



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

July 6, 2011

The Honorable Andrew M. Cuomo
Governor of New York State
New York State Capitol Building
Albany, NY 12224

Dear Governor Cuomo:

I am writing in response to New York's request to amend its approved Race to the Top grant project. Between March 20 and June 22, 2011, 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 January 6, 2011, the Department sent a letter and "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 am pleased to approve the amendments included in the attached chart. In its approved budget, New York blended a number of resources to fund its Race to the Top plan. In addition to State and Federal funds, it included funds from a class action settlement with Microsoft. Subsequently, the State received additional guidance about allowable uses of the Microsoft settlement funds and requested amendments to better align these funds with specific projects that are consistent with the allowable uses. The State's total Race to the Top investment remains the same. The revised information and metrics are also reflected in the State's Scope of Work. Please note that this letter and chart, as well as the attached Appendix, will be posted on the Department's website as a record of the amendments; we also encourage you to share these changes with the

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.

various stakeholders involved with implementing the important work of this grant. It is our understanding that the amendments will not result in a change in your State's outcomes, nor will they substantially change the scope of work.

I am confident that New York 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 your Race to the Top Program Officer, Rachel Vessey, at 202-453-5545 or rachel.vessey@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

//s//

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

cc: Acting Commissioner John King
Rebecca Kennard, Executive Director, Race to the Top Performance Management Office

Enclosures: 2

New York Race to the Top
 Chart of Grant Project Changes

Item #	Grant project areas affected	Specific Project	Description of change(s)
1	A: State Success Factors	Project A2: Office of District Services	<p>(1) Add a total of \$1,169,530 to this project with funds from Project E3: Office of Innovative School Models, below, as follows: (A) Provide \$1,000,000 to the 23 currently participating local educational agencies (LEAs) that are either new charter schools (opened since the Race to the Top application was submitted) or Special Act LEAs. These LEAs are not eligible for the “supplemental funding to participating LEAs” granted based on 2009-2010 Title I allocations. The State has also budgeted for additional charter schools to join in future years, allowing for a greater number of students to be directly impacted by the reform initiatives funded by Race to the Top; (B) Provide \$169,530 in funding to support State-level professional development for Network Teams, which are a key component of the State’s reform plan. As the State developed its implementation plan and finalized allocations for its participating LEAs, it became clear that many LEAs would need additional support for Network Teams. For this reason, New York has added funds to this project to provide substantial direct training for the Network Teams to prepare them to offer effective professional development and implementation support to their LEAs.</p> <p>(2) Add \$420,000 to this project with funds from Project E2: Continuum of Supports for Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) Schools. The additional funds will be used to support professional development activities for Network Teams serving LEAs with PLA schools. This support is necessary for the same reason as described in (1) above.</p> <p>(3) Clarify that all Race to the Top-funded Network Teams will begin operations in year 2. The initial application noted that in year 1, Network Teams would be deployed to the LEAs engaging in 2010-11 turnaround interventions of persistently lowest achieving schools. The State has requested this change in order to spend the first year planning for Statewide implementation by assisting LEAs with creating and staffing their Network Teams and by planning for the summer 2011 institute.</p>
2	A: State Success Factors	Project A1: Performance Management Office	<p>(1) Increase SEA capacity by increasing the budget for this project by \$2,218,479. The funds will be used to support salaries and benefits for five additional State staff. These employees will help coordinate the State’s transition to new assessments, manage more than 24 RFPs, and oversee communications, compliance, monitoring, and special projects. This project will be supported by funds originally allocated for charter school facilities competitive grants in Project E3: Office of Innovative School Models, described below.</p>

Item #	Grant project areas affected	Specific Project	Description of change(s)
3	C: Data Systems to Support Instruction	Project C1: Construction and Rollout of Data Portal/ Statewide Instructional Reporting and Improvement System	<p>(1) Adjust project timeline as follows: begin project in June 2011, pilot in May 2012, and conduct Statewide rollout in November 2012. The State had initially planned to begin the project with a pilot beginning in October 2010 and complete Statewide rollout by October 2012; this delay in starting is due to internal processes related to procurement/contracts; in addition, the State has clarified its interim milestones in order to better align the pieces of this project with the final timeframe for Statewide rollout.</p> <p>(2) Postpone expenditures in order to reflect amended timelines, moving year 1 funding into year 2.</p>
4	C: Data Systems to Support Instruction	Project C2: Integration of Higher Education (public and independent)	<p>(1) Delay project from year 1 until year 2, in order to better align expenditures of these funds with the State's schedule for integrating the data systems of both the State University of New York (SUNY) and the City University of New York (CUNY).</p> <p>(2) Postpone expenditures in order to reflect amended timelines, moving year 1 funding into year 2.</p>
5	D: Great Teachers and Leaders	Project D3: Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Programs	<p>(1) Replace \$9,154,100 of Microsoft Settlement monies originally budgeted for this project with Race to the Top funds. Since submitting its budget and application, the State has received additional guidance and clarification about allowable uses of settlement funds, and has redistributed funding between projects accordingly. There is no net change to the total project budget.</p>
6	D: Great Teachers and Leaders	Project D4: Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Programs	<p>(2) Replace \$7,050,300 of Microsoft Settlement monies originally budgeted for this project with Race to the Top funds. Since submitting its budget and application, the State has received additional guidance and clarification about allowable uses of settlement funds, and has redistributed project funding between projects accordingly. Reallocate \$20,000 from this project to support Project D7: Teacher and Principal Evaluation.</p>

Item #	Grant project areas affected	Specific Project	Description of change(s)
7	D: Great Teachers and Leaders	Project D5: Leadership Academies for School Principals	<p>(1) Reallocate funding between Race to the Top, Title I § 1003(a), and Microsoft Settlement monies. The approved budget proposed \$6,000,000 of Race to the Top funds, \$40,000,000 of Title I § 1003(a) funds, and \$3,000,000 of Microsoft Settlement funds. The amended project budget will include \$9,795,600 of Race to the Top funding, \$0 of Title I § 1003(a) funds, and \$39,204,400 of Microsoft Settlement funds. Since submitting its budget and application, the State has received additional guidance and clarification about allowable uses of settlement funds, and has redistributed project funding between projects accordingly. There is no net change to the total project budget.</p> <p>(2) Launch the Academies at the start of the 2011-2012 school year instead of winter 2011, due to the time required to complete the Microsoft Settlement negotiations and finalize funding support for the Academies.</p> <p>(3) Adjust expenditures accordingly, postponing year 1 expenditures and reallocating project funds evenly across years 2-4, based on the amended timeline.</p>
8	D: Great Teachers and Leaders	Project D6: Model Induction Programs to Prepare Teachers to be Teacher Leaders	<p>(1) Replace \$20,000,000 of Microsoft Settlement funding for this project with Race to the Top funds. Since submitting its budget and application, the State has received additional guidance and clarification about allowable uses of settlement funds, and has redistributed project funding between projects accordingly. There is no net change to the total project budget.</p> <p>(2) Issue RFP in September 2011, announce awards in December 2011. This is a change from the application's plan to issue RFP in February 2011 and announce awards in September 2011. Full implementation of local pilot programs will occur in September 2012. This delay is necessary due to further implementation planning and the State's decision to focus its finite resources on the launch of Project D7: Teacher and Principal Evaluation, and its related RFPs, before moving to other related projects.</p> <p>(3) Adjust expenditures accordingly, postponing year 1 expenditures and reallocating project funds evenly across years 2-4, based on the amended timeline.</p>

Item #	Grant project areas affected	Specific Project	Description of change(s)
9	D: Great Teachers and Leaders	Project D7: Teacher and Principal Evaluation (formerly: Adoption and Development of Growth Model)	<p>(1) Increase project budget by \$11,920,000 to \$14,500,000 with funding from other Section D projects. This project was initially designed to develop the value-added student achievement growth model (used to inform the evaluations). When the State began implementation, it became apparent that the success of its reforms in this area would be dependent on successful implementation of the new teacher and principal evaluation system at the LEA level. Thus, it has requested to increase the budget for this project to support the development of additional supports, resources, and professional development for teachers, principals, and district administrators. Specifically, funds would be used for the following deliverables: (A) development of the value-added model: \$5,000,000; (B) piloting evaluation and data management tools/software with a sample of participating LEAs: \$2,000,000; and (C) implementation training / development of online resources for LEAs (and associated in-person training via regional networks): \$7,500,000. The majority of the increased funding will come from two other projects, Project D8: Innovative Compensation Incentive Fund and Project D9: Transfer fund, described below. The State will also transfer \$20,000 to this project from Project D4: Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Programs.</p> <p>(2) Postpone year 1 contractual/equipment expenditures until year 2 due to the State requiring additional time for detailed implementation planning and for consultation with its stakeholders.</p> <p>(3) Rename this project to “Teacher and Principal Evaluation” to more accurately reflect the State’s amended plans and additional activities related to implementation of the evaluation system.</p>
10	D: Great Teachers and Leaders	Project D8: Innovative Compensation Incentive Fund	<p>(1) Reduce the total budget for this project by \$8,000,000 to \$22,000,000; transfer the savings to Project D7: Teacher and Principal Evaluation, above. This change will not affect the amount of grant funding offered to individual educators but rather will reduce the number of grants from 1,000 to 730. (The State also plans to use its \$40,500,000 in Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) funds to support the overall goals of the project by providing incentive grants to attract and retain highly-effective teachers and principals in 80 high-need schools in four of the State’s largest urban districts: New York City, Rochester, Syracuse, and Yonkers.)</p> <p>(2) Alter the timing for awarding grants from October 2011 to summer 2012. This is because awards made under this project are contingent on prospective awardees being appropriately identified through the State’s new evaluation system, which will not have ratings results for use until the close of the 2011-2012 school year.</p> <p>(3) Adjust expenditures accordingly, reallocating project funds evenly across years 3-4, based on the amended timeline.</p>

Item #	Grant project areas affected	Specific Project	Description of change(s)
11	D: Great Teachers and Leaders	Project D9: Transfer Fund	<p>(1) Reduce the total budget for this project by \$3,900,000 to \$35,100,000; transfer the savings to Project D7: Teacher and Principal Evaluation, described above in Item 9. This change will not affect the amount of grant funding offered to individual educators but rather will reduce the number of grants from 1,300 to 1,170. (As in Project D8: Innovative Compensation Incentive Fund, the State also plans to use its \$40,500,000 in TIF grant funds to support the overall goals of the project by providing incentive grants to attract and retain highly-effective teachers and principals in 80 high-need schools in four of the State’s largest urban districts: New York City, Rochester, Syracuse, and Yonkers.)</p> <p>(2) Alter the timing for awarding grants from school year 2011-12 to summer 2012. This is because awards made under this project are contingent on prospective awardees being appropriately identified through the State’s new evaluation system, which will not have ratings results for use until the close of the 2011-2012 school year.</p> <p>(3) Adjust expenditures accordingly, reallocating project funds evenly across years 3-4, based on the amended timeline.</p>
12	Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	Project E2: Continuum of Supports for PLA Schools (formerly External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation & Turnaround, ETACIT)	<p>(1) Reassign management of project to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) with no impact on the six original goals of this project. The State analyzed the pool of potential bidders who could do all activities required by this project and determined that it could more effectively and efficiently manage the activities in-house.</p> <p>(2) Move funding originally intended for professional development and conducting outreach to potential lead partners to two other projects, as follows: (A) \$1,500,000 to Project E3: State School Turnaround Office to better align resources and goals among projects; and (B) \$420,000 to Project A2 for professional development for Network Teams serving LEAs with PLA schools. In both cases, the State believes that these movements will promote administrative efficiencies while accomplishing the same goals.</p> <p>(3) Rename the project to “Continuum of Supports for PLA Schools” in order to more accurately reflect the reconfigured services to be delivered under the amended project.</p>

Item #	Grant project areas affected	Specific Project	Description of change(s)
13	Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	Project E3: Office of Innovative School Models	<p>(1) Reallocate \$10,000,000 of the amount originally budgeted for charter school facilities competitive grants in the following manner: (A) \$1,000,000 to Project A2: Office of District Services, for funding to participating new charters and Special Act schools as described above; (B) \$6,500,000 to Project E4: School Innovation Fund in order to supplement the funding for this project, described below; (C) \$169,530 to Project A2: Office of District Services, for training for Network Teams, including those LEAs with PLA schools and charter schools, as described above; and (D) \$2,330,470 to Project A1: Performance Management Office (PMO), for hiring five additional staff to perform administrative and oversight duties for the PMO, as described above. The State has demonstrated the potential value of investing additional resources in existing charter schools and accelerating innovation across the State; in addition it believes that the advancement of similar goals can be executed through other programs such as the Charter Schools Development and Stimulus Fund, which provides assistance to applicants for planning purposes and to approved charter schools for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of school facilities.</p> <p>(2) Transfer \$1,500,000 from Project E2: Continuum of Supports for PLA Schools for outreach and professional development to better align resources and goals among projects, as described above.</p>

Item #	Grant project areas affected	Specific Project	Description of change(s)
14	Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	Project E4: School Innovation Fund (formerly: Secondary School Innovation Fund)	<p>(1) Expand this project to a total of \$43,860,000 with the addition of funding from two other projects: (A) Project E3 (\$6,500,000), described above; and (B) Project I2: Full Service Schools (\$5,000,000), described below, which would be consolidated under this project without any change in that project’s objective or scope. The State is requesting this additional funding because it plans to eliminate the required match that would have been provided by LEAs participating in this program (see below).</p> <p>(2) Eliminate the requirement for LEAs to provide matching funds with local Race to the Top dollars. Once the State finalized its list of 715 participating LEAs and calculated subgrant allocations, it realized that many LEAs would not have sufficient funding to provide a match, given the other requirements for their use of Race to the Top funds. In order to address the Department’s concern about ensuring that grantees are committed to the work embodied by this project, the State has confirmed that it will select LEAs that have demonstrated local commitment, documented their willingness and capacity to implement improvement strategies, and provided a clear grant proposal demonstrating how they would incorporate these funds with other State and federal funds to support comprehensive plans.</p> <p>(3) Reallocate funding so that this project is funded, in large part, by \$40,000,000 in Title I § 1003(a) funds. This movement of funds is aligned with the State’s reallocation of funds between Race to the Top, the Microsoft Settlement, and Title I § 1003(a) based on guidance about allowable uses of funds.</p> <p>(4) Change the name of this project from “Secondary School Innovation Fund” to “School Innovation Fund” to clarify the State’s intention to make funding available to support local innovation throughout the PreK-12 system.</p>

Item #	Grant project areas affected	Specific Project	Description of change(s)
15	Invitational Priority #3: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes	Project I1: Early Learning Outcomes	<p>(1) Focus \$4,000,000 in Race to the Top funds on the QUALITYstarsNY initiative in conjunction with the New York State Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS), the Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC), and private donors. These Race to the Top funds will allow New York to expand its pilot project to assess the quality of local programs into high-need communities where PLA schools are located, by conducting quality assessments of additional local programs in these targeted communities, based on four categories of standards: learning environment, family engagement, qualifications and experience, and leadership and management. The State will also provide technical assistance to providers whose programs receive less than the highest ratings and develop and disseminate informational/educational materials to parents of young children. These materials will help parents understand how they can support their children's transitions between preschool and kindergarten as well as between kindergarten and the early grades. NYSED will enter into a MOU with the lead agency, which will clearly define respective roles, responsibilities, deliverables, and timelines. The funds will flow to the lead agency on a reimbursement basis as deliverables are completed. The State has confirmed that all other early learning outcome deliverables, with the exception of the parent/caregiver toolkit, are included in Project B1 or within in the work of the Network Teams.</p> <p>(2) Transfer \$3,220,000 previously in Project B3 to Project I1, for a total of \$4,000,000 in contractual services for this project. This amount reflects a more realistic cost estimate. Contract funds would be used principally to support personnel to conduct the program assessments, provide technical assistance and supports targeted to address the needs of early learning programs in high-need communities, and conduct outreach to parents.</p>
16	Invitational Priority #6: School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning	Project I2: Full Service Schools	<p>(1) Transfer \$5 million of Race to the Top funds for this project to Project E4: School Innovation Fund, in order to consolidate grant programs targeting PLA schools and State-identified schools needing improvement and to provide more holistic oversight and consistent management of grant funds. This amendment is a redistribution of funding sources to improve administrative efficiency while accomplishing the same goals.</p>
17	Performance Metrics	N/A	<p>(1) The State has added supplemental metrics throughout its application and clarified or revised a subset of metrics and performance targets. In each instance, the approved State Scope of Work (excerpted in the attached Appendix) includes notations and explanations where New York made a revision since the original application was submitted.</p>



New York: Race to the Top State Scope of Work Performance Metrics Excerpts

May 2011

**THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**

Goals and Overall Performance Targets

The overarching goal of the New York State Board of Regents is to ensure that students graduate from high school ready for college and career success. The Race to the Top award of nearly \$700 million will be used to significantly accelerate our progress toward this goal by considerably narrowing the State’s achievement gap, while simultaneously raising performance overall – even as New York raises expectations for what it means to be “college- and career-ready.” The following performance metrics will be tracked to measure our progress towards this foundational goal.

It is important to note that in July 2010 (one month after submitting our application), the Board of Regents raised cut scores on the 4th and 8th grade ELA and mathematics State assessments and redefined the “college-ready” scores on the ELA and mathematics examinations needed for high school graduation. This policy decision was made after the Board reviewed research showing that these assessments are strong leading indicators of whether a student will be able to succeed in college without remediation.¹ The baseline student performance results in the tables for the State assessments have been *adjusted* to reflect the new Regents’ policy for defining what it means to be on track to graduate from high school “college- and career-ready.” The baseline performance statistics have also been *updated*, since more recent data are available. The tables show four, rather than five, years of annual targets; although the annual targets in terms of percentage points gain remain the same for the four years covered by the RTTT grant.

TABLE 1: Student Performance Targets for State ELA and Mathematics Assessments

% Proficient or Advanced (3 or 4)	Baseline		Annual Percentage Points Gain Targets				Total 4 Year Gains
	Application (2008-09)	Adjusted (2009-10)	SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	
NYS 4th Grade ELA Assessment							
All Students	77%	56.7%	2	2	3	2	9
Black or African American students	65%	36.7%	2	3	4	4	13
Hispanic or Latino students	65%	39.8%	2	3	4	4	13
Students with Disabilities	38%	18.7%	1	3	3	3	10
English Language Learners	41%	20.2%	2	3	3	3	11
Economically Disadvantaged students	67%	42.6%	3	4	4	3	14

¹ At the State’s higher education institutions, students who had scored at least an 80 on their mathematics Regents had a significantly greater chance to be placed in credit-bearing courses and earn a C in their first college mathematics course, compared to high school students who scored below an 80 on their mathematics Regents. If students need a score of at least 80 on the Regents mathematics exam to be prepared for an introductory collegiate course, then the cut score for proficiency on the grade 8 mathematics assessment should indicate that a student is on track to be able to achieve that score on the Regents mathematics exam. The former 8th grade assessment cut scores were insufficient to prepare students for the Regents’ new definition of proficiency. Students at the cut score for Level 3 proficiency (650) previously had less than a 33% chance of earning an 80 on their mathematics Regents exam just 1-2 years later. By contrast, students who achieve the new cut score of 673 on the 8th grade mathematics assessment have a 75% chance of achieving a college-ready score of 80 or above on a mathematics Regents exam.

The numbers were slightly better for English language arts but still of concern. Students scoring at the Level 3 proficiency threshold in 8th grade had a 66% probability of being ready to demonstrate college preparedness on their English Regents exam (score of at least 75). The 8th grade proficiency scores are now set at a level that provides students a 75% chance of earning a college-ready Regents exam score. 3rd to 7th grade proficiency scores are set so that if a student makes a year’s worth of developmental growth they will be on track for a college-ready Regents exam score.

In summary, the Regents have determined the college-ready score that students need on the Regents exams in English and mathematics, aligned the 8th grade proficiency standards to these Regents exam scores, and then worked backward to link scores in grades 3 to 7 to these new standards.

TABLE 1: cont'd

% Proficient or Advanced (3 or 4)	Baseline		Annual Percentage Points Gain Targets				Total 4 Year Gains
	Application (2008-09)	Adjusted (2009-10)	SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	
NYS 4th Grade Mathematics Assessment							
All Students	87%	63.8%	1	2	2	1	6
Black or African American students	78%	45.3%	2	3	3	2	10
Hispanic or Latino students	82%	50.8%	2	3	3	2	10
Students with Disabilities	61%	29.4%	1	2	3	2	8
English Language Learners	71%	35.8%	2	3	3	2	10
Economically Disadvantaged students	82%	52.7%	2	3	3	2	10
NYS 8th Grade ELA Assessment							
All Students	69%	51.0%	2	3	3	2	10
Black or African American students	52%	30.6%	3	4	4	3	14
Hispanic or Latino students	53%	33.2%	3	4	4	4	15
Students with Disabilities	25%	11.4%	3	3	4	3	13
English Language Learners	13%	3.6%	4	4	5	4	17
Economically Disadvantaged students	54%	35.3%	3	3	4	3	13
NYS 8th Grade Mathematics Assessment							
All Students	80%	54.8%	2	3	3	3	11
Black or African American students	63%	32.1%	3	4	4	3	14
Hispanic or Latino students	69%	38.5%	3	3	4	3	13
Students with Disabilities	46%	16.8%	3	3	4	3	13
English Language Learners	53%	24.3%	3	4	4	3	14
Economically Disadvantaged students	71%	41.3%	3	3	4	3	13
Note:	Targets in Table 1 have been adjusted from the State's RTTT application. Since baseline data have been updated since the application was submitted, the targets are for 4 years, not 5 years.						

TABLE 2: High School Performance

% Student Scoring At or Above	Baseline (2005 cohort)	Annual Percentage Points Gain Targets				Total 4 Year Gains
		SY 2010-11 (2007 cohort)	SY 2011-12 (2008 cohort)	SY 2012-13 (2009 cohort)	SY 2013-14 (2010 cohort)	
75 on the English Language Arts Regents Exam	56%	5	2	3	3	13
80 on the Mathematics Regents Exam Required for Graduation	42%	6	3	4	4	17
Four-Year Cohort High School Graduation Rate	72%	72%	72%	74%	76%	4
Note:	All numbers are rounded. Regents exams and graduation rate data are for the 2005 total cohort after 4 years. The assessment and graduation data are as of June 2009 as certified by LEAs on 07/30/09. When reporting the 2010-11 school year results, the State must adopt the new federal cohort definition (cohort membership based on one day of enrollment vs. five months of enrollment). When these results become available, the State will provide a new baseline for the 2006 cohort through June 2010 that incorporates this federal cohort definition.					

TABLE 3: College Persistence

Metric	Baseline	Annual Performance Targets				Total 4 Year Gains
		SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	
% High school graduates enrolled in an institution of higher education within 16 months of graduation (2007-08)*	74%	75%	78%	80%	82%	8
% Students returning in the fall who started a first-time, full-time program in New York State the year prior (baseline: 2007-08)	72%	73%	74%	75%	76%	4
*Source: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Information Center for Higher Education Policymaking and Analysis; baseline updated from June 2010 application; annual performance target gains remain unchanged.						

TABLE 4: NAEP Targets By Subject and Subgroup, 2011 and 2013: Grades 4 and 8 Reading Percent Proficient

Student Subgroup	Grade 4			Grade 8		
	Latest Score	RTTT Targets		Latest Score	RTTT Targets	
	2007	2011	2013	2007	2011	2013
Black or African American students	17%	24%	29%	14%	19%	25%
Hispanic or Latino students	18%	24%	30%	16%	21%	27%
Students with Disabilities	8%	15%	20%	9%	15%	21%
English Language Learners	5%	12%	18%	1%	8%	13%
Economically Disadvantaged students	20%	26%	32%	19%	24%	29%
Female	39%	45%	49%	38%	42%	46%
Male	33%	39%	43%	26%	30%	34%
All Students	36%	42%	46%	32%	36%	40%

TABLE 5: NAEP Targets By Subject and Subgroup, 2011 and 2013: Grades 4 and 8 Mathematics Percent Proficient

Student Subgroup	Grade 4			Grade 8		
	Latest Score	RTTT Targets		Latest Score	RTTT Targets	
	2009	2011	2013	2009	2011	2013
Black or African American students	19%	23%	29%	13%	17%	23%
Hispanic or Latino students	25%	30%	35%	15%	19%	25%
Students with Disabilities	13%	17%	23%	10%	14%	20%
English Language Learners	13%	17%	23%	5%	11%	15%
Economically Disadvantaged students	28%	32%	38%	22%	26%	32%
Female	37%	40%	46%	32%	35%	40%
Male	43%	46%	51%	36%	39%	44%
All Students	40%	43%	48%	34%	37%	42%

The performance metrics in this section will be used to assess the extent to which New York is successful in meeting its foundational education reform goal, that is: all students graduate from high school ready for college and career success. NYSED is committed to building a system of performance metrics (with targets) at the level of each of the four assurance areas. We have started, but not completed, this work. This plan includes the performance metrics and targets required in the application and several NYS supplemental metrics. We anticipate the development and refinement of the performance metrics will continue through 2011-12.

Section B: Standards and Assessments

NYSED is committed to adopting and implementing rigorous State standards and assessments in order to ensure all students are ready for success in college and careers upon high school graduation.

Standards and Assessments, Section B, details a comprehensive plan that includes statewide curriculum models and performance-based formative and interim assessments for use in New York classrooms. Our strategic vision is to build sequenced, spiraled, content-rich statewide curriculum models aligned to the Common Core State Standards, initially for English Language Arts and Mathematics, and eventually across all of the other content areas, including Science and Technology, Social Studies and Economics, and the Arts. This vision will incorporate the best ideas from high-performing school districts, other states, and countries that will lead to dramatically enhanced instructional practices, thus improving student engagement and performance.

We will know that New York is making progress towards this vision if at each grade level 3 – 8 and high school, students demonstrate that they are on track to graduating with requisite college and career ready skills and knowledge in ELA, Mathematics, Science, Technology and Engineering, Social Studies & Economics, and the Arts.

Required Performance Metrics for Subsections (B)(1), (B)(2), and (B)(3): None

Supplemental NYS Performance Metrics for Subsection (B)(3) – Supporting the Transition to Enhanced Standards and High-Quality Assessments:

Performance metrics to be tracked for this Assurance include those in the Section “Overall Goals and Performance Targets” and the following:

Student Performance Targets for Additional State Assessments Grades 6 – 8

% Proficient or Advanced (3 or 4)		End of SY 2012-13	End of SY 2013-14
NYS 6th -8th Grade Science Assessment			
All Students			
Black or African American students	These assessments are not yet developed. The Department expects to have them developed for administration in the 2012-13 school year. See Project B3, deliverable “Grade 6-8 Assessments for Teacher/School Leader Evaluation”		
Hispanic or Latino students			
Students with Disabilities			
English Language Learners			
Economically Disadvantaged students			
NYS 6th -8th Grade Social Studies Assessment			
All Students			
Black or African American students	These assessments are not yet developed. The Department expects to have them developed for administration in the 2012-13 school year. See Project B3, deliverable “Grade 6-8 Assessments for Teacher/School Leader Evaluation”		
Hispanic or Latino students			
Students with Disabilities			
English Language Learners			
Economically Disadvantaged students			

Student Performance Targets for Regents History Exams

% Scoring at levels reflecting "on track" to be college- and career-ready ²	Baseline ³ (2009-10)	Annual Percentage Points Gain Targets (TBD)				Total 4 Year Gains
		SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	
U.S. History and Government						
All Students	83					
Black or African American students						
Hispanic or Latino students						
Students with Disabilities	60					
English Language Learners						
Economically Disadvantaged students						
Global History and Geography						
All Students	70					
Black or African American students						
Hispanic or Latino students						
Students with Disabilities	42					
English Language Learners						
Economically Disadvantaged students						

Student Performance Targets for Regents Science Exams

% Scoring at levels reflecting "on track" to be college- and career-ready ²	Baseline ³ (2009-10)	Annual Percentage Points Gain Targets (TBD)				Total 4 Year Gains
		SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	
Earth Science						
All Students	74					
Black or African American students						
Hispanic or Latino students						
Students with Disabilities	51					
English Language Learners						
Economically Disadvantaged students						
Living Environment/Biology						
All Students	78					
Black or African American students						
Hispanic or Latino students						
Students with Disabilities	54					
English Language Learners						
Economically Disadvantaged students						

² We have not yet defined what specific levels of performance equate with students being "on track for college- and career-readiness" for these exams (similar to the passing score of 75 on Regents ELA and 80 on Regents math). And without a metric specifically defined, we cannot set annual targets. As part of the Regents Reform Agenda, we will be working to increase the rigor of the State-development Regents exams, aligning the exams to the literacy standards in the Common Core, and working with higher education representatives to define college- and career-readiness.

³ Baseline for all Regents examinations is the percent passing with scores of 65 or higher since the Department has not set the performance standard for college- and career-readiness for these specific examinations.

Student Performance Targets for Regents Science Exams cont'd

% Scoring at levels reflecting "on track" to be college- and career-ready ²	Baseline ³ (2009-10)	Annual Percentage Points Gain Targets (TBD)				Total 4 Year Gains
		SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	
Chemistry						
All Students	73					
Black or African American students						
Hispanic or Latino students						
Students with Disabilities	58					
English Language Learners						
Economically Disadvantaged students						
Physics						
All Students	82					
Black or African American students						
Hispanic or Latino students						
Students with Disabilities	68					
English Language Learners						
Economically Disadvantaged students						

Section C: Data Systems to Support Instruction

Over the past several years, New York State has developed a P–16 data system that meets all requirements of the America COMPETES Act. This system includes longitudinal student data from pre-kindergarten through grade 12 (P–12) and is currently able to connect with the State’s public systems of higher education data repositories so that student transitions from high school to college, among other things, can be monitored and analyzed. The State envisions a fully-developed P–20 longitudinal data system to be the key resource upon which all other educational reform proposals will rely.

Diverse stakeholders will use the data portal to access and analyze education data, make decisions, and take actions to improve outcomes for New York State students. The specific examples below illustrate how we anticipate different stakeholder groups will use the student achievement data accessed through the data portal:

- In collaboration with parents and teachers, *students* will use the data to establish and track personal annual achievement goals. The information contained in the data portal will be used to guide conversations during student-teacher conferences.
- In collaboration with students, parents, and principals, *teachers* will use the student achievement and early warning predictive data to assess student learning needs, improve instructional practice, and establish/track annual achievement goals for students in their classes. The information contained in the data portal will be used to guide conversations during parent-teacher and student-teacher conferences.
- In collaboration with teachers and parents, *principals* and *school-based inquiry teams* will use the student achievement and early warning predictive data to assess student learning needs, improve curriculum and instruction, and establish/track disaggregated annual achievement goals for students in their school. The information contained in the data portal will be used to guide conversations during professional development activities.
- In collaboration with their child(ren) and teachers, *parents* will use the student achievement to establish and track annual achievement goals for their child(ren). The information contained in the data portal will be used to guide conversations during parent-teacher conferences.

To reach this vision, New York will complete the following milestone activities:

1. Further refine and adopt an updated statewide data governance structure (C)(2).
2. Build an Education Data Portal that provides customized (“dashboard”) information so that diverse stakeholders can access and analyze materials and information, make decisions, and take actions to improve outcomes for New York’s students (C)(2).
3. Create a statewide Comprehensive Instructional Reporting and Improvement System (IRIS) that will be accessed through the Education Data Portal so that educators and key partners can drive instructional improvement in all schools statewide, with a targeted focus on low-achieving schools and the achievement gap (C)(3).
4. Provide integrated, ongoing professional development to educators on the use of data and information through a statewide network (C)(3).
5. Make the data from the Comprehensive Instructional Reporting and Improvement System and the longitudinal data system fully accessible electronically to researchers while simultaneously promoting a wide-ranging research agenda to engage educators and researchers in the identification and replication of best practices (C)(3).

Required Performance Metrics for Subsections (C)(1), (C)(2), and (C)(3): None

Supplemental NYS Performance Metrics for Subsection (C)(2) – Accessing and Using State Data:

The optional performance metrics included in this subsection (C)(2) and the following one (C)(3) have been refined from the metrics included in the application. This set of metrics includes more data points, is more tailored to the various specific deliverables, and is intended to gather more actionable data. For example, in our application, we proposed collecting the “Number of stakeholders providing feedback on the Data Portal.” In contrast, in this Scope of Work, we are interested in knowing the percentage of LEAs which *use* the applications in the Data Portal for their intended purposes. In the chart below, we have indicated which metrics have been added [NEW] or have been edited to be more specific/actionable [REVISED]. In those cases, where the metric is carried over from the application, the trajectory of the annual targets may have changed to reflect our revised thinking about the pace of implementation; however, the cumulative four-year goal remains comparable. Changes in the annual targets from the metrics carried over from the application are noted, with the targets from the application in brackets ().

Metrics	Annual Targets			
	End of SY 2010-11	End of SY 2011-12	End of SY 2012-13	End of SY 2013-14
Number of annual Education Data Portal users	NA (5,000)	NA (72,000)	80,000 (160,000)	240,000
[DELETED] Number of Data Portal visits (per year) – <i>not specific enough to be actionable</i>				
[REVISED] Percentage of users reporting that Data Portal and IRIS helped drive policy decisions, supported improved instruction, and focused professional development activities [REPLACING] Number of schools using the statewide instructional improvement system	NA	NA	30%	90%
[REVISED] Percentage of authorized users reporting that these 2 applications helped improve service delivery and student outcomes [REPLACING] Number of stakeholders providing feedback on the Data Portal	NA	NA	30%	90%
[NEW] Updated statewide data governance structure established	Yes	Ongoing		
[NEW] P-20 data system will store/provide reports from other State agencies and databases	NA	NA	Yes	Yes
[NEW] SUNY and CUNY will provide data to the statewide system	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
[NEW] Number of other New York State agencies and/or non-educational data systems linked for reporting purposes	NA	NA	≥ 2	≥ 4
[NEW] Number of New York State independent colleges and universities providing data to statewide system	NA	NA	NA	≥ 4

Supplemental NYS Performance Metrics for Subsection (C)(3) – Using Data to Improve Instruction:

Metrics	Annual Targets			
	End of SY 2010-11	End of SY 2011-12	End of SY 2012-13	End of SY 2013-14
[REVISED]Number of educators and administrators statewide who will be receiving professional development in the use of data tools through Network Teams and school-based Inquiry Teams [REPLACING] Number of teachers and administrators receiving professional development through the “network teams”	NA (90,000)	120,000 (135,000)	180,000 (240,000)	240,000
[NEW] Percentage of all LEAs using 2 data portal applications (Early Warning System, Electronic Student Records Exchange System)	NA	NA	35%	100%
[NEW] Percentage of all LEAs using the student growth model to support performance management processes	NA	100%	100%	100%
[NEW] Percentage of school districts statewide that will have joined Statewide Collaborative Inquiry Network	NA	100%	100%	100%
[NEW] Percent of all teachers who click through to student achievement data with at least one page view of 20 second duration; Measure of association between these frequencies and student achievement scores	NA	NA	80%/.6	100%/.6
[NEW] Percent of all principals who click through to student achievement data with at least one page view of 20 second duration; Measure of association between these frequencies and student achievement scores	NA	NA	80%/.6	100%/.6

Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders

On May 28, 2010, New York State enacted historic new legislation – proposed by NYSED and the Regents with the public endorsement of the statewide teachers’ union and its largest local union – that sets a new course for teacher and school leader effectiveness by requiring annual evaluations based in significant part on student achievement. This new law not only fundamentally changes the way teachers and principals are evaluated, but requires that such evaluations be a significant factor in decisions relating to promotion, retention, tenure, and differentiated support and professional development. The law also provides an expedited disciplinary process for the removal of ineffective teachers and principals (Chapter 103 of the Laws of 2010). The State will build on this new law to recognize outstanding teachers by establishing criteria for supplemental compensation and new career paths.

Teachers and principals– held accountable for their professional achievement, supported by world-class data systems, given support tailored to improve performance, and recognized for their success – will be prepared to drive student academic achievement to benchmarked levels that are critical for their success in college and the 21st century workplace.

To reach this goal, New York will:

- Radically redesign teacher and school leader preparation programs through the creation of clinically-grounded instruction, performance-based assessments and innovative alternative certification pathways.
- Prepare teachers and school leaders to meet the instructional needs of students, particularly in high-need schools, by supporting residency-based teacher and school leader preparation programs and enlisting new, non-traditional providers of teacher and principal preparation.
- Hold the teacher and school leader preparation institutions accountable for the performance of their graduates by connecting the teaching and school performance of those graduates back to the institutions that prepared them.
- Enhance the *Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR)* for teachers to clearly differentiate effectiveness using four qualitative rating categories, employ multiple measures that are grounded in the newly-developed teacher standards, and include student growth as a significant factor.
- Implement an expedited process for removing ineffective teachers from the classroom.
- Develop a school leader *Principal Performance Evaluation System* to clearly differentiate effectiveness using four qualitative rating categories, employ multiple measures, and include student growth as a significant factor.
- Implement an expedited process for removing ineffective principals from schools.
- Create incentives for outstanding teachers and principals in the STEM fields, teachers of English language learners, and teachers of students with disabilities to take assignments in high-need schools.
- Provide supplemental compensation to retain outstanding teachers and principals, especially in high-need schools.
- For public review, create accountability systems for teacher/school leader preparation programs to ensure that all teachers and school leaders are prepared to teach all students, and for all LEAs to ensure the effective implementation of performance evaluations for all educators.
- Create career ladders for teachers and principals using differentiated effectiveness to provide supplemental compensation based on performance and leadership.

Subsection (D)(2): Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance

Required Performance Metrics for Subsection (D)(2)

Data will be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in the NYS RTTT application. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii).		Baseline	End of SY 2010-11	End of SY 2011-12	End of SY 2012-13	End of SY 2013-14
Criteria	Metrics	Baseline Data and Annual Targets				
(D)(2)(i)	Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in the application)	N/A	N/A	70	90	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying ⁴ evaluation systems for teachers	N/A	N/A	70	90	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying ⁴ evaluation systems for principals	N/A	N/A	70	90	100
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying ⁴ evaluation systems that are used to inform:					
(D)(2)(iv)(a)	• Developing teachers and principals	0	N/A	70	90	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Compensating and advancing teachers and principals	0	N/A	70	90	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Promoting teachers and principals	0	N/A	70	90	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Retaining effective teachers and principals	0	N/A	70	90	100
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	• Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals ³	0	N/A	70 ⁵	90 ¹	100
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	• Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals ⁶	0	N/A	70 ¹	90 ¹	100
General Data Provided at the Time of Application						
Total number of participating LEAs (at time of application submission 06/10/10)		744				
Total number of principals in participating LEAs		~3,866				
Total number of teachers in participating LEAs		~190,968				

⁴ This is a technical correction. In the application, these metrics referred to participating LEAs with “approved” evaluation systems. For RTTT purposes, the term should be “qualifying.” The language of the metric has been revised accordingly without any change in definition.

⁵ Targets represent technical corrections. In the application, these 2011-12 and 2012-13 targets were set at 100% of participating LEAs that would use the new evaluation system to inform their decisions regarding the granting of tenure (D)(2)(iv)(c) and the removal of ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals (D)(2)(iv)(d). Yet, we projected that less than 100% of our participating LEAs would have approved evaluation systems for teachers and principals during these same school years, which, of course, is a prerequisite for using the system for any type of decision making.

⁶ In 2011-12, the new evaluation system may be used for removal decisions for all non-tenured teachers and principals. Also in 2011-12, the point at which the new system becomes operational, evaluations under the new system may be used as evidence in removal proceedings for tenured teachers and principals. The expedited process for removal for ineffective teaching or performance will be available following evaluations in 2012-13.

Criteria	Metrics to be Reported in the Future
(D)(2)(ii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems
(D)(2)(iii) ⁷	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year
(D)(2)(iii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year

Supplemental NYS Performance Metrics for Subsection (D)(2)

Metrics	Baseline	End of SY 2010-11	End of SY 2011-12	End of SY 2012-13	End of SY 2013-14
		Annual Targets			
Percentage of teachers/principals statewide rated as Highly Effective, Effective, Developing and Ineffective	NA	TBD	TBD	TBD	Highly Effective 15% Ineffective <10% ⁸
Median student growth percentile of teachers/principals rated Effective and Highly Effective	NA	Improvement annually from baseline performance. Specific targets to be set after baseline data are collected.			
Median student growth percentile of newly tenured and/or professionally certified teachers/principals	NA				

⁷For some data elements, there are likely to be data collection activities the state would do in order to provide aggregated data to the Department. For example, in Criteria (D)(2)(iii), states may want to ask each participating LEA to report, for each rating category in its evaluation system, the definition of that category and the number of teachers and principals in the category. The state could then organize these two categories as effective and ineffective, for Department reporting purposes.

⁸This approximates a normal distribution of teacher ratings which we expect would stay approximately the same statewide over time (once the new initiatives and culture change the practice of rating almost all teachers and principals as satisfactory.)

Subsection (D)(3): Ensuring the Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Principals

Required Performance Metrics for Subsection

Notes on Annual Targets for (D)(3) Metrics

New York’s original targets in this section and the revised ones are both based on a strong commitment by New York State to improve the effectiveness of the teacher workforce, especially in high-need schools. Originally, the State expressed this goal in simple terms: Over the grant period, the percentage of teachers rated “highly effective” will increase steeply to 40% and the percent rated “ineffective” will plummet from 25% to under 10%. The State now realizes that those original targets will not necessarily result in real underlying improvement in the effectiveness of the teachers in these schools, and may rather encourage misuse of new evaluation categories. The new evaluation statute that was enacted in May 2010—which initially bases 20% of the evaluation score on measures of student growth (and then 25% once a value-added model is adopted) —will enable us to use an approach that is much more likely to result in authentic improvement in the student learning resulting from each teacher’s instruction.⁹

Like most states, New York’s history with teacher evaluation suffers from what The New Teacher Project dubs “The Widget Effect,” where nearly 98% of teachers are judged to be “satisfactory” (S) and a small handful receive “unsatisfactory” (U) ratings, with an even smaller share removed from the classroom. For this reason, we have no baseline history to tell us what share of teachers in high-need schools are meeting or exceeding high basic standards for effectiveness. We do know, however, from work in New York City and in other states and districts, that “growth percentile” and “value-added” measurement of teacher impact on student achievement (as measured by state assessments) typically results in a normal distribution, where a small percentage (15-20%) of teachers are clearly well below average, a similar percentage are clearly well above average, and the large category in the middle is not statistically much different from one another. Of course, measurement of student growth is only one lens on teacher effectiveness, but as an objective input that will initially count for 20 points of the teacher and principal composite score (and then 25% once a value-added model is adopted), it provides useful insight into target setting for this section of Race to the Top.¹⁰

Using this insight from value-added analysis, we plan to design the full teacher evaluation system, with multiple metrics, to result in much more differentiation across the four teacher rating categories than currently happens with our 2-rating system. While we cannot force a normal distribution of overall ratings, we are setting rigorous, high standards so that only those who are well above average in their practice and student outcomes will earn a “Highly Effective” rating. “Effective” will represent more accomplishment than today’s barely acceptable “S” rating. More low-performing teachers will be identified as “Ineffective” than today’s rarely-used “U”, (although we do not expect that percentage to be as high as 30% in 2011-12). We expect that across large numbers of teachers, the result will resemble a normal distribution.

Once the “widget effect” is broken in New York State and teacher effectiveness is differentiated, districts and principals can accurately target a range of professional development, rewards, and consequences to raise teacher effectiveness. Also, our initiatives in the areas of teacher preparation,

⁹ In addition to the percentage of the evaluation that is statutorily required to be based on statewide measures of student growth using state assessments, another 20% (down to 15% once a value-added model is adopted) is to be based on locally selected measures of student achievement. If LEAs select student growth measures based on state assessments for all or part of the local portion, then up to 40% of the evaluation score may be based on student growth on state assessments.

¹⁰ See footnote 6.

certification, and induction selection will enable New York to produce more effective early-career teachers. As this happens, the average student achievement impact of teachers should go up, but we would still expect to see a normal distribution of teacher evaluation scores. Some teachers are likely always to be much stronger or weaker than others. We expect that our evaluation system will continue to identify these relative differences, even as absolute accomplishment improves. If we did not take this approach, we would shortly end up recreating a widget effect where all teachers are rated “Highly Effective” out of 4 ratings, rather than “S” out of 2 ratings.

With that broad approach in mind, we adjusted the targets in section (D)(3) based on the following assumptions:

- Performance bands will be set and the evaluation system will be designed in such a way that the majority of educators will be rated either “Developing” or “Effective.” The expectations for “Highly Effective” educators will be set appropriately high, so that the percentage of educators in this category will be relatively small.
- For principals and superintendents, the new evaluation systems will represent a major change, and differentiating performance as New York State intends will require a cultural shift. Setting targets as we have revised for as many as 10% of teachers to be rated “Ineffective” and as few as 15% to receive the top rating, both are significant positive departures from today’s “widget” effect, providing the impetus for differentiated development, reward and consequences across the system.
- Our revised targets show a narrowing of the gap between high- and low-need schools in terms of the effectiveness of teachers because many of New York’s Race to the Top interventions—such as our teacher compensation and school turnaround initiatives for high-need schools and districts—are focused on doing just this. The speed and magnitude of that gap narrowing is consistent with our earlier targets, but the absolute numbers are different because our rating categories will represent relative achievement across teachers and principals, which we expect will always be normally distributed. Thus, instead of starting with 25% of teachers rated “Ineffective” and another 25% rated “Highly Effective,” and ending up with 40% “Highly Effective” after 3 years (as in our original targets), we expect the new evaluation system to result in a normal distribution in which 70%-80% of teachers and principals will fall into either the “Developing” or “Effective” categories each year.
- In both high- and low-need districts, as professional development efforts are focused on promising new educators who were rated “Developing,” we would expect to see more dramatic improvements in the percentage of educators who move from the “Developing” into the “Effective” category. This trend is not picked up in the Race to the Top required metrics, but will show up in the supplemental metrics we have suggested.

The baseline data for 2010-2011 represent certification data for teachers and principals. Teachers and principals were identified as ineffective if they were not appropriately certified for their teaching assignment. Beginning with the 2011-12 year, the State will collect performance evaluation data for all teachers and principals. The percentages for 2011-12 and thereafter are based on the State's goal to equalize the equitable distribution of highly effective and effective teachers across high-poverty and low-poverty schools to be measured by the newly mandated performance evaluations for teachers and principals.

Criteria	Metrics (As defined in RTTT application; <i>Participating LEAs Only</i>)	Baseline	Annual Targets							
			End of SY 2010-11 ¹¹		End of SY 2011-12		End of SY 2012-13		End of SY 2013-14	
			Application	Revised	Application	Revised	Application	Revised	Application	Revised
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are highly effective	N/A	10	N/A	20	11	30	13	40	15
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are highly effective	N/A	15	N/A	25	15	30	15	40	15
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are ineffective	N/A	30	N/A	25	10	20	10	<10	<10
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are ineffective	N/A	30	N/A	25	<10	20	<10	<10	<10
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are highly effective	N/A	10	N/A	20	11	30	13	40	15
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are highly effective	N/A	20	N/A	25	15	30	15	40	15
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who are ineffective	N/A	30	N/A	25	10	20	<10	<10	<10
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who are ineffective	N/A	10	N/A	5	<10	<5	<10	<5	<10

¹¹ New York's Race to the Top application states, on page 173 and elsewhere, that the new teacher and principal evaluation system will begin rating teachers and principals in 2011-12. Yet the application provided "annual targets" for the percentages of ineffective and highly effective teachers and principals in particular subsets of districts at the end of 2010-11. As noted on page 207, the 2010-11 targets for "Ineffective" teachers and principals were intended to represent the percentage who were not appropriately certified for their teaching assignment. The targets for subsequent years represent the percentages of teachers and principals who will receive ratings of "Ineffective" or "Highly Effective" under the new evaluation system. The State proposes changing all the 2010-11 measures to "Not Applicable" because they are not directly comparable to the targets for subsequent years. This does not represent any change in the timeline for implementing the teacher and principal evaluation system.

Criteria	Data Provided at Time of Application (As defined in the RTTT application)		
(D)(3)(i)	Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both	1,489	
(D)(3)(i)	Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both	1,947	
(D)(3)(i)	Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both	69,491	
(D)(3)(i)	Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low -minority, or both	88,503	
(D)(3)(i)	Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both	1,526	
(D)(3)(i)	Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low -minority, or both	1,946	

Criteria	Metrics to be Reported in the Future		
(D)(3)(i)	Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year		
(D)(3)(i)	Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who were evaluated as highly effective in the prior academic year		
(D)(3)(i)	Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year		
(D)(3)(i)	Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year		

Criteria	Metrics (As defined in the RTTT application; <i>Participating LEAs Only</i>)	Baseline	End of SY 2010-11	End of SY 2011-12
		Baseline Data and Annual Targets		
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better	N/A	N/A	60
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better	N/A	N/A	60
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better	N/A	N/A	60
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better	N/A	N/A	60

General Data Provided at the Time of Application			
Total number of mathematics teachers		17,683	
Total number of science teachers		16,329	
Total number of special education teachers		41,398	
Total number of teachers in language instruction educational programs		6,966	

Criteria	Metrics to be Reported in the Future		
(D)(3)(ii)	Number of mathematics teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year		
(D)(3)(ii)	Number of science teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year		
(D)(3)(ii)	Number of special education teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year		
(D)(3)(ii)	Number of mathematics teachers in language instruction educational programs in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year		

Supplemental NYS Performance Metrics for Subsection (D)(3)

Metrics	Baseline	End of SY 2010-11	End of SY 2011-12	End of SY 2012-13	End of SY 2013-14
	Baseline Data and Annual Targets				
Comparison of effectiveness rates in high-poverty/high-minority districts compared to low-poverty/low-minority districts.	NA	Narrowing of the gaps in effectiveness rates annually from baseline performance. Specific targets to be set after baseline data are collected.			
Percentage of teachers in high-needs subjects (math, science, special education, ESL) rated as effective or better	NA	TBD	TBD	TBD	≥70%
Percent of students in poverty who have a teacher and principal rated Effective or better each year	NA	Improvement annually from baseline performance. Specific targets to be set after baseline data are collected.			

Subsection (D)(4): Improving the Effectiveness of Teacher and Principal Preparation Programs

Required Performance Metrics for Subsection (D)(4)

In addition to the teacher/principal preparation programs in our public university systems (SUNY and CUNY), there are 84 independent colleges in New York with teacher and/or principal preparation programs. The State estimates that it will take three years to phase all of these independent institutions into the P-20 longitudinal data system so student achievement data can be provided for teachers and principals prepared by each of these institutions.		Baseline	End of SY 2010-11	End of SY 2011-12	End of SY 2012-13	End of SY 2013-14
Criteria	Metrics (As defined in the RTTT application)	Baseline Data and Annual Targets				
(D)(4)	Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth of the graduates' students	0	0	20	70	100
(D)(4)	Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth of the graduates' students	0	0	20	70	100
General Data Provided at the Time of Application						
Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the State		4,897				
Total number of principal credentialing programs in the State		127				
Total number of teachers in the State		226,000				
Total number of principals in the State		4,540				
Criteria	Metrics To Be Reported in the Future					
(D)(4)	Number of teacher credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported					
(D)(4)	Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported					
(D)(4)	Number of principal credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported					
(D)(4)	Number of principals prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported					
(D)(4)	Number of teachers in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs					
(D)(4)	Number of principals in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs					

Supplemental NYS Performance Metrics for Subsection (D)(4): None

Subsection (D)(5): Providing Effective Support to Teachers and Principals

Required Performance Metrics for Subsection: None

Supplemental NYS Performance Metrics for Subsection: None

Section E/F: Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools/Creating Innovative Educational Options for Students

In order to fully develop a robust and coherent system of education for the students of New York, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) must dramatically improve the State’s lowest-achieving schools and create new innovative education options for our students. New York has strong legal authority to intervene in persistently lowest-achieving schools and districts. We have been consistently recognized nationally for the rigor of our charter school authorization, approval, oversight and renewal processes.

To build upon these efforts, in December of 2009, the New York State Board of Regents approved a bold reform agenda focused on improving the lowest-achieving schools and creating excellent schools across the State that prepare all students for college and careers. This reform agenda creates the conditions and incentives that will lead to more opportunities for more students to attend high-performing schools, while focusing its accountability measures to turning around or closing the lowest-achieving schools.

This agenda served as the basis for legislation enacted on May 28th, 2010 that: 1) provides school districts with the ability to contract with Educational Management Organizations (known in New York as Educational Partnership Organizations) to implement a whole school reform intervention, 2) requires that student achievement be a significant factor in teacher and principal evaluations, and 3) increases the cap on charter schools. This groundbreaking legislation, combined with the lessons New York has learned through its past efforts, allows New York to implement a comprehensive plan for identifying low-achieving schools, supporting LEAs in implementing intervention models, turning persistently lowest-achieving schools into high-performing models of excellence, and launching 260 new charter schools.

Required Performance Metrics for Section E/F

Metrics	Actual Data Baseline	Annual Targets ¹²			
		End of SY 2010-11	End of SY 2011-12	End of SY 2012-13	End of SY 2013-14
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (Turnaround, Restart, Transformation, and Closure) will be initiated each year.					
Number of schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving	57	31	31	31	31
Number of persistently lowest-achieving schools for which one of the four school intervention models will be initiated each year	0 ¹³	28	59	30	30
Number of schools in restructuring for which one of the four school intervention models will be initiated each year	0	10	13	11	21 ¹⁴

¹² Targets for these metrics represent a technical correction. In the application, the targets were cumulative from year to year. They have been adjusted to be annual. The totals at the end of SY 2013-14 remain unchanged.

¹³ Consistent with the guidelines set forth in the School Improvement Grant under Section 1003(g), the LEAs with schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving used 2009–2010 to engage in diagnostic work to develop an overall approach to their portfolio of schools before opening redesigned schools in September of 2010. In addition to the schools identified in the table above, SED projects that 41 schools in restructuring will return to Good Standing during the grant period after implementing a locally developed restructuring plan and prior to the schools implementing one of the four intervention models.

¹⁴ The total of 55 schools over the four-year RTTT grant period includes 25 schools participating in the School Innovation Fund grant program and 30 schools in which LEAs will voluntarily implement one of the four models, including closure, before identification by the Commissioner as Persistently Lowest-Achieving (PLA) Schools or Schools Under Registration Review (SURR).

Supplemental NYS Performance Metrics for Section E/F

Metric	Annual Targets			
	SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14
Number of schools identified as PLA; Number removed from PLA list	Identified 88	Identified 119	Identified 150	Identified 181
	Removed 0	Removed 25	Removed 75	Removed 100
Number of formerly PLA schools returned to "In Good Standing" status	33 PLA schools: Not move further along Differentiated Accountability	33	66	100
Percentage of 10 th graders passing Math Regents exam at each PLA school ¹⁵ AND Percentage of 11 th graders passing ELA Regents at each PLA school	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 25% of schools have ≥ 60% passing	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 50% of schools have ≥ 60% passing	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 75% of schools have ≥ 60% passing	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 100% of schools have ≥ 60% passing
		<i>Cohort 2:</i> 25% of schools have ≥ 60% passing	<i>Cohort 2:</i> 50% of schools have ≥ 60% passing	<i>Cohort 2:</i> 75% of schools have ≥ 60% passing
			<i>Cohort 3:</i> 25% of schools have ≥ 60% passing	<i>Cohort 3:</i> 50% of schools have ≥ 60% passing
				<i>Cohort 4:</i> 25% of schools have ≥ 60% passing
Annual retention rate of 9th grade students at each PLA school	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 5% reduction	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 5% reduction	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 10% reduction	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 15% reduction
		<i>Cohort 2:</i> 5% reduction	<i>Cohort 2:</i> 5% reduction	<i>Cohort 2:</i> 10% reduction
			<i>Cohort 3:</i> 5% reduction	<i>Cohort 3:</i> 5% reduction
				<i>Cohort 4:</i> 5% reduction
Annual school performance on grades 3-8 State ELA/Math assessments (July) at each PLA school	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 25% of schools have 10% reduction in students not proficient	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 50% of schools have 20% reduction in students not proficient	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 75% of schools have 30% reduction in students not proficient	<i>Cohort 1:</i> 100% of schools have 33% reduction in students not proficient
		<i>Cohort 2:</i> 25% of schools have 10% reduction in students not proficient	<i>Cohort 2:</i> 50% of schools have 20% reduction in students not proficient	<i>Cohort 2:</i> 75% of schools have 30% reduction in students not proficient
			<i>Cohort 3:</i> 25% of schools have 10% reduction in students not proficient	<i>Cohort 3:</i> 50% of schools have 20% reduction in students not proficient
				<i>Cohort 4:</i> 25% of schools have 10% reduction in students not proficient

¹⁵Each year, the Commissioner will identify new PLA schools. Each of these cohorts will have different goals for progress on this indicator, related to the number of years they have implemented the model. For example, Cohort 1, identified in 2009, will have been engaged in implementing an intervention model for all four years tracked on this chart. However, Cohort 4, identified in 2013, will have only been implementing an intervention model for one year at the 2013-2014 target point.

We expect to have additional indicators to measure progress towards our goals as the grant period progresses. For each year of the grant, we have projected when these additional indicators may be in place:

- **SY 2011-12:** PLA schools performance contracts that will capture quarterly attendance data and school environment surveys (such as the Ferguson Tripod Survey);
- **SY 2012-13:** Local Interim Assessments, Results from Annual Professional Performance Reviews, Student growth data, External Evaluator Data on implementation; and
- **SY 2013-14:** Performance targets created for student academic performance, school operational performance and fiscal stewardship of federal and State grant funds.

Metrics	Annual Targets					
	Baseline		SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14
	Year	Result				
Number of charter schools open and operating statewide	2009-10	140	171	200	230	260
Student enrollment in charter schools	2009-10	50,000	79,000	165,000	190,000	214,500
Number of low-performing charter schools closed	2010-11	TBD		2.5% of schools	2.5% of schools	2.5% of schools
Number of students enrolled in charter schools determined by NYSED to be in good standing	2010-11	TBD				

NOTE: The number of charter schools open and operating in the State includes schools authorized by the State Board of Regents, the Trustees at the State University of New York, the Chancellor of New York City Public Schools, and the Buffalo Board of Education. Under State law, local Boards of Education may also sponsor the conversion of traditional public schools to public charter schools. The enrollment increase projection includes new schools opening and growing as well as the continued growth in currently operating schools.

The NYSED has submitted its 2011-2016 federal Charter School Program (CSP) grant application. If this application is funded, the Department may include several performance metrics from that application to this RTTT Scope of Work to ensure coherence between the two initiatives and integrate them together under the umbrella of the Regents Reform Agenda.