

On-line Appendix

Paul Manna and Laura L. Ryan. 2011. Competitive grants and educational federalism: President Obama's Race to the Top program in theory and practice. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*.

Contact author: Paul Manna, Associate Professor, Department of Government and the Thomas Jefferson Program in Public Policy, College of William & Mary, pmanna@wm.edu, 757-221-3024, <http://pmanna.people.wm.edu/>.

This on-line appendix contains two items referenced in our article. First, we present a list of data sources. Second, we provide supplementary analyses to show bivariate relationships between our independent variables in Table 2 and our independent variables in Table 3. From the article, Table 2 and Table 3 examine the same dependent variable: state RTTT proposal scores. To recap, here are our independent variables from those two tables.

Table 2. Predicting state RTTT proposal scores using measures of capacity, need, and politics

- Received application support from Gates
- Logged population density
- % education budget cut FY09 to FY10
- % residents in poverty
- Governor is Republican

Table 3. Predicting state RTTT proposal scores using external assessments of state policy and prior state academic performance

- Data systems quality
- Standards/accountability/teacher policy quality
- Adopted Common Core standards
- Charter law permissiveness
- NAEP achievement gains overall, 2003-2009
- NAEP achievement gap progress between poor and others, 2003-2009

Table A1. Data sources

| Variable | Source (date last accessed) |
|--|---|
| RTTT patterns of application and overall scores | U.S. Department of Education, http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase1-resources.html and http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase2-resources.html (fall 2010). |
| Received support from Gates Foundation | <i>Education Week</i> Politics K-12 blog by Michele McNeil and Alyson Klein, http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2009/12/14_states_fail_gates_race_to_t.html (November 2010). |
| Population density | U.S. Census Bureau. Population estimates from http://www.census.gov/popest/datasets.html and total land area from http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/geography_environment.html (November 2009 and February 2010, respectively). |
| % education budget cut FY09 to FY10 | National Governors' Association and the National Association of State Budget Officers. 2010. <i>The Fiscal Survey of the States: An Update of State Fiscal Conditions</i> . Fall. Washington, DC: National Association of State Budget Officers. |
| % residents in poverty | U.S. Census Bureau. Historical Poverty Tables—People, http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/histpov/perindex.html (November 2009). |
| Governor partisanship | National Governors' Association list of current governors, http://www.nga.org (February 26, 2010). |
| Data system elements and policy ratings | Data Quality Campaign, http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/survey/states (October 2010). |
| <i>Quality Counts</i> ratings of standards, assessments, and accountability systems and teacher policy | Editorial Projects in Education, 2010 <i>Quality Counts</i> report, http://www.edweek.org/ew/qc/index.html (October 2010). |
| Adoption of Common Core standards | Common Core State Standards Initiative, http://www.corestandards.org/in-the-states (November 2010). |
| Charter law permissiveness | Center on Education Reform, http://www.charterschoolresearch.com/ (November 2010). |
| NAEP scores | U.S. Department of Education, NAEP Data Explorer, http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/ (September 2008 and September 2010). |

Table A2. Bivariate correlations using continuous independent variables in Table 2 and continuous/ordinal independent variables in Table 3

| Table 3 independent variables | Table 2 independent variables | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Logged population density | % education budget cut FY09 to FY10 | % residents in poverty |
| Data systems quality | 0.13 | -0.17 | 0.13 |
| Standards / accountability / teacher policy | 0.36** | 0.30** | 0.42** |
| Charter law permissiveness | 0.31** | 0.18 | -0.05 |
| NAEP achievement gains overall, 2003-09 | 0.36** | 0.06 | -0.05 |
| NAEP achievement gap progress between poor and others, 2003-09 | 0.41** | 0.29** | -0.02 |

Note: *p<.10, **p<.05. N=46 for all cells. Cells report correlation coefficients.

Table A3. Differences in means using continuous independent variables from Table 2 and binary independent variable from Table 3.

| Table 3 independent variable | Table 2 independent variables | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Logged population density | % education budget cut FY09 to FY10 | % residents in poverty |
| Adopted Common Core standards | 1.18** | 2.00 | 0.80 |

Note: *p<.10, **p<.05. N=46 for all cells. Cells report the difference in means of the column variables between states that had adopted Common Core standards and states that had not adopted Common Core standards. On average, states that adopted Common Core standards had higher logged population densities, higher percentage cuts to their education budget, and higher percentages of residents in poverty. Only the population density comparison is statistically significant.

Table A4. Differences in means using binary independent variables from Table 2 and continuous/ordinal independent variables from Table 3.

| Table 3 independent variables | Table 2 independent variables | |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Received Gates foundation support | Governor is Republican |
| Data systems quality | 1.04 | -0.97 |
| Standards / accountability / teacher policy | 4.88** | -0.04 |
| Charter law permissiveness | 0.35 | 0.36 |
| NAEP achievement gains overall, 2003-09 | 0.48 | 0.52 |
| NAEP achievement gap progress between poor and others, 2003-09 | 0.73 | 0.80 |

Note: * $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$. $N=46$ for all cells. Cells in the first column report the difference in means of the row variables between states that received Gates Foundation support for their RTTT proposals and states that did not receive support. Cells in the second column examine differences in means between states that have Republican governors and states that do not. The first row reads that states that received Gates support had higher data systems quality on average; states with Republican governors had lower data systems quality on average; neither of these differences are statistically significant.

Table A5. Cross-tabulation between binary independent variables from Table 2 and binary independent variables from Table 3

A. Republican governor and adopted Common Core standards

| | | Republican governor (Table 2) | |
|---|-----|-------------------------------|--------------|
| | | No | Yes |
| Adopted Common Core standards (Table 3) | No | 7 (26.9) | 8 (40.0) |
| | Yes | 19 (73.1) | 12 (60.0) |

B. Received Gates Foundation support and adopted Common Core standards

| | | Received Gates Foundation support (Table 2) | |
|---|-----|---|--------------|
| | | No | Yes |
| Adopted Common Core standards (Table 3) | No | 12 (52.2) | 3 (13.0) |
| | Yes | 11 (47.8) | 20 (87.0) |

Note: $N=46$ for both parts. Cell counts with column percentages in parenthesis are reported. Part A: Chi-square statistic = 0.88 ($p=0.35$). Part B: Chi-square statistic = 8.01 ($p=0.005$).