



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

January 3, 2014

The Honorable Neil Abercrombie
Office of the Governor
State Capitol, Executive Chambers
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Governor Abercrombie:

I am writing in response to Hawaii's amendment request related to its school year 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 performance measure targets for sections (D)(2) and (D)(3) of its approved Race to the Top application. In the July 26, 2013 amendment approval letter, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) conditioned approval of amendments related to the teacher evaluation system upon the State submitting updated school year (SY) 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 targets for its performance measures in sections (D)(2) and (D)(3) no later than October 4, 2013. Based on the updated targets in this amendment request, the State has fulfilled the condition specified.

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.

The Department approves the State's revised performance measure targets for SY 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 in sections (D)(2) and (D)(3) of its Race to the Top plan.

- 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, Hawaii did not include performance measures in section (D)(2). 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. In its original application, Hawaii provided performance measures in section (D)(3) with a note that it would provide updated targets once it had finalized the timeline for implementation of *qualifying* evaluation systems.ⁱ

- In response to the Department's conditional approval described in the July 26, 2013 letter, Hawaii submitted performance measures for section (D)(2) and updated performance measures for section (D) (3) to align with its revised timeline for implementing a qualifying evaluation system. The attached chart provides revised targets for SY 2013-2014 and SY 2014-2015 for the following measures: (D)(2)(i), (D)(2)(ii), (D)(2)(iv), (D)(3)(i), and (D)(3) (ii).

It is our understanding that this amendment will not substantially change the scope and objectives of the work. Please note that this letter will be posted on the Department's website as a record of the amendment.

If you need any assistance or have any questions regarding Race to the Top, please do not hesitate to contact Hawaii's Race to the Top Program Officer, Rebecca Zazove, at 202-260-1425 or Rebecca.Zazove@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

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

cc: Superintendent Kathryn Matayoshi
Yvonne Lau
Stephen Schatz

Performance Measures for (D)(2)		End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
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).			
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Targets	
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	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	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Compensating teachers and principals.	0	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Promoting teachers and principals.	0	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Retaining effective teachers and principals.	0	100
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.	0	100
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.	0	100

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)		End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
<i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>			
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Targets	
(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).	20	23
(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).	25	28
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	5	4
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	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).	25	26
(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).	25	28
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	5	4
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	3	2

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii)		End of SY 2013-2014	End of SY 2014-2015
<i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>			
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Targets	
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	85	90
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	85	90
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	85	90
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	85	90

ⁱ The State was unable to provide revised targets for these performance measures until it had secured a ratified contract with the Hawaii State Teachers Association (HSTA). This is because without this contract, the State did not have authority to fully implement a teacher evaluation system that includes all the elements included in its approved application. In April 2013, HIDOE and HSTA entered into a ratified contract.