 professional development is not very effective and reported that one of GAO's first reports will be to evaluate the program and its 2010 initial awards which is due in 2016. The blog also notes that some i³ winners such as Success for All "have a track record of strong results that include strategies that focus on professional development."

Miscellaneous (l)

Washington insiders provided their pessimistic perceptions that most proposals in the President's State of the Union address would not likely be funded. For example, 73 percent of insiders felt a "substantial expansion of Federal support for pre-K is either not happening or doubtful and on another matter while most insiders were pessimistic that USED could find new resources to expand personalized learning and focus on college and career exploration for students were pessimistic, 15 percent felt this would not happen or were doubtful, with only 31 percent feeling it might have a chance.

Miscellaneous (m)

E-Rate Update on Districts With “Potential” E-Rate Refunds for Purchasing Non-eligible Products and Services

As we attempt to do on a regular basis, we have included a list of districts that received funding commitments from the SLD, during the last two quarters, for applications submitted back to 2005. We believe that most of the funding commitment letters represent appeals that were filed by districts when they were notified that certain requests in their applications were denied. In many cases, these districts went ahead and purchased the product in question, paying the whole pre-discount price. Because the SLD eventually found many of these appeals to be meritorious, these districts can request a check instead of a credit through the so-called BEAR process. Those districts doing so can use the discount refund to purchase non-eligible E-Rate products and services such as instructional software and

professional development.

If a district staff person is interested in purchasing a non-E-Rate eligible product or service, then he or she should contact the district E-Rate office to determine whether a check was requested for the refund amount through the BEAR process and, if so, whether some of that money can be used to purchase the desired product or service. The accompanying chart shows the funding commitments greater than \$50,000. It should be noted that, during the fourth quarter of 2013, older commitments (2005-2010) to Dallas ISD totaled more than \$85 million.

As emphasized in the attached TechMIS Special Report, under the new modernization of the E-Rate, the SLD will speed up the appeals review process, which will likely result in more timely “meritorious” decisions over the next one to two years. Keep “tuned in” with TechMIS for timely updates and call us if you have any questions.

E-Rate

Funding Year 2013, Quarter 3 (Jul-Sep) Commitments

(greater than \$50,000)

Applicant	City	State	Amount Committed
2010 Commitments			
PINELLAS COUNTY SCHOOLS	LARGO	FL	\$437,865
NOTRE DAME HIGH SCHOOL	LAWRENCE	MA	\$41,283
2011 Commitments			
SYRACUSE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	SYRACUSE	NY	\$10,782,324
ALHAMBRA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	ALHAMBRA	CA	\$7,037,257
EDGEWOOD INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	SAN ANTONIO	TX	\$1,769,169
IDEA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	WESLACO	TX	\$1,387,926
MARYSVILLE JT UNIF SCHOOL DIST	MARYSVILLE	CA	\$1,270,421
HARRISON SCHOOL DISTRICT TWO	COLORADO SPGS	CO	\$1,209,588
ROOSEVELT UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT	ROOSEVELT	NY	\$1,130,431
UNO CHARTER SCHOOL NETWORK	CHIGAGO	IL	\$806,921
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUB SCHS	WASHINGTON	DC	\$806,257
PATERSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	PATERSON	NJ	\$573,564
BARSTOW UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST	BARSTOW	CA	\$394,983
INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DIST 287	PLYMOUTH	MN	\$309,498
LAKWOOD CHEDER SCHOOL	LAKWOOD	NJ	\$176,300
WHEELING SCHOOL DISTRICT 21	WHEELING	IL	\$168,840
HEBREW DAY SCHOOL	KIAMESHA LAKE	NY	\$154,701
BAYONNE SCHOOL DISTRICT	BAYONNE	NJ	\$148,040
MARANA SCHOOL DISTRICT 6	MARANA	AZ	\$115,110
2012 Commitments			
SANTA ANA UNIF SCHOOL DISTRICT	SANTA ANA	CA	\$11,046,686
LAREDO INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	LAREDO	TX	\$10,426,613
PHILADELPHIA SCHOOL DISTRICT	PHILADELPHIA	PA	\$9,932,606
NEWARK SCHOOL DISTRICT	NEWARK	NJ	\$6,915,200
MOBILE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	MOBILE	AL	\$6,544,309
ALBUQUERQUE SCHOOL DISTRICT	ALBUQUERQUE	NM	\$5,653,070
WASHINGTON OFM K20	OLYMPIA	WA	\$5,180,927
LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	LOS ANGELES	CA	\$4,815,749
NORWALK-LA MIRADA UN SCH DIST	NORWALK	CA	\$4,627,338
Erie 1 BOCES	West Seneca	NY	\$3,751,059
PEORIA SCHOOL DISTRICT 150	PEORIA	IL	\$3,490,934
GLENDALE ELEM SCHOOL DIST 40	GLENDALE	AZ	\$3,446,716
CENIC-CORP FOR EDUC NETWORK INITIATIVES IN CAL	LA MIRADA	CA	\$3,351,451
SACRAMENTO CITY UNIF SCH DIST	SACRAMENTO	CA	\$3,179,487
HOUSTON INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	HOUSTON	TX	\$3,171,816
CLEVELAND CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	CLEVELAND	OH	\$3,043,208
BIRMINGHAM CITY SCHOOL DIST	BIRMINGHAM	AL	\$2,812,441
ASPIRE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	OAKLAND	CA	\$2,773,237
NOBLE NETWORK OF CHARTER SCHOOLS	CHICAGO	IL	\$2,554,180
HARLANDALE INDEP SCHOOL DIST	SAN ANTONIO	TX	\$2,338,269

TechMIS publication provided by

Education TURNKEY Electronic Distribution

256 North Washington Street, Falls Church, VA 22046

703/536-2310, fax 703/536-3225, cblaschke@edturnkey.com

Education TURNKEY Electronic Distribution©, Vol. 19, No. 2, February 20, 2014

R.I. DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY	PROVIDENCE	RI	\$2,313,714
ALVORD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	RIVERSIDE	CA	\$2,304,877
MISSION CONS INDEP SCHOOL DIST	MISSION	TX	\$2,247,864
LONG BEACH UNIF SCHOOL DIST	LONG BEACH	CA	\$2,227,371
NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOL DIST	NEW HAVEN	CT	\$2,150,540
ORANGE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	ORLANDO	FL	\$2,077,929
PAJARO VALLEY UNIFIED SCH DIST	WATSONVILLE	CA	\$2,070,550
EDISONLEARNING CONSORTIUM	KNOXVILLE	TN	\$1,908,074
FORT WAYNE COMM SCHOOL DIST	FORT WAYNE	IN	\$1,799,464
CERES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	CERES	CA	\$1,663,222
BOARD OF SCHL COMM CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS	INDIANAPOLIS	IN	\$1,570,520
WEST OSO INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	CORPUS CHRISTI	TX	\$1,563,033
LA FERIA INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	LA FERIA	TX	\$1,559,412
YAKIMA SCHOOL DISTRICT 7	YAKIMA	WA	\$1,547,858
SCHOOL CITY OF EAST CHICAGO	EAST CHICAGO	IN	\$1,547,475
JEFF DAVIS CO SCHOOL DISTRICT	HAZLEHURST	GA	\$1,541,195
EDGEWOOD INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	SAN ANTONIO	TX	\$1,523,690
PASSAIC CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	PASSAIC	NJ	\$1,516,766
SAINTE PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 625	SAINTE PAUL	MN	\$1,513,615
SALINAS CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT	SALINAS	CA	\$1,481,877
ALHAMBRA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	ALHAMBRA	CA	\$1,477,074
MINNEAPOLIS SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	MINNEAPOLIS	MN	\$1,430,695
HIGHLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT 401	SEATTLE	WA	\$1,413,470
BEN HILL COUNTY SCHOOLS	FITZGERALD	GA	\$1,375,095
RIVERSIDE COUNTY LIB SYSTEM AUTOMATION CTR	RIVERSIDE	CA	\$1,341,659
LITTLETON ELEM SCH DISTRICT 65	CASHION	AZ	\$1,311,658
RESPONSIVE EDUCATION SOLUTION	LEWISVILLE	TX	\$1,300,680
SANTA ROSA INDEP SCHOOL DIST	SANTA ROSA	TX	\$1,280,937
NORTHSIDE INDEP SCHOOL DIST	SAN ANTONIO	TX	\$1,246,458
EL PASO INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	EL PASO	TX	\$1,241,466
JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	LOUISVILLE	KY	\$1,228,146
CANDLER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	METTER	GA	\$1,216,347
RAYMONDVILLE INDEP SCHOOL DIST	RAYMONDVILLE	TX	\$1,209,583
GLOBAL EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE	ANN ARBOR	MI	\$1,082,590
DIS STATE OF ARKANSAS	LITTLE ROCK	AR	\$1,070,646
INSTITUTO DEL PROGRESO LATINO CONSORTIUM	CHICAGO	IL	\$1,056,522
TEMPLE INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	TEMPLE	TX	\$1,025,956
BACON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	ALMA	GA	\$955,855
HOPI JR/SR HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT	KEAMS CANYON	AZ	\$916,815
NEW ORLEANS COL PREP-SYLVANIE WILLIAMS CAMP	NEW ORLEANS	LA	\$899,248
DURHAM PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT	DURHAM	NC	\$828,468
WASHITA VALLEY COMMUNITY ACTION COUNCIL	CHICKASHA	OK	\$790,316
KATY INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	KATY	TX	\$780,655
ALMANSOR CENTER	SOUTH PASADENA	CA	\$779,363
WASHAKIE COUNTY SCHOOL DIST 1	WORLAND	WY	\$756,014
LYNN SCHOOL DISTRICT	LYNN	MA	\$684,512
SYRACUSE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	SYRACUSE	NY	\$656,781
TEAM ACADEMY	NEWARK	NJ	\$646,791
GLOVERSVILLE ENLARGED DISTRICT	GLOVERSVILLE	NY	\$604,804
BOYS TOWN SCHOOLS	BOYS TOWN	NE	\$595,108

Miami-Dade County Public Schools	MIAMI	FL	\$589,293
MASSACHUSETTS DEPT OF YOUTH SERVICES	BOSTON	MA	\$564,755
PERSPECTIVES CHARTER SCHOOL-ADMINISTRATION	CHICAGO	IL	\$564,244
MOTHER CABRINI HIGH SCHOOL	NEW YORK	NY	\$543,286
BAIS TZIPORAH GIRLS SCHOOL	BROOKLYN	NY	\$510,711
SOUTH BEND CAREER ACADEMEY	SOUTH BEND	IN	\$508,119
LINCOLN UNIF SCHOOL DISTRICT	STOCKTON	CA	\$497,144
MONTGOMERY COUNTY SCHOOL DIST	ROCKVILLE	MD	\$459,905
BE'ER HAGOLAH INSTITUTES	BROOKLYN	NY	\$440,816
HARALSON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION	BUCHANAN	GA	\$412,845
INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DIST 287	PLYMOUTH	MN	\$358,189
LIGHTHOUSE ACADEMIES, INC - DATA CENTER	FRAMINGHAM	MA	\$339,438
RABBI JACOB JOSEPH SCHOOL	STATEN ISLAND	NY	\$333,952
YESHIVATH VIZNITZ D'KHAL TORATH CHAIM	MONSEY	NY	\$333,327
LAKEWOOD CHEDER SCHOOL	LAKEWOOD	NJ	\$331,187
MINERAL SPRINGS SCHOOL DIST	MINERAL SPRING	AR	\$325,347
CAMINO NUEVO CHARTER ACADEMY	LOS ANGELES	CA	\$324,019
POLICE ATHLETIC LEAGUE, INC.	NEW YORK	NY	\$292,731
EXPLORE EMPOWER CHARTER SCHOOL	BROOKLYN	NY	\$292,538
GAN YISROEL	BROOKLYN	NY	\$291,499
YESHIVA OF KINGS BAY SCHOOL	BROOKLYN	NY	\$289,328
CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS	CHICAGO	IL	\$285,520
CASCADE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT	ANDERSON	CA	\$285,369
GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED SCH DIST	GARDEN GROVE	CA	\$275,720
SHALOM TORAH CENTERS	LAKEWOOD	NJ	\$269,925
NAZLINI COMMUNITY SCHOOL	GANADO	AZ	\$258,051
BNOS MELECH OF LAKEWOOD	LAKEWOOD	NJ	\$254,707
SAINT MARTIN DE PORRES HIGH SCHOOL	CLEVELAND	OH	\$246,641
EXPLORE EXCEL CHARTER SCH	BROOKLYN	NY	\$237,354
GREEN PASTURES CHRISTIAN ACAD	DECATUR	GA	\$234,824
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUB SCHS	WASHINGTON	DC	\$233,784
EXPLORE EXCEED CHARTER SCHOOL	BROOKLYN	NY	\$228,547
CHURCH OF GOD HOLINESS ACADEMY	CHRISTIANSTED	VI	\$210,375
RISING STAR ACADEMY	UNION CITY	NJ	\$209,759
VILLAGE ACADEMY	WASHINGTON	DC	\$209,205
EL MONTE UNION HIGH SCH DIST	EL MONTE	CA	\$208,818
VINELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT	VINELAND	NJ	\$205,748
HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	HAYWARD	CA	\$195,724
HARVEY PUBLIC LIBRARY DISTRICT	HARVEY	IL	\$192,907
CHEDER LUBAVITCH	MORRISTOWN	NJ	\$187,132
REVERE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	REVERE	MA	\$182,304
MONTEBELLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	MONTEBELLO	CA	\$175,847
MONTEREY CO OFFICE OF EDUC	SALINAS	CA	\$173,232
WHEELING SCHOOL DISTRICT 21	WHEELING	IL	\$168,960
ESCALON UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST	ESCALON	CA	\$168,153
BAYONNE SCHOOL DISTRICT	BAYONNE	NJ	\$157,523
HINDS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	RAYMOND	MS	\$154,131
OREGON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 62	OREGON CITY	OR	\$150,562
AF-BROWNSVILLE CHARTER SCHOOL	BROOKLYN	NY	\$146,958
KIPP METRO ALTANTA COLLABORATIVE	ATLANTA	GA	\$145,087

MARION COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	OCALA	FL	\$144,503
MARANA SCHOOL DISTRICT 6	MARANA	AZ	\$140,434
LAKWOOD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	LAKWOOD	OH	\$138,607
PRIMAVERA TECHNICAL LEARNING CENTER	CHANDLER	AZ	\$132,841
MY CHOICE ACADEMY	RIVIERA BEACH	FL	\$131,533
SINAI ACADEMIC CENTER	BROOKLYN	NY	\$129,966
RIPON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	RIPON	CA	\$123,053
KIPP INDIANAPOLIS COLLEGE PREPARATORY	INDIANAPOLIS	IN	\$109,093
VILLAGE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY	CHICAGO	IL	\$107,935
YESHIVAT OHR HATORAH	BROOKLYN	NY	\$103,174
JEWISH EDUCATIONAL MEDIA	BROOKLYN	NY	\$100,002
JEFFERSON ELEM SCHOOL DISTRICT	TRACY	CA	\$96,397
NEWTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	DECATUR	MS	\$95,194
CONGREGATION KOL TORAH	BROOKLYN	NY	\$93,121
BORREGO SPRINGS UNIF SCH DIST	BORREGO SPRING	CA	\$92,863
FORT BEND INDEP SCHOOL DIST	SUGAR LAND	TX	\$92,299
ROWE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMIN OFFICES	CHICAGO	IL	\$79,776
COLORADO RIVER UN H S DIST 2	BULLHEAD CITY	AZ	\$77,567
D. C. BILINGUAL PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL	WASHINGTON	DC	\$74,743
ERIE UNIF SCH DIST 101	ERIE	KS	\$72,645
TIERRA ENCANTADA CHARTER SCHOOL	SANTA FE	NM	\$70,895
DINUBA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	DINUBA	CA	\$69,844
THE CHILDREN'S STOREFRONT	NEW YORK	NY	\$69,807
EDWARD B COLE CHARTER SCHOOL	SANTA ANA	CA	\$66,916
HAWTHORNE CEDAR KNOLLS U F S D	HAWTHORNE	NY	\$65,956
MAIMONIDES HEBREW DAY SCHOOL	FORT MEYERS	FL	\$64,895
SAFE HARBOR AT INDIAN OAKS ACADEMY	MANTENO	IL	\$62,307
KIN DAH LICHIL OLTA	GANADO	AZ	\$53,986
OSWEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST 504	OSWEGO	KS	\$50,246

E-Rate

Funding Year 2013, Quarter 4 (Oct-Dec) Commitments

(greater than \$50,000)

Applicant	City	State	Amount Committed
2005 Commitments			
DALLAS INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	DALLAS	TX	\$3,732,568
2007 Commitments			
DALLAS INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	DALLAS	TX	\$4,281,868
WILLIAMSBURG CO SCHOOL DIST	KINGSTREE	SC	\$565,563
HAMPTON COUNTY SCHOOL DIST 1	HAMPTON	SC	\$51,282
2008 Commitments			
DALLAS INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	DALLAS	TX	\$12,256,463
2009 Commitments			
DALLAS INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	DALLAS	TX	\$32,190,083
SOUTH SAN ANTONIO IND SCH DIST	SAN ANTONIO	TX	\$129,520
Erie 1 BOCES	West Seneca	NY	\$52,735
2010 Commitments			
DALLAS INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	DALLAS	TX	\$34,142,935
SOUTH SAN ANTONIO IND SCH DIST	SAN ANTONIO	TX	\$716,881
2011 Commitments			
MORENO VALLEY UNIF SCHOOL DIST	MORENO VALLEY	CA	\$13,963,182
SOUTH SAN ANTONIO IND SCH DIST	SAN ANTONIO	TX	\$3,231,242
KIPP INC.	HOUSTON	TX	\$2,262,942
FORT WAYNE COMM SCHOOL DIST	FORT WAYNE	IN	\$1,713,284
BUFFALO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	BUFFALO	NY	\$1,712,777
DALLAS INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	DALLAS	TX	\$1,019,748
LA JOYA INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	LA JOYA	TX	\$1,000,143
APPALACHIA INT UNIT 8	ALTOONA	PA	\$808,176
CLEVELAND HTS-UNIV HTS DIST	CLEVELAND HEIGHTS	OH	\$797,430
PITTSBURG UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	PITTSBURG	CA	\$733,411
NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	NEW YORK	NY	\$453,350
SENECA HIGHLANDS IU 9	SMETHPORT	PA	\$354,519
UNITED ISD	LAREDO	TX	\$89,951
INTERMEDIATE UNIT 10	WEST DECATUR	PA	\$85,119
BAIS TZIPORAH GIRLS SCHOOL	BROOKLYN	NY	\$67,335
BALDWIN COUNTY BOARD OF EDUC	LOXLEY	AL	\$61,971

2012 Commitments

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS	CHICAGO	IL	\$22,752,833
DALLAS INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	DALLAS	TX	\$11,306,405
SOUTH SAN ANTONIO IND SCH DIST	SAN ANTONIO	TX	\$7,419,007
UNO CHARTER SCHOOL NETWORK	CHIGAGO	IL	\$4,361,036
PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO I S D	PHARR	TX	\$2,322,592
COLUMBUS CITY SCHOOLS	COLUMBUS	OH	\$2,171,452
AUSTIN INDEP SCHOOL DISTRICT	AUSTIN	TX	\$1,718,605
BUFFALO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	BUFFALO	NY	\$1,300,857
TOPPENISH SCHOOL DISTRICT 202	TOPPENISH	WA	\$1,211,433
ASPIRA PENNSYLVANIA	PHILADELPHIA	PA	\$1,032,371
SYRACUSE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	SYRACUSE	NY	\$821,053
IDEA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	WESLACO	TX	\$777,106
APPALACHIA INT UNIT 8	ALTOONA	PA	\$634,374
LEARN CHARTER SCHOOL NETWORK	CHICAGO	IL	\$614,583
NORTH LAWNSDALE COLLEGE PREP. CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	CHICAGO	IL	\$613,796
WHITEHALL CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	WHITEHALL	OH	\$608,338
Erie 1 BOCES	West Seneca	NY	\$590,819
CHANDLER UNIF SCHOOL DIST 80	CHANDLER	AZ	\$569,582
MONTEREY CO OFFICE OF EDUC	SALINAS	CA	\$556,378
PITTSBURG UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	PITTSBURG	CA	\$555,666
NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	NEW YORK	NY	\$456,684
ADELPHOI EDUCATION	LATROBE	PA	\$411,680
IRVINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	IRVINGTON	NJ	\$368,142
CHAFFEY UNION HIGH SCH DIST	ONTARIO	CA	\$368,097
LINCOLN LEADERSHIP ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL	ALLENTOWN	PA	\$340,015
EVERETT SCHOOL DISTRICT	EVERETT	MA	\$305,177
DADE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	TRENTON	GA	\$278,140
SENECA HIGHLANDS IU 9	SMETHPORT	PA	\$274,709
CRISTO REY PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL	PHILADELPHIA	PA	\$268,742
IMANI EDUCATION CIRCLE	PHILADELPHIA	PA	\$259,222
HIALEAH SR HIGH SCHOOL	HIALEAH	FL	\$257,483
IMHOTEP CHARTER SCHOOL	PHILADELPHIA	PA	\$233,001
TUBA CITY UNIF SCHOOL DIST 15	TUBA CITY	AZ	\$196,597
RICH TWP HIGH SCHOOL DIST 227	OLYMPIA FIELDS	IL	\$186,750
DR. ROBERT KETTERER CHARTER SCHOOL	LATROBE	PA	\$176,617
NORLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL	MIAMI	FL	\$139,744
LEISURE CITY K8 CENTER	HOMESTEAD	FL	\$131,223
BISCAYNE GARDENS ELEM SCHOOL	MIAMI	FL	\$127,661
LILLIE C. EVANS K-8 CENTER	MIAMI	FL	\$116,284
GREYNOLDS PARK ELEM SCHOOL	MIAMI	FL	\$115,219
CHARLES HADLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MIAMI	FL	\$112,737
TORAH ACADEMY LAWRENCE CEDARHURST-HIGH SCHOOL	FAR ROCKAWAY	NY	\$112,563
EDWARD WHIGHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MIAMI	FL	\$110,525
NORTH MIAMI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	NORTH MIAMI	FL	\$109,983
MADIE IVES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	MIAMI	FL	\$107,803
CARDINAL HAYES HIGH SCHOOL	BRONX	NY	\$98,517
INTERMEDIATE UNIT 10	WEST DECATUR	PA	\$91,350
NATURAL BRIDGE ELEM SCHOOL	MIAMI	FL	\$90,783
HARRISON CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT	HARRISON	NY	\$81,924
EDISON CHARTER ACADEMY	SAN FRANCISCO	CA	\$74,740
REGIONAL EDUC SERV AGENCY VIII	MARTINSBURG	WV	\$62,840
CONGREGATION NOAM E. LIZENSK	NANUET	NY	\$61,322

TechMIS publication provided by

Education TURNKEY Electronic Distribution

256 North Washington Street, Falls Church, VA 22046

703/536-2310, fax 703/536-3225, cblaschke@edturnkey.com

Education TURNKEY Electronic Distribution©, Vol. 19, No. 2, February 20, 2014

