



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

December 27, 2011

The Honorable Beverly Perdue
Office of the Governor
20301 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-0301

Dear Governor Perdue:

I am writing in response to North Carolina's request to amend its approved Race to the Top grant project. Between September 28 and December 16, 2011, the State submitted several amendment requests and supporting documentation 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:

- In the "Turning Around Lowest-Achieving Schools" project, hiring for the 75 positions included in the project plan occurred later than anticipated so actual personnel and fringe costs were lower than the initial budget for year one.¹ Additionally, actual expenditures in the travel, equipment, supply, contractual, and indirect cost categories were lower in year one than initially budgeted. The State will shift a total of \$4,527,923 of unspent funds from year one from this project to three purposes described below:
 - First, the State will shift \$1,777,924 of the \$4,527,923 to fund three additional School Transformation Coaches (STCs) within the "Turning Around Lowest-Achieving Schools" project in years two through four. The State believes that increasing the STC staff to 19 total will better enable each coach to help persistently lowest-achieving schools build their capacity to implement and sustain reform.

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.

- Second, \$725,040 will shift from the aforementioned \$4,527,923 to the year two travel budget in the “Performance Incentives for Lowest-Achieving Schools and Teacher and Principal Effectiveness” project. North Carolina’s Educator Evaluation System includes convening Measures of Student Learning Design Groups to participate in an effort to determine measures of student learning for non-tested grades and subjects. These additional funds will enable North Carolina to support three in-person convenings for 800 teachers (increased from 200 initially projected) participating in these Design Groups. The State believes the expanded stakeholder involvement will better position educators to review and vet assessment items for potential inclusion in the statewide set approved for school year (SY) 2012-13.
- Third, \$2,024,960 will shift from the aforementioned \$4,527,923 to the year two contractual budget in the “Performance Incentives for Lowest-Achieving Schools and Teacher and Principal Effectiveness” project. Based on new research and feedback from local educational agencies (LEAs), the State will supplement its teacher effectiveness efforts with a student survey pilot. The State believes that this pilot aligns well with the second standard in the State’s Educator Evaluation System, “Teachers Establish a Respectful Environment for a Diverse Population of Students,” and would allow the State to acquire baseline data, communicate and build support among teachers, and create capacity for a potential statewide administration in the future. Based on conversations with the State, it is the Department’s understanding that 28 LEAs have expressed interest in participating in the pilot, which would be administered in spring 2012.
- In the “Professional Development” project, shift the \$2,367,000 mentioned as still under Department review in Amendment #7 to two different contractual items:²
 - First, \$228,180 will shift to support the cost of extended professional development trainings. After the first series of summer institutes, the State determined that the cost exceeds the initial annual budget of \$23,940. Now, the State will budget \$80,985 in each of the four years to fully fund the costs associated with hosting these trainings.
 - Second, \$2,138,820 will shift to support the cost of contracts in years two through four with partner organizations and individuals the State believes are necessary to meet the demands of the Professional Development Initiative (PDI). The State initially budgeted \$12,381,013 over four years to contract with professional development providers and collaborative partners to provide onsite and remote training and coaching throughout eight regions of the State. Based on partnerships solidified in year one and more information about the actual cost of contracting with content-specific professional development providers, including the cost for the eight Regional Education Service Alliances to provide 12 to 15 meetings annually, the State has revised its cost estimate for this contractual item. The State believes additional funds are needed to ensure the PDI has the capacity to provide LEAs with targeted, ongoing support.
 - Additionally, \$3,107,167 allocated to this contractual item was not expended in year one due to several factors including the timing of executing contracts and billing for summer 2011 events after June 30,

2011. The State proposes to shift these unexpended funds from year one to align with the revised cost estimates for this contractual item for years two through four to as discussed above.

- In application areas (A)(1), (D)(2), (D)(4), (E)(2), and Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), revise the performance measures as described below. Appendix 1a-f provides revised measures in *bold italic*.
 - In the “(A)(1) Goals, Measures, Baselines and Final Race to the Top Targets” performance measures, refine the annual targets for college readiness. The State used trend data released by the College Board to set its annual performance measures. In its amendment request, the State explained that prior to 2010 the College Board based trend data on all students who took the test in high school through March of their senior year. However, to capture students taking the SAT exam for the first time later in their senior year, in 2010 the College Board began to examine trends of student scores and participation through June rather than March. The State will update its baseline and targets to reflect the revised cohort of students (see appendix 1a).
 - In the “(D)(2) Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance” performance measures, the State will increase its SY 2011-12 target for the percentage of participating LEAs using qualifying evaluation systems for “compensating teachers and principals” from 25 to 32.8 percent based on the total number of LEAs participating in the State’s Race to the Top plan and updated information on the LEAs participating in the “Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools” initiative.³ The State will also update subsequent years’ targets from TBD to 32.8 percent (see appendix 1b).
 - In the “(D)(4) Improving the Effectiveness of Teacher and Principal Preparation Programs” performance measures, represent the current preparation programs included in reports and update targets for future grant years.
 - In its application, the State considered an existing University of North Carolina (UNC) study that links student achievement and growth data to teacher preparation programs to establish baselines and targets for this performance measure. The UNC study does not currently include principal preparation programs. The State will revise its measures to align with the current timeline to expand the UNC study to include principal preparation programs in fall 2013.
 - In addition to the UNC study, as part of its Race to the Top plan, the State is developing Institution of Higher Education (IHE) Report Cards that will link public and independent teacher and principal preparation programs to the growth of their graduates’ students. The newly designed IHE Report Cards will be publicly released in the fall of SY 2012-13 with information from SY 2011-12. As such, the State has proposed to revise its targets for teacher and principal preparation programs from TBD to reflect the timeline for the IHE Report Cards. Additionally, in its initial plan, the State provided targets disaggregated by public and independent teacher and principal preparation programs. To clarify, the State’s revised

targets also include an overall percentage target for each year (see appendix 1d).

- In the “(E)(2) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools” performance measures, adjust the performance measure regarding the number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models will be initiated. Per an amendment approved on January 31, 2011, the State anticipated that it would support the implementation of an intervention model in 118 new schools as part of its Race to the Top plan.
 - The State will update its targets to represent the actual models initiated in each year rather than a cumulative total of those participating in the State’s turnaround initiative. Additionally, the State will revise its baseline to clarify that this performance measure only includes schools implementing one of the four federally-defined intervention models. Previously the State’s total accounted for schools that were served through a statewide initiative that included supports similar to the strategies required under these models. (see appendix 1e).

At this point in time, the Department understands that North Carolina is using a phased approach to implementation of intervention models and that the State interprets the term “initiate” to mean that the initial phase of the intervention model is underway.⁴ In SY 2010-11, the State reports that it initiated work in 118 schools; in many cases, that work included implementation of some but not all of the strategies required to fully implement the intervention model. For example, in some cases it included steps such as replacement of the principal, depending on the model selected. The State is committed to fully implementing (*i.e.*, phasing in all strategies included in the definition of each model as described in the Race to the Top notice) the selected model within the timeframe of the grant.

- In the “Competitive Preference Priority: STEM” performance measures, clarify the target language and adjust the annual targets to align with the timeline to initiate STEM Anchor Schools and Affinity Networks.
 - The State’s plan included establishing four Anchor Schools and four Affinity Networks over the four-year grant period. The targets are revised to capture the Anchor School(s) or Network School(s) initiated in each year rather than a cumulative total of those participating. The State is also proposing to amend the target so that the fourth Anchor School will now be established in SY 2012-13 rather than SY 2011-12. The State also revises its Affinity Network Schools targets to reflect the faster timeline by which it expects all 16 schools initiate participation.
 - Additionally, rather than “Affinity Cluster Networks Established,” the State will capture its progress by the number of “STEM Affinity Network Schools established through the NC New Schools Project.” The State’s plan included the establishment of four Networks, each with four schools. The State believes this language clarification provides more useful detail on progress of implementation (see appendix 1f).

Additionally, North Carolina clarified its performance measures in (D)(2) and (D)(3) to align with the State's plan for implementing a qualifying evaluation system and the use of that system for informing various human capital decisions. In its original application, North Carolina provided performance measures in "(D)(2) Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance," that did not align with the federal definition for qualifying evaluation systems. North Carolina's application stated that the State's existing State Educator Evaluation System "threaded" student outcomes throughout; however, a student growth measure will not be in place until SY 2011-12 when North Carolina expands its evaluation system. As a result, North Carolina has updated these 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. Also, in its initial plan, the State provided targets disaggregated by teachers and principals. To align with the required measure and ensure comparability across States, the revised targets are provided in aggregate form (see appendix 1b).

The State also clarified its performance measures in "(D)(3) Ensuring Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Principals," to align with the State's plan for implementing a qualifying evaluation system and the use of that system to determine educator rating categories (*e.g.*, highly effective, ineffective). A qualifying evaluation system must be in place before a State would be able to report meaningful data on educator effectiveness ratings. Thus, North Carolina has also updated performance measures in (D)(3)(i) and (ii), to align with its timeline for implementing a qualifying evaluation system aligned with the federal definition. In its initial plan, the State provided targets disaggregated by grade level and, in some cases, by subject area. To align with the required measure and ensure comparability across States, the revised targets are provided in aggregate form (see appendix 1c).

If you need any assistance or have any questions regarding Race to the Top, please do not hesitate to contact North Carolina's Race to the Top Program Officer, Jessie Levin, at 202-453-6651 or Jessie.Levin@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

//s//

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

cc: Dr. June Atkinson
 Dr. William Harrison
 Adam Levinson

¹ The 75 initially budgeted State Education Agency staff positions include 10 District Transformation Coaches, 16 School Transformation Coaches, and 38 Instructional Coaches, five instructional review coaches, three team leads, and three program assistants.

² See <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/amendments/north-carolina-7.pdf>.

³ The State's initial application included full participation from each of the State's 115 LEAs. North Carolina did not initially consider charter schools that were Title I, Part A recipients as eligible LEAs for Race to the Top. Upon clarification from the Department, the State offered all eligible charters (based on the definition in the Race to the Top notice) an opportunity to participate in the State's plan.

⁴ Of the 118 schools North Carolina is serving through Race to the Top, 19 are also School Improvement Grant (SIG) recipients. Any schools receiving funds through the SIG are required to fully implement in the first year of receiving SIG funds.

Appendix 1a: Performance Measures (A)(1)

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline 2009-10	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Average SAT Composite	1008 1004	1009 1005	1014 TBD³	1019 TBD	1025 TBD
Percent of students taking SAT exam	63% 64%	65% 66%	67% TBD	69% TBD	72% TBD

³ It is the Department's understanding that the targets for future years will be reviewed by the State Board of Education later this winter and that the State will provide revised SYs 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 targets aligned with the revised baseline in early 2012.

Appendix 1b: Performance Measures (D)(2)

Performance Measures		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
Note: 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).						
(D)(2)(i)	Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in the Race to the Top notice).	100	100	100	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	45 <i>0</i>	100 <i>0</i>	100	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	100 <i>0</i>	100 <i>0</i>	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:					

(D)(2)(iv)(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing teachers and principals. 	T: 45	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100
		N/A		N/A		100		100		100	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compensating teachers and principals. 	T: 8	P: 8	T: 25	P: 25	T: 25	P: 25	T: TBD	P: TBD	T: TBD	P: TBD
		N/A		N/A		32.8		32.8		32.8	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting teachers and principals. 	T: 45	P: N/A	T: 100	P: N/A	T: 100	P: N/A	T: 100	P: N/A	T: 100	P: N/A
		N/A		N/A		100 ⁴		100		100	
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retaining effective teachers and principals. 	T: 45	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100
		N/A		N/A		100		100		100	
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals. 	T: 45	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100
		N/A		N/A		100		100		100	
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals. 	T: 45	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100	T: 100	P: 100
		N/A		N/A		100		100		100	

⁴ In order to provide an aggregated target for this performance measure, the State revised its target to 100 percent; however, the State does not consider using qualifying evaluation systems to inform the promotion to be applicable to principals.

Appendix 1c: Performance Measures (D)(3)

Please note: 'E' indicates 'elementary,' 'M' indicates 'middle school,' 'H' indicates 'high school,' 'Read' indicates 'reading,' 'Math' indicates 'mathematics,' and 'Sci' indicates science.

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i) <i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>	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
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	E: 20.6 M: 17.6 H: 23.9	E: 21.2 M: 18.2 H: 24.6	E: 21.9 M: 18.7 H: 25.3	E: 22.5 M: 19.3 H: 26.1	E: 23.2 M: 19.9 H: 26.9
	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	21.9	22.6	23.3
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) who are highly effective (as defined in the Race to the Top notice).	E: 30.3 M: 33.3 H: 25.5	E: 31.2 M: 34.3 H: 26.3	E: 32.1 M: 35.4 H: 27.1	E: 33.1 M: 36.4 H: 27.9	E: 34.1 M: 37.5 H: 28.7
	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	31.1	32.0	33.0
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) who are ineffective.	E: 30.8 M: 32.9 H: 29.9	E: 27.7 M: 29.6 H: 26.9	E: 24.9 M: 26.6 H: 24.2	E: 22.4 M: 24.0 H: 21.8	E: 20.2 M: 21.6 H: 19.6
	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	25.3	22.7	20.5

Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) who are ineffective.	E: 19.4 M: 18.0 H: 23.3			E: 17.5 M: 16.2 H: 20.9			E: 15.7 M: 14.6 H: 18.8			E: 14.1 M: 13.1 H: 17.0			E: 12.7 M: 11.8 H: 15.3		
	<i>N/A</i>			<i>N/A</i>			16.3			14.7			13.2		
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) who are highly effective (as defined in the Race to the Top notice).	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci
	E: 15.1	E: 22.5	E: 12.2	E: 15.5	E: 23.2	E: 12.5	E: 16.0	E: 23.9	E: 12.9	E: 16.5	E: 24.6	E: 13.3	E: 17.0	E: 25.3	E: 13.7
	M: 16.7	M: 15.3	M: 7.4	M:17.2	M:15.8	M: 7.7	M:17.7	M:16.3	M: 7.9	M: 18.2	M: 16.8	M: 8.1	M:18.8	M:17.3	M: 8.4
H: 26.1	H: 21.9	H: 20.1	H:26.9	H:22.5	H:20.7	H:27.7	H:23.2	H:21.4	H: 28.6	H: 23.9	H: 22.0	H:29.4	H:24.6	H:22.7	
<i>N/A</i>			<i>N/A</i>			18.2			18.8			19.3			
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) who are highly effective (as defined in the Race to the Top notice).	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci
	E: 35.9	E: 31.3	E: 35.9	E: 37.0	E: 32.2	E: 37.0	E: 38.1	E: 33.2	E: 38.1	E: 39.3	E: 34.2	E: 39.2	E: 40.4	E: 35.2	E: 40.4
	M: 30.6	M: 37.7	M: 38.0	M:31.5	M:38.8	M:39.1	M:32.5	M:40.0	M:40.3	M: 33.4	M: 41.2	M: 41.5	M:34.4	M:42.4	M:42.8
H: 18.8	H: 21.6	H: 27.8	H:19.3	H:22.2	H:28.7	H:19.9	H:22.9	H:29.5	H: 20.5	H: 23.6	H: 30.4	H:21.1	H:24.3	H:31.3	
<i>N/A</i>			<i>N/A</i>			33.9			35.0			36.0			
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) who are ineffective.	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci
	E: 32.0	E: 26.3	E: 38.1	E: 28.8	E: 23.7	E: 34.3	E: 25.9	E: 21.3	E: 30.9	E: 23.3	E: 19.2	E: 27.8	E: 21.0	E: 17.3	E: 25.0
	M: 35.3	M: 31.3	M: 48.0	M:31.8	M:28.2	M:43.2	M:28.6	M:25.4	M:38.9	M: 25.8	M: 22.8	M: 35.0	M:23.2	M:20.6	M:31.5
H: 26.1	H: 31.9	H 27.7:	H:23.5	H:28.7	H:24.9	H:21.2	H:25.8	H:22.4	H: 19.1	H: 23.2	H: 20.2	H:17.2	H:20.9	H:18.2	
<i>N/A</i>			<i>N/A</i>			26.8			24.1			21.7			

Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) who are ineffective.	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci	Read	Math	Sci
	E: 13.4	E: 19.1	E: 13.8	E:12.1	E:17.2	E: 12.4	E: 10.9	E: 15.5	E: 11.1	E: 9.8	E: 13.9	E: 10.0	E: 8.8	E: 12.5	E: 9.0
	M:15.8	M:14.2	M: 9.5	M14.3	M:12.8	M: 8.5	M:12.8	M:11.5	M: 7.7	M: 11.6	M: 10.4	M: 6.9	M:10.4	M: 9.3	M: 6.2
	H: 24.3	H: 21.6	H: 22.2	H:21.9	H:19.4	H:19.9	H:19.7	H:17.5	H:18.0	H: 17.7	H: 15.7	H: 16.2	H:15.9	H:14.2	H:14.5
<i>N/A</i>			<i>N/A</i>			<i>12.7</i>			<i>11.5</i>			<i>10.3</i>			

Continued on next page

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii) <i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>	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
Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	E: 75.0 M: 75.0 H: 75.0	E: 77.3 M: 77.3 H: 77.3	E: 79.6 M: 79.6 H: 79.6	E: 82.0 M: 82.0 H: 82.0	E: 84.4 M: 84.4 H: 84.4
Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	E: 75.0 M: 75.1 H: 75.1	E: 77.3 M: 77.3 H: 77.3	E: 79.6 M: 79.6 H: 79.7	E: 82.0 M: 82.0 H: 82.0	E: 84.4 M: 84.5 H: 84.5
Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	TBD N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD
Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	TBD N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD

Appendix 1d: Performance Measures (D)(4)

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline 2009-10	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) of the graduates' students.	Public: 100 Independent: 0	Public: 100 Independent: 0	Public: 100 Independent: TBD	Public: 100 Independent: TBD	Public: 100 Independent: TBD
	Public: 100 Independent: 0 Overall: 31.25⁵	Public: 100 Independent: 0 Overall: 31.25	Public: 100 Independent: 0 Overall: 31.25	Public: 100 Independent: 100 Overall: 100	Public: 100 Independent: 100 Overall: 100
Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) of the graduates' students.	Public: 100 Independent: 0	Public: 100 Independent: 0	Public: 100 Independent: TBD	Public: 100 Independent: TBD	Public: 100 Independent: TBD
	Public: 0 Independent: 0 Overall: 0	Public: 0 Independent: 0 Overall: 0	Public: 0 Independent: 0 Overall: 0	Public: 100 Independent: 100 Overall: 100	Public: 100 Independent: 100 Overall: 100

⁵ The State reported 15 total public teacher credentialing programs in the State and 33 independent teacher credentialing programs in the State as part of the general data provided at the time of application. The "overall" figure represents the aggregate percentage of teacher (or principal) preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in the Race to the Top notice) of the graduates' students for each school year. For example, 15 (all public teacher preparation programs) out of a total of 48 programs (sum of public and independent teacher preparation programs) is equivalent to 31.25 percent.

Appendix 1e: Performance Measures (E)(2)

Please note: 'HS' indicates 'high school,' 'MS' indicates 'middle school,' 'ES' indicates 'elementary school,'

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline 2009-10	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Total number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C of the Race to the Top notice) will be initiated each year.	85 <i>0</i>	176 ⁶ <i>118</i>	176 <i>0</i>	176 <i>0</i>	176 <i>0</i>
Turnaround Model	<i>0</i>	12 (2 HS; 1 MS; 9 ES) <i>13(2 HS; 1 MS; 10 ES)</i>	12 <i>0</i>	12 <i>0</i>	12 <i>0</i>
Restart Model	18 high schools <i>0</i>	19 high schools <i>1 (HS)</i>	19 <i>0</i>	19 <i>0</i>	19 <i>0</i>
School Closure Model	6 (4 high schools; 2 middle) <i>0</i>	12 (7 HS; 4 MS; 1 ES) <i>9 (5 HS; 2 MS; 2 ES)</i>	12 <i>0</i>	12 <i>0</i>	12 <i>0</i>
Transformation Model	61 (28 high schools 33 middle schools) <i>0</i>	133 (39 HS; 38 MS; 56 ES) <i>95 (22 HS; 20 MS; 53 ES)</i>	133 <i>0</i>	133 <i>0</i>	133 <i>0</i>

⁶ It is the Department's understanding that 58 schools were served through the State's District and School Transformation division prior to Race to the Top and continue to be supported and receive services similar to the federal reform models.

Appendix 1f: Performance Measures STEM⁷

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline 2009-10	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Anchor Schools Established	0	2	4	4	4
<i>STEM Anchor Schools established through the NC Schools Project</i>		2	1	1	0
Affinity Cluster Networks Established	0	0	2	3	4
<i>STEM Affinity Network Schools established through the NC New Schools Project</i>		5	10	1	0

⁷The State initially embedded its targets for STEM Anchor Schools and STEM Affinity Clusters within its (E)(2) performance measures. All States were asked to provide at least two performance measures to report on the State's progress in STEM in the Year 1 Annual Performance Report (APR). North Carolina applied the two measures in its (E)(2) table initially to meet the STEM requirement.