



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

December 21, 2012

The Honorable Jack Markell
Office of the Governor
Carvel State Office Building
820 N. French Street 12th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

Dear Governor Markell:

I am writing in response to Delaware's request to amend its approved Race to the Top grant project. Between August and October 2012, the State submitted amendment requests to the U.S. Department of Education (Department). As you are aware, the Department has the authority to approve amendments to your plan and budget, provided that such a change does not alter the scope or objectives of the approved proposal. On October 4, 2011, the Department sent a letter and revised "Grant Amendment Submission Process" document to Governors of grantee States indicating the process by which amendments would be reviewed and approved or denied. To determine whether approval could be granted, the Department has applied the conditions noted in the document, and compared it with the Race to the Top program Principles, which are also included in that document.

I approve the following amendments:

- For the "Longitudinal Data System (LDS)" project, shift the unspent Year 1 LDS funds (\$1,368,731) into Year 2 (\$942,130), Year 3 (\$226,601), and Year 4 (\$200,000). In a March 15, 2011 amendment, the Department previously approved a one-year delay in the Warehouse and Dashboard portion of the project. The budget delays related to this shift were not initially reflected in that amendment.

www.ed.gov

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

- For the “Partnership Zone (PZ) Implementation” project, adjust the budget associated with the implementation of Delaware’s first cohort of PZ schools by shifting \$2,909,195 from Year 4 into Year 1 (\$946,615), Year 2 (\$1,387,565), and Year 3 (\$575,015). The original Year 1 budget for this project did not have any funding specifically budgeted; however, Year 1 spending totaled \$946,615. DDOE’s original budget did not take into account the need for PZ schools to access funds during their planning phase in either Year 1 or Year 2. The budget is revised to align with the Scope of Work that included implementation in Year 1 and Year 2 that was not initially adequately reflected in the original project-level budget.
- For the “IHE MOUs” project, originally, the Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) envisioned signing memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with the institutions of higher education (IHEs) that would formalize and define how all data were to be shared, safeguarded, and governed. However, additional research into best practices for interagency data governance suggested legislation and changes to DDOE regulations would be needed before MOUs acceptable to all affected institutions could be formalized. In the State’s original Scope of Work, DDOE estimated that MOUs would be signed by in-State IHEs by school year (SY) 2011-2012. The State revised the timeline for finalizing the MOUs in order to pursue legislation and change DDOE regulations. The State now expects MOUs with the IHEs to be completed by January 2013.

The Department acknowledges the change in timeline related to this part of the State’s Scope of Work due to the change in approach. It is our understanding that Delaware will still accomplish within the grant period all of the activities and deliverables articulated in its approved application.

It is our understanding that the amendments described above will not result in a change in your State’s performance measures and outcomes, nor will they substantially change the scope of the project.

In addition to these amendments, I acknowledge the following delay in DDOE’s timeline:

- For the “Statewide Educator Recruitment/Talent Management Website/Portal” project, DDOE missed its initial timelines to create the proposal for the recruitment portal and finalize the technical infrastructure for the recruitment port due to additional time needed to discuss the portal with local human resource directors, to build internal SEA capacity, and to complete a full and competitive RFP process. As a result, DDOE has requested to adjust timelines for several dependent deliverables (e.g., developing the recruitment portal, unveiling the revamped web portal) so that both DDOE and the Department can manage to these adjusted timelines moving forward. The Department acknowledges the timeline delays and

missed milestones related to this part of the State's Scope of Work. It is our understanding that Delaware will still accomplish within the grant period all of the activities and deliverables articulated in its approved application.

Additionally, Delaware clarified its SY 2010-2011 performance measures in sections (D)(2) and (D)(3). The Race to the Top application required performance measures for specific sub-criterion. In "Great Teachers and Leaders," section (D)(2): improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance, the Department requested information on the percentage of participating local educational agencies (LEAs) that implement and use information from qualifying evaluation systems to inform various human capital decisions. In its original application, Delaware provided performance measures in section (D)(2) that did not align with the federal definition for qualifying evaluation systems. As a result, Delaware has updated these SY 2010-2011 measures to align with the federal definition and reflect a more accurate percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems over the course of the grant cycle.

Additionally, in "Great Teachers and Leaders" section (D)(3): ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals, the Department requested information on educator rating categories (e.g., highly effective, ineffective). A qualifying evaluation system must be in place before States would be able to report meaningful data on educator effectiveness ratings. Thus, Delaware has also updated the SY 2010-2011 performance measures in (D) (3), to align with its approved timeline for implementing a qualifying evaluation system aligned with the federal definition. The attached chart provides clarifications (in bold italics) for the following measures: (D) (2) (ii), (D) (2) (iv) (a-d), (D) (3) (i), and (D) (3) (ii).

Please note that this letter will be posted on the Department's website as a record of the amendments. I am confident that Delaware will continue its bold, comprehensive reform efforts. If you need any assistance or have any questions regarding Race to the Top, please do not hesitate to contact Delaware's Race to the Top Program Officers, Patrick Carr at 202-708-8196 or patrick.carr@ed.gov or Meredith Farace at 202-401-8368 or meredith.farace@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

//s//

Ann Whalen
Director, Policy and Program Implementation
Implementation and Support Unit

cc: Mark Murphy
Sara Kerr

Performance Measures for (D)(2)

Notes: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in this application package in Section II. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii). (Baseline data and annual targets). The revised performance measure, aligned with the federal definition of qualifying evaluation system, is indicated in bold italics.

Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	100 <i>N/A</i>	100 <i>N/A</i>	100	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	100 <i>N/A</i>	100 <i>N/A</i>	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:	-	-	-	-	-
(D)(2)(iv)(a)	Developing teachers and principals.	100 <i>N/A</i>	100 <i>N/A</i>	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Compensating teachers and principals.	5 <i>N/A</i>	5 <i>N/A</i>	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Promoting teachers and principals.	100 <i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Retaining effective teachers and principals.	100 <i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.	100 <i>N/A</i>	100 <i>N/A</i>	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.	100 <i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	100	100	100

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)

Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs. (Baseline data and annual targets). The revised performance measure, aligned with the federal definition of qualifying evaluation system, is indicated in bold italics.

Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	5 <i>N/A</i>	13	20	25
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	25 <i>N/A</i>	29	32	35
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	25 <i>N/A</i>	21	17	12
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	5 <i>N/A</i>	4	3	2
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	5 <i>N/A</i>	13	20	25

Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	25 N/A	29	32	35
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	25 N/A	20	15	10
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	5 N/A	4	3	2

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii)

Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs. (Baseline data and annual targets. The revised performance measure, aligned with the federal definition of qualifying evaluation system, is indicated in bold italics.

Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	60 <i>N/A</i>	68	75	80
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	60 <i>N/A</i>	68	75	80
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	60 <i>N/A</i>	68	75	80
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	60 <i>N/A</i>	68	75	80