



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

December 9, 2011

The Honorable John Kasich,
Office of the Governor
Riffe Center, 30th Floor
77 South High Street
Columbus, OH 43215-6108

Dear Governor Kasich:

I am writing in response to Ohio's request to amend its approved Race to the Top grant project. Between August 10 and October 7, 2011, the State submitted several amendment requests to the U.S. Department of Education (Department). As you are aware, the Department has the authority to approve amendments to your plan and budget, provided that such a change does not alter the scope or objectives of the approved proposal. On October 4, 2011, the Department sent a letter and revised "Grant Amendment Submission Process" document to Governors of grantee States indicating the process by which amendments would be reviewed and approved or denied. To determine whether approval could be granted, the Department has applied the conditions noted in the document, and compared it with the Race to the Top program *Principles*, which are also included in that document.

I am pleased to approve the following amendments:

- Clarify the total amount of budget savings resulting from shifting two salaried positions into three contractual positions, as described in Ohio's Amendment Approval letter #5. The budget savings for this amendment is \$649,922, broken out as follows:
 - The total personnel, fringe, and related benefits savings is \$495,816.ⁱ
 - The total savings from indirect costs per Ohio's approved rate is \$154,106.ⁱⁱ
- For the project area of Great Teachers and Leaders, repurpose the \$649,922 cost savings (described above) to increase the number of teachers through Teach for America (TFA), with special emphasis, when possible, for STEM, special education and gifted teachers.

It is our understanding that the amendments will not result in a change in your State's performance measures and outcomes, nor will they substantially change the scope of work. Please note that this letter will be posted on the Department's website as a record of the amendments.

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.

Additionally, Ohio clarified its performance measures in sections (D)(2) and (D)(3). The Race to the Top application required performance measures for specific subcriterion. In “Great Teachers and Leaders,” section (D)(2): improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance, the Department requested information on the percentage of participating local educational agencies (LEAs) that implement and use information from qualifying evaluation systems to inform various human capital decisions. In its original application, Ohio provided performance measures in section (D)(2) that did not align with the federal definition for qualifying evaluation systems. As a result, Ohio 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. Additionally, in “Great Teachers and Leaders” section (D)(3): ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals, the Department requested information on educator rating categories (e.g., highly effective, ineffective). A qualifying evaluation system must be in place before States would be able to report meaningful data on educator effectiveness ratings. Thus, Ohio has also updated performance measures in (D) (3), to align with its approved timeline for implementing a qualifying evaluation system aligned with the federal definition. The attached chart provides clarifications (in bold italics) for the following measures: (D) (2) (ii), (D) (2) (iii), and (D) (2) (iv) (a – d), (D) (3) (i), and (D) (3) (ii).

The State also clarified a typographical error in its approved application for the performance measure in section (D)(5) related to the length of new teacher induction programs. The correct baseline and school year 2011 target for the length in years should be one year, not two, for new teacher induction programs.

I am confident that Ohio 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 Ohio’s Race to the Top Program Officer, Rebecca Zazove, at 202-260-1425 or Rebecca.zazove@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

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

cc: Stan Heffner, Superintendent of Public Instruction
 Michael Sawyers, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction
 Maggie Niedzwiecki, Race to the Top State lead

¹ 2 salary/benefits positions X 4 years changed to 3 contractual positions X 3 years = \$495,816 (\$1,413,816 - \$918,000).

¹ “Indirect costs” budgeted for the 2 salary/benefits positions over 4 years = \$154,106 (\$77,053 X 2 positions)

Performance Measures for (D)(2)		Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:		Baseline data and annual targets			
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	N/A	0 <i>N/A</i>	50 <i>10</i>	75 <i>35</i>	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	N/A	25 <i>N/A</i>	50 <i>10</i>	75 <i>35</i>	100
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:	-	-	-	-	-
(D)(2)(iv)(a)	Developing teachers and principals.	N/A	25 <i>N/A</i>	50 <i>10</i>	100 <i>35</i>	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Compensating teachers and principals.	N/A	0 <i>N/A</i>	25 <i>10</i>	50 <i>35</i>	75
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Promoting teachers and principals.	N/A	0 <i>N/A</i>	50 <i>10</i>	75 <i>35</i>	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Retaining effective teachers and principals.	N/A	0 <i>N/A</i>	50 <i>10</i>	75 <i>35</i>	100
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.	N/A	0 <i>N/A</i>	50 <i>10</i>	75 <i>35</i>	100
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.	N/A	0 <i>N/A</i>	50 <i>10</i>	75 <i>35</i>	100

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)		Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:					
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	10 N/A	15 N/A	20	25
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	15 N/A	20 N/A	25	30
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	20 N/A	15 N/A	10	<=5
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	15 N/A	10 N/A	5	<=5
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	10 N/A	15 N/A	20	25
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	N/A	15 N/A	20 N/A	25	30
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	20 N/A	15 N/A	10	<=5
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	N/A	15 N/A	10 N/A	5	<=5

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii)		Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
<i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>						
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
(D)(3)(ii)	Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	80 <i>N/A</i>	85 <i>N/A</i>	90 30	>=90
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	80 <i>N/A</i>	85 <i>N/A</i>	90 30	>=90
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	80 <i>N/A</i>	85 <i>N/A</i>	90 30	>=90
(D)(3)(i)	Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	80 <i>N/A</i>	85 <i>N/A</i>	90 30	>=90
