

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(A) State Success Factors (125 total points) 3

(A)(1) Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it 3

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up and sustain proposed plans 34

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps 44

(B) Standards and Assessments (70 total points) 69

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards 69

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments 75

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments 79

(C) Data Systems to Support Instruction (47 total points) 95

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system 95

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data 98

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction 107

(D) Great Teachers and Leaders (138 total points) (See Appendix D_T for a complete set of timelines) 116

(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals 116

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance 123

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals 149

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs160
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals172
(E) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (50 total points).....184
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs.....184
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools.....187
(F) General (55 total points)216
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority.....216
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools221
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions234

COMPETITION PRIORITIES

Priority 1: Absolute Priority -- Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform239
Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority -- Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM).239
Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes.....242
Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems.....244
Priority 5: Invitational Priority -- P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment.....247
Priority 6: Invitational Priority -- School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning250

SELECTION CRITERIA: PROGRESS AND PLANS IN THE FOUR EDUCATION REFORM AREAS

(A) State Success Factors (125 total points)

(A)(1) Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it (65 points)

The extent to which—

- (i) The State has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcomes statewide, establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application; (5 points)
- (ii) The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State’s plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (as set forth in Appendix D)¹ or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include— (45 points)
 - (a) Terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State’s plans;
 - (b) Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top plans; and
 - (c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers’ union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice); and

¹ See Appendix D for more on participating LEA MOUs and for a model MOU.

(iii) The LEAs that are participating in the State's Race to the Top plans (including considerations of the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty) will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its ambitious yet achievable goals, overall and by student subgroup, for—(15 points)

- (a) Increasing student achievement in (at a minimum) reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;
- (b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;
- (c) Increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice); and
- (d) Increasing college enrollment (as defined in this notice) and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion, as well as projected goals as described in (A)(1)(iii). The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii):

- An example of the State's standard Participating LEA MOU, and description of variations used, if any.
- The completed summary table indicating which specific portions of the State's plan each LEA is committed to implementing, and relevant summary statistics (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(b), below).
- The completed summary table indicating which LEA leadership signatures have been obtained (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(c), below).

Evidence for (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed summary table indicating the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(iii), below).
- Tables and graphs that show the State's goals, overall and by subgroup, requested in the criterion, together with the

supporting narrative. In addition, describe what the goals would look like were the State not to receive an award under this program.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed detailed table, by LEA, that includes the information requested in the criterion (see Detailed Table for (A)(1), below).

Recommended maximum response length: Ten pages (excluding tables)

A(1) Creating the Foundation for Race to the Top

Under the leadership of Governor Paterson, the Board of Regents, Chancellor Tisch, and recently appointed Commissioner of Education, Dr. David Steiner, New York State has built an aggressive reform platform that includes the four reform areas described in ARRA as well as in the Competitive and Invitational Priorities of Race to the Top. New York State is committed to boldly pursuing fundamental changes in practice that will result both in the narrowing of the achievement gap for all students and increased rates of college access and success.

New York's RTTT application prioritizes an investment in people by building permanent structures to support educator effectiveness and thus achieve dramatically higher learning outcomes for all students. At its core is an intense focus on the quality of the interaction between the student and teacher. All of the plan's policies, practices and structures have been designed to radiate from this focal point and provide those who are accountable for producing this interaction with the essential tools and support they need: unsurpassed preparation programs; world class curriculum frameworks; formative, interim, and summative assessments aligned to internationally benchmarked standards; and targeted professional development in strong schools to ensure educators have the in-service training they need to provide our students with a truly exceptional educational experience.

To provide the full suite of tools and supports needed to ensure high quality interactions between students and teachers, our RTTT plan draws heavily on the entrepreneurial experiences of two of the State's most senior education leaders, Commissioner Dr. David

Steiner and Senior Deputy for P-12 Education, Dr. John King. Further described in Section A(2), these two education entrepreneurs have nationally renowned track-records of leading path-breaking innovations in education; innovations that have been proven to drive increases in student achievement and that are now core components of New York’s RTTT plan. From Commissioner Steiner’s work in teacher preparation as Dean of Hunter College of Education at the City University of New York, this includes: using video to demonstrate best practices and as a tool for clinical feedback; collaborative teaching by education school professors and staff of high-performing charters and innovative district school models; requiring the use of value-added data for graduation from teacher preparation programs; and the design of a second-generation urban teacher-residency model. From Dr. King’s work as a Managing Director at Uncommon Schools² and as founder of Boston’s Roxbury Prep charter school, the plan draws on his expertise to incorporate: an intense focus on curriculum and meaningful professional development based on student performance; data-driven instruction where teams develop individual student action plans based on data from formative and interim assessments; differentiated professional development and coaching based on data (including the use of best practice video); extended school day and school year scheduling; and school leadership focused on instructional leadership through careful observation and feedback and collaborative analysis of data and student work.

The State’s plan also draws on lessons learned from innovative local initiatives and successful charter school models from across New York, and we will take those lessons to scale. While acknowledging that not everything is transferable – what works in one school or community may not work in another - we intend to take what we have collectively learned about successful practices and

²**Uncommon Schools:** is a nonprofit organization that starts and manages urban charter public schools that close the achievement gap and prepare low-income students to graduate from college. On the 2009 New York Math and English/Language Arts exams, Uncommon Schools’ 1,000 students, grades three through eight – 99% of whom are Black and Latino – collectively closed the “achievement gap,” out-performing the state’s White students.

models, and package those lessons in such a way that preserves their core components, while allowing for local adaptation and innovation. With the assistance of RTTT funding, we also intend to provide unprecedented levels of support to our educators and LEAs as they implement the State's RTTT reforms, leveraging existing statewide network structures and also facilitating LEA and State engagement of external service providers with expertise in specific areas of our reform plan.

While our plan leverages the expertise of the State's new reform-driven leadership and other innovative school-based practices, the conditions created by the Board of Regents ensure that it's a realistic one, too. The New York State Board of Regents has greater executive authority over public education in New York than any other state education board. First established by the State legislature in 1784, the Regents of The University of the State of New York (USNY) form the oldest continuous state education entity in America and are responsible for the general supervision of all educational activities in the State (Pre-K through Postsecondary, Professional and Cultural Education). USNY is a rich portfolio of resources that comprises *all* of the State's institutions, both public and private, that offer education. While USNY does not directly have any classrooms of its own, it is a licensing and accreditation body that sets standards for schools from pre-kindergarten (PreK) through professional and graduate school as well as for the practice of a wide variety of professions. USNY, under the oversight of the Regents, the Commissioner, and the New York State Education Department (NYSED), includes: over 7,000 public and private elementary and secondary schools including 158 charter schools; 248 public colleges and universities; 251 proprietary (for-profit) schools; nearly 7,000 libraries; 750 museums; vocational and educational services for children and adults with disabilities; 25 public radio and television broadcasting stations; 750,000 licensed professionals practicing 48 professions, and 240,000 certified public school teachers, counselors, and administrators. As a component of NYSED, the USNY network also includes 37 District Superintendents who oversee Boards of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES). Since they were established by the State legislature in 1948, BOCES have played a key role in supporting districts by providing them with shared educational programs and services. Unlike any other

state, all of the resources described above are under the care of one board, the Regents.

In 2002, the Regents embarked on an effort to create the conditions to promote greater statewide student achievement and lay a foundation for dramatic education reform. In a move supported by the Regents, a key initial step was taken that year as the New York State legislature passed a mayoral control statute. The legislation invested accountability for New York City schools in the mayor and a Chancellor to be selected by the mayor. Prior to mayoral control, no single elected official was accountable for the education of the City's 1.1 million students (which represent over 1/3 of the State's K-12 students). The adoption of mayoral control created not only more robust accountability for New York City Schools, but also a broader framework for greater efficiency.

In 2005, following the adoption of statewide learning standards and summative assessments tied to those standards, the Board of Regents published *P-16 Education: A Plan for Action*. In this seminal document, which is strikingly aligned to Race to the Top, the Regents envisioned a New York in which all people are prepared for citizenship, work and continued learning throughout their lives, where gaps in achievement have closed, and where the overall level of knowledge and skill among the people matches or exceeds the best in the world.

To achieve these goals in this first phase of reform, the Board implemented a five-year data driven action plan which aligned the resources of USNY around students, systems, and structures. Within the student category, the Regents set specific targets for increases in early childhood opportunities, outcomes for students with disabilities and English Language Learners, and high school attendance and graduation rates. They also committed to increasing investments in programs that had successfully removed barriers to graduation.

In the systems category, the Regents set targets for strengthening the State's overall education infrastructure with specific improvements in State Learning Standards, the equitable distribution of teaching talent, the State Aid funding formula, and the

capacity of NYSED to support schools. They also set out to develop a P-16 data system that would drive improvements in high school graduation rates.

Finally, within the structures category, the Regents set specific goals to: reduce barriers to teaching and learning in high needs schools by establishing education, health, and mental health collaborations; increase the success rate of students' at key transition points as they progress through the USNY system; leverage resources and improve student outcomes by developing a regional network strategy.

Our Plan for the Future

Since the 2005 publication of *P-16: A Plan for Action*, the State has made solid gains in student achievement, spurred in part by local efforts made possible by the Regents foundational reform policies. (Please see Section A(3)(i) for details on the progress New York made under this plan.) Today, Race to the Top provides an opportunity to reinforce and accelerate the State's efforts to transform schools and align resources and practices as never before, ensuring that all New York's students graduate from high school ready for college, 21st century citizenship, and lifelong learning. In November and December 2009 and January 2010, with recommendations from Commissioner Steiner, the Board of Regents approved pioneering policies in pursuit of an aggressive RTTT reform agenda. The Governor, the Chancellor and Board of Regents, the State legislature, dozens of stakeholder groups including our statewide teachers' and principals' unions, along with 550 participating districts and charter schools have come together to support the State's plan and the unique opportunity it represents for the students of New York. While our plans are detailed within each of the assurance sections, an overview is provided below:

Develop and adopt world class, internationally benchmarked common standards and assessments; design and implement sequenced, spiraled, content-rich, detailed curriculum frameworks and formative, interim, and summative assessments fully aligned with those standards; align standards, assessments, and performance targets to ensure college and career readiness

for New York State's high-school graduates

We know that in order to increase our students' levels of achievement, our educators must have the fundamental tools essential for producing successful interactions with students: world-class standards, detailed curriculum frameworks, and assessments. New York thus plans to implement new Common Core standards beginning with English language arts and math. The Board of Regents and the Commissioner will develop clear, content-rich, sequenced, spiraled, detailed curriculum frameworks, aligned to the new standards, that will collectively form the foundation for a new generation of assessments - assessments that will be redesigned to generate truly useful data for students, teachers, principals and parents. This next generation of assessments will include rich formative and interim assessments, offering feedback not only on students' acquisition of crucial foundational knowledge and skills, but also their ability to demonstrate, through more performance-based tasks, the higher-order critical thinking skills needed for success in higher education and the world of work. We envision that the enthusiasm resulting from the work of the Common Core Standards will spark a revolution in the design of formative, interim, and summative assessments and open a new marketplace that will increase the relevance of those assessments and bridge the knowledge gap that currently impedes instructional strategies that promote effective differentiated instruction. As part of their recent actions, the Regents approved participation in a consortium of states that will develop assessments aligned to the Common Core standards. The State has also signed MOU's with consortia that are forming that show our intention to pursue assessment practices that build on enriched curriculum frameworks aligned to the Common Core standards. We will also vertically scale our assessments to facilitate teacher value-added analysis – providing educators and administrators with information crucial for strengthening our teaching corps.

In order to embrace the knowledge and skills students need in the 21st century, New York will expand its curricular offerings by developing curriculum frameworks and assessments in the Arts, Economics, and Multimedia/Computer Technology. We will also prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) by

ensuring our students are equipped for higher level mathematics and science work through the design and implementation of a blended Grades 3-8 science testing program. This program will integrate computer-based assessment and take advantage of advances in computer technology to stage lab simulations, conduct data analysis, and test scientific hypotheses.

To support our educators in using the new standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessments, NYSED will partner with our Boards of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES), districts, unions, professional associations, cultural institutions, museums, the State University of New York (SUNY), the City University of New York (CUNY), private Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), and contracted external services providers to develop on-going professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators through a regional network strategy.

Develop an advanced “P-20” data longitudinal data system that promotes data-driven decision making to facilitate effective strategies in classroom pedagogy, district and school management, system accountability and education policy

To ensure that good teaching, effective school leadership, and thoughtful policy making are informed by accurate, actionable, and interconnected data, New York State will use RTTT funding to accelerate work currently under way to build a single comprehensive longitudinal data system. New York’s Statewide Instructional Reporting and Improvement System (NY-SIRIS) will leverage the best of such systems already in use in New York State and will provide standard, customized, real-time reports (for formative, interim, and summative data) and analysis to teachers, school officials, parents, researchers, and state education policy makers. It will link student performance data to educator effectiveness, provide electronic transcripts for all students, and truly span the P-20 continuum by connecting P-12 education with higher education and other non-educational databases (such as information on the workforce and health). It will also enable mastery/competency-based progress. To ensure this new tool is used to drive effective school-level practices, we will provide extensive and ongoing professional development in using the system to analyze data and then, once student deficiencies are identified, to take the appropriate, research-driven actions to improve student achievement or

school climate.

Ensure the equitable distribution of high quality teachers and require development and deployment of high quality principals in all schools; prioritize this focus on high-needs schools and subject areas for high needs schools

To promote the equitable distribution of high quality teachers and principals in all schools and to prioritize high-needs school and subject areas, New York State will benefit from RTTT funding to undertake a number of strategic initiatives.

To increase the supply of effective teachers in high-needs schools, New York will use RTTT funds to create an incentive program to pay eligible teachers who teach in STEM and other designated subjects in the State's high-need middle and high schools \$30,000 bonuses over 5 years.

To ensure we have effective educators teaching in every classroom and leading every school, New York will redesign its teacher and school leader preparation programs. Educators will be certified on the basis of their capacity to be effective, including their ability to raise the academic achievement of all students who make up the rich diversity of our State's student population. The State will develop richer, more extensive, and better supervised clinical experiences for student-teachers and aspiring principals with a focus on serving the needs of students in the performance gap in high need schools. We will make better use of learning technologies and expect to see the next generation teacher training programs using video as a tool both for demonstrating best practices and for providing aspiring teachers with critical feedback from highly effective mentor teachers. We also expect to seed the proliferation of online teacher learning communities which will allow teachers to share knowledge and learn from each other anytime and anyplace.

To support these goals, higher education institutions will retool their teacher preparation programs to align with new standards and performance-based assessments for teacher certification. The Regents have instituted new policies to facilitate the development of

alternative preparation pathways – aligned with the new standards and performance-based assessments – for teachers by institutions that are not colleges or universities, but do have a track record of raising the achievement of high needs student populations. Based on rigorous selection and evaluation criteria, the New York will work with these institutions - such as cultural institutions and high performing school networks – to pilot teacher preparation programs. NYSED will also publish transparent data profiles for all institutions that prepare teachers indicating in particular the performance of the students their graduates have taught

Working with district, union, and higher education partners, NYSED will redesign the State’s teacher evaluation systems to reflect the full depth and breadth of the teaching profession, utilizing multiple dimensions in order to clearly differentiate teacher effectiveness. The crucial ability of a teacher to raise the academic performance of her or his students will form a critical part of this redesigned evaluation system and we will launch an incentive fund to encourage LEAs and their union partners to implement optional, but far-reaching teacher effectiveness measures beyond the RTTT scope of work. We will incorporate the equitable distribution of effective teachers into our district score cards and district accountability. In addition, we will provide targeted financial incentives to bring effective teachers into our neediest schools and to encourage more teachers to teach science, technology, engineering, and math, as well as English language learners and children with special needs.

To ensure we have effective leaders in our schools, New York will pilot new, non-traditional educational leader preparation programs along similar lines to those planned for preparing teachers. We will develop school leader evaluations that are focused on strengthening student performance, incorporating student achievement data and feedback from multiple sources and aligning professional growth with areas that need improvement. We will launch a second fund to incentivize LEAs and their union partners to implement optional measures to drive increased principal effectiveness. We will also expand “leadership academies” across the State ensuring that our five largest cities and LEAs throughout the State have access to the highest quality professional development for school leaders.

Increase opportunities for students to attend high performing secondary schools; promote development of multiple high-performing school models throughout the State, with a particular focus on breaking the cycle of chronic under-performance for low-performing schools by supporting LEAs with low-performing schools with district-wide diagnostic planning and implementation to ensure alignment of strategy and resources to serve all students

While New York State has some of the finest schools in the country, we are all too aware that it also has too many that are failing students year after year. The Governor, Chancellor, Board of Regents, and Commissioner wholly agree with the premise embedded in Race to the Top that we must generate real options to turnaround our failing schools and bring in new models and new partners. Districts with persistently low achieving schools will be supported in district-wide planning processes to include a diagnostic assessment that promotes a system-wide approach to turning around the lowest performing schools, not a disjointed school-by-school strategy. Districts with persistently low achieving schools will be given four options: (1) closure; (2) turnaround (in which they replace the principal and 50% or more of the staff); (3) restart (reopening with an external partner); or (4) transformation (in which they replace the principal and implement rigorous staff and school leader development and evaluation systems).

Research has shown that external lead partners are a critical part of school turnaround work. Therefore, to assist our districts with implementing school change strategies, we will leverage lead partners including proven charter management organizations, proven education management organizations, and our public higher education institutions – the State University of New York (SUNY), the nation's largest comprehensive system of public higher education, offering programs at 64 geographically dispersed campuses, and the City University of New York (CUNY), the nation's leading urban public university serving more than 480,000 students at 23 colleges and institutions in New York City – both of which are empowered with the statutory authority to operate schools directly. Additionally, New York State will leverage several new statewide virtual schools and blended school providers.

Create conditions for middle and secondary school innovation and reform

New York will use Race to the Top funds to create a new School Development Grant program to increase the supply of high-performing secondary models tied to twenty-first century competencies. These incentive grants will encourage districts to address achievement in high schools before they are identified as Low Performing schools. As part of this reform strategy we have catalogued and created new policies to promote innovation in school design such as a plan to develop competency based credits, policies to promote virtual instruction and virtual school models, and new STEM models.

NYSED will support the transformation of 25 lower-achieving schools, in addition to those schools identified as the State's persistently lowest achieving in Section D, through the creation of the state-level competitive Innovative Secondary Schools Model Incentive fund. Districts with schools that are in need of improvement, corrective action or restructuring status will be eligible to compete for grant funds of one to two million dollars per school to implement innovative models, including partnerships with institutions of higher education, business and industry in local communities, management agencies, and other external for-profit and non-profit organizations. Funding will also be available to launch model schools and expanded learning opportunities that are centered on themes such as, but not limited to, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), virtual/blended high schools, transfer schools, schools for the arts, career and technical schools, museum schools, and language acquisition schools. These funds will provide LEAs in partnership with external partners the autonomy to support, stimulate, reengage, and sustain customized pathways to high school completion. In addition, NYSED will expand the use of federal school improvement grant funds ("1003(g) funds," 20 USC §6303[g]) to support LEAs that voluntarily opt-in to use one of the four intervention models before schools are identified as persistently lowest-achieving.

New York State will implement new policies that allow for and provide rigorous virtual instruction. NYSED will facilitate the provision of a robust set of State-approved online high school courses for implementation by local school districts to address course makeup opportunities and to advance opportunities for the acquisition of credit. For students who would otherwise lack access to

special subject matter at their schools, New York will provide virtual school offerings, filled with the best of interactive, quality, on-line coursework. Developed through a request for proposal and beginning first in the four core content areas (English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and expanding over time to include all content areas, NYSED will identify an external partner to review and recommend identified resources such as online courses for students and professional development for teachers. As a quality control measure, all recommendations will require final approval by the Commissioner.

Similarly, we will establish the New York State Virtual High School to facilitate the completion of diploma requirements through an online environment. In a progressive step towards growing a statewide online learning environment and providing a baseline digital platform to support all learners with options for alternative pathways to meet state and national learning standards and benchmarks, the New York State Virtual High School will be an innovative option not only for over-aged and under-credited students and other students disconnected from traditional schools, but also for all learners who want access to participate in school “anytime, anywhere.” This approach will grant alternative pathways to completing graduation requirements and advanced courses of study for up to 20,000 students across the State by 2014; these students will have the option to take online public school courses at no cost.

These new options to transform the portfolio of educational routes to graduation will be enhanced by parallel growth in the State’s charter school networks and the launch of a Partnerships Zone model with Mass Insight.³ The Partnership Zone model builds on the successful collaborative school networks created with partners such as New Visions⁴ for Public Schools, one of The Bill and

³Mass Insight Education & Research Institute, founded in 1997, is non-profit that organizes public schools, higher education, business, and state government to significantly improve student achievement, with a focus on closing achievement gaps. Their Publication *Meeting the Turnaround Challenge* was internationally recognized and is now being implemented with a select group of states and districts including New York State.

⁴New Visions for Public Schools is a NYC based non-profit who have created over 139 new small schools. As a NYC PSO NVPS support a network of 76 Schools. Their work includes all levels of education reform: from policy and advocacy to the creation of new, effective public schools and classrooms with rigorous instruction to developing new tools for teacher and leader development based on data driven decision making. Of the 139 New Small Schools NVPS

Melinda Gates Foundation's new small high school partners and New York City's largest education reform partner, and The College Board⁵, a not-for-profit membership association whose mission is to connect students to college success and opportunity. Additionally, many of New York's 154 charter schools operate with the support of some of the country's highest performing charter management organizations (CMOs). CMOs like KIPP⁶, Uncommon Schools, and Achievement First⁷ are beginning to demonstrate a sustainable and scalable model to drive strong gains in student achievement. Recently, New York City's charters were heralded for verifiably outperforming their peer schools as found through a study by Stanford University economist Caroline Hoxby. Subsequently, a study by Stanford University's Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) found that the typical student in a New York City charter school learns more than their virtual counterparts in their feeder pool in reading and mathematics. (The composite virtual student is based on students in competitor traditional public schools, known as the charter

created, initial graduation rates are 20% higher than the citywide average. In particular, Black and Latino students in New Visions' schools graduated at rates 20 percentage points higher than the citywide average for similar cohorts.

⁵The College Board is a not-for-profit membership association whose mission is to connect students to college success and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the College Board is composed of more than 5,700 schools, colleges, universities and other educational organizations. In September 2004, they initiated the creation of College Board Schools, laboratories of learning aimed at preparing underserved middle and high school students to get into college and graduate. The first two schools debuted in New York City's public school system.

⁶Starting in 2000, the non-profit KIPP Foundation began training prospective principals to replicate the success of the two original KIPP Academies in Houston and the South Bronx in New York City. There are currently 82 KIPP public schools in 19 states and the District of Columbia enrolling around 20,000 students. Across the KIPP network, most schools are charter schools. Many students begin KIPP in the fifth grade at least one grade level behind their peers in reading and math. After four years at KIPP, 100% of KIPP eighth grade classes outperformed their district averages in both math and reading/English Language Arts.

⁷Achievement First is a non-profit Charter School Management organization with 7 Charter Schools in New York City. Their network includes 17 academies under nine charters in four cities. In New York, Achievement First Crown Heights Elementary and Achievement First East New York Elementary fourth graders outperformed their New York City peers in math and English Language Arts proficiency by 19 percentage points and surpassed the state proficiency average by 14 percentage points.

school's feeder pool.) The Governor and the Regents have endorsed raising the cap on charter schools to further grow the State's successful charter schools and networks. (The Regents Item related to charter schools is included in Appendix A_1_i_1.)

A(1) (ii)

A copy of New York State's Participating LEA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Preliminary Scope of Work is included in Appendix A_1_ii_1 and A_1_ii_2, respectively.

(A)(1)(iii)

The initiatives funded by the RTTT award will accelerate the closing of the achievement gap in New York State and lift overall student achievement above and beyond those gains expected without an award. We have set aggressive but attainable annual targets, having secured the participation of those LEAs serving the students most in need of improved educational opportunities and outcomes.

Without RTTT funding, New York's students will still continue to make gains on state assessments. The State's plan identifies specific targets for 4th and 8th grade ELA, Math and Science Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) assessments, secondary-level ELA, Math and Science Regents Examinations, high-school graduation rates, and college enrollment and persistence rates.

The effects of the proposed reforms on student performance will be seen starting immediately in the 2010-11 academic year. As our projects are developed and rolled out, as districts and their partners intervene in struggling schools, and as our students experience more years with better prepared and developed teachers and curriculum, New York State's students will increasingly experience the greatest benefits from the Race to the Top award, and the incremental gains to student achievement will accelerate.

Targets for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

As indicated in the tables below, the State targets overall NAEP proficiency levels of 46% for 4th grade reading and 48% for 4th grade math by 2013, representing an incremental 7% and 4%, respectively, above the gains anticipated in the absence of a Race to the Top award. While the overall gain for 4th grade reading is targeted at 10 percentage points over 6 years, priority subgroup gain targets are higher at 12-13 percentage points. These gains will narrow the achievement gap, more than double proficiency levels of students with disabilities and triple the proficiency of English Language Learners (baseline gains are 1-4% points). The 4th grade math gain target for all students is 8 percentage points over 4 years (4% without the grant). We project that priority subgroups will rise on a faster trajectory of 8-10 percentage points over 4 years (contrast to 3-5% without RTTT funding).

NAEP Targets By Subject and Subgroup, 2011 and 2013: Grade 4 Reading Percent Proficient

NAEP Targets By Subject and Subgroup, 2011 and 2013: Grade 4 Reading Percent Proficient

	Latest Score	Baseline (Without Grant) Targets		Race to the Top Grant Targets	
	2007	2011	2013	2011	2013
Black or African American	17%	20%	22%	24%	29%
Hispanic or Latino	18%	19%	20%	24%	30%
Students with Disabilities	8%	10%	11%	15%	20%
English Language Learners	5%	6%	6%	12%	18%
Economically Disadvantaged	20%	21%	22%	26%	32%
Female	39%	41%	42%	45%	49%
Male	33%	35%	36%	39%	43%
All Students	36%	38%	39%	42%	46%

NAEP Targets By Subject and Subgroup, 2011 and 2013: Grade 4 Math Percent Proficient

	Latest Score	Baseline (Without Grant) Targets		Race to the Top Grant Targets	
	2009	2011	2013	2011	2013
Black or African American	19%	21%	23%	23%	29%
Hispanic or Latino	25%	27%	29%	30%	35%
Students with Disabilities	13%	14%	16%	17%	23%
English Language Learners	13%	15%	17%	17%	23%
Economically Disadvantaged	28%	31%	34%	32%	38%
Female	37%	39%	41%	40%	46%
Male	43%	45%	47%	46%	51%
All Students	40%	42%	44%	43%	48%

note: numbers may not add due to decimal rounding

As indicated in the tables below, New York State targets overall NAEP proficiency levels of 40% for Grade 8 Reading and 42% for Grade 8 Math by 2013 (an incremental 7 percentage point gain in both areas above the gains anticipated in the absence of a Race to the Top award). While the overall gain for Grade 8 Reading is targeted at 8 percentage points over 6 years, priority subgroup gain targets are higher, with growth ranging from 10 to 12 percentage points, as strategies specific to traditionally underserved populations will support greater academic achievement for these students. The Grade 8 Math gain target for all students is 8 percentage points over 4 years (1 point without RTTT). We believe priority subgroups will rise on a faster trajectory of 8 to 10 percentage points over 4 years.

NAEP Targets By Subject and Subgroup, 2011 and 2013: Grade 8 Reading Percent Proficient

	Latest Score	Baseline (Without Grant) Targets		Race to the Top Grant Targets	
	2007	2011	2013	2011	2013
Black or African American	14%	14%	15%	19%	25%
Hispanic or Latino	16%	17%	17%	21%	27%
Students with Disabilities	9%	10%	10%	15%	21%
English Language Learners	1%	1%	2%	8%	13%
Economically Disadvantaged	19%	19%	20%	24%	29%
Female	38%	39%	39%	42%	46%
Male	26%	27%	27%	30%	34%
All Students	32%	33%	33%	36%	40%

NAEP Targets By Subject and Subgroup, 2011 and 2013: Grade 8 Math Percent Proficient

	Latest Score	Baseline (Without Grant) Targets		Race to the Top Grant Targets	
	2009	2011	2013	2011	2013
Black or African American	13%	14%	15%	17%	23%
Hispanic or Latino	15%	16%	17%	19%	25%
Students with Disabilities	10%	12%	13%	14%	20%
English Language Learners	5%	5%	6%	11%	15%
Economically Disadvantaged	22%	22%	23%	26%	32%
Female	32%	33%	33%	35%	40%
Male	36%	37%	37%	39%	44%
All Students	34%	35%	35%	37%	42%

note: numbers may not add due to decimal rounding

Note: NAEP exclusion and accommodations data and policy are included in Appendix A_1_iii_1.

Targets for State Assessments

For State exams, we set target *gains*, as opposed to target *achievement levels*, anticipating New York’s plan to adopt more rigorous standards and cut points for State assessments (please refer to Section B). By changing the measuring stick, it becomes difficult to compare absolute levels of student achievement from one year to the next; gains show the ambitious goals New York has set while allowing for flexibility within the prevailing assessment system.

On Grade 4 ELA, the statewide target is an 11 percentage point gain over 5 years. This represents an incremental 4 percentage point

gain off of baseline targets (should New York State not get the RTTT grant). While in the last 3 years the State has seen an 8% increase, less aggressive gains are expected as the State moves to new assessments and changes cut points. Priority subgroups will experience higher gains, since these groups will benefit most from our planned reforms. For example, we target a 15 percentage point gain for African Americans (5 points above baseline), and a 12 percentage point gain for Students with Disabilities (7 points above baseline), as indicated in the table below.

2009–2014 State Assessment Percentage Gain Targets (Baseline and Goal): Grade 4 ELA Overall and By Subgroup

4th Grade ELA Assessment: Baseline (<u>Without Grant</u>) Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	65%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	10%
Hispanic or Latino	65%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	10%
Students with Disabilities	38%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	5%
English Language Learners	41%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%
Economically Disadvantaged	67%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	10%
All Students	77%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	7%

4th Grade ELA Assessment: <u>Race to the Top Grant</u> Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	65%	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%	15%
Hispanic or Latino	65%	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%	15%
Students with Disabilities	38%	1%	1%	3%	3%	3%	12%
English Language Learners	41%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	13%
Economically Disadvantaged	67%	2%	3%	4%	4%	3%	15%
All Students	77%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	11%

note: numbers may not add due to decimal rounding

On Grade 4 Math, the statewide target is an 8 percentage point gain over 5 years. This represents an incremental 3 percentage point

gain off of baseline targets (should New York State not get the grant). Again, while in the last 3 years the State has experienced a 9% increase, less aggressive net gains are expected as the State moves to new assessments and changes cut points. Priority subgroups will experience higher gains, reflecting the targeted investments included for those groups through the Race to the Top funding. For example, we target a 12 percentage point gain for Hispanics (3% above baseline), and a 12 percentage point gain for English Language Learners (5% above baseline), narrowing the achievement gap. (See tables below.)

2009–2014 State Assessment Percentage Gain Targets (Baseline and Goal): 4th Grade Math Overall and By Subgroup

4th Grade Math Assessment: Baseline (Without Grant) Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	78%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%
Hispanic or Latino	82%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%
Students with Disabilities	61%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	4%
English Language Learners	71%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	7%
Economically Disadvantaged	82%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%
All Students	87%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	5%

4th Grade Math Assessment: Race to the Top Grant Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	78%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	13%
Hispanic or Latino	82%	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%	12%
Students with Disabilities	61%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	10%
English Language Learners	71%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	12%
Economically Disadvantaged	82%	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%	12%
All Students	87%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	8%

note: numbers may not add due to decimal rounding

New York State has also set ambitious targets for proficiency in science. Given the investment the State plans to make in improving teaching and learning in the STEM subjects, science proficiency levels are expected to increase commensurate with gains in math, as described above, especially given the comparability of baseline achievement levels. Targets for Grade 4 Science are shown below.

2009–2014 State Assessment Percentage Gain Targets (Baseline and Goal): 4th Grade Science Overall and By Subgroup

4th Grade Science Assessment: Baseline (Without Grant) Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	79%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%
Hispanic or Latino	79%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%
Students with Disabilities	69%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	4%
English Language Learners	63%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	7%
Economically Disadvantaged	81%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%
All Students	88%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	5%

4th Grade Science Assessment: Race to the Top Grant Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	79%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	13%
Hispanic or Latino	79%	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%	12%
Students with Disabilities	69%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	10%
English Language Learners	63%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	12%
Economically Disadvantaged	81%	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%	12%
All Students	88%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	8%

note: numbers may not add due to decimal rounding

As indicated in the tables below, in Grade 8 ELA, the statewide target is a 13 percentage point gain over 5 years. This represents an

incremental 4 percentage point gain off of baseline targets (should New York State not get a Race to the Top grant). Previously, the State has experienced a 20 percentage point increase over 3 years. Priority subgroups will experience higher gains. In particular, we believe measures like curriculum frameworks that include strategies for teaching English Language Learners and improvements in teacher preparation programs to prepare teachers to teach in urban environments will assist our ELL population to achieve a 20 percentage point gain over 5 years (9% above baseline).

2009–2014 State Assessment Percentage Gain Targets (Baseline and Goal): 8th Grade ELA Overall and By Subgroup

8th Grade ELA Assessment: Baseline (<u>Without Grant</u>) Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	52%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	12%
Hispanic or Latino	53%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	12%
Students with Disabilities	25%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	8%
English Language Learners	13%	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	11%
Economically Disadvantaged	54%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	12%
All Students	69%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%

8th Grade ELA Assessment: <u>Race to the Top Grant</u> Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	52%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	18%
Hispanic or Latino	53%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	19%
Students with Disabilities	25%	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%	17%
English Language Learners	13%	3%	4%	4%	5%	4%	20%
Economically Disadvantaged	54%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	17%
All Students	69%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	13%

note: numbers may not add due to decimal rounding

In 8th grade math (please see tables below), the statewide target is a 12 percentage point gain over 5 years. This represents an incremental 3 percentage point gain off of baseline targets (should New York State not get the grant). Previously, the State has experienced a 26 percentage point increase over 3 years – a rate we do not believe is sustainable in light of changing assessments and more rigorous cut points. Priority subgroups will experience higher gains. We target achieving 15-18 percentage point for our priority populations (in contrast to 8-12 percentage point gains, should New York not receive the grant). These gains translate into a ~5-8 percentage point decrease in the achievement gap.

2009–2014 State Assessment Percentage Gain Targets (Baseline and Goal): 8th Grade Math Overall and By Subgroup

	8th Grade Math Assessment: Baseline (Without Grant) Targets						
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	63%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	12%
Hispanic or Latino	69%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	12%
Students with Disabilities	46%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	8%
English Language Learners	53%	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	11%
Economically Disadvantaged	71%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	12%
All Students	80%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%

	8th Grade Math Assessment: Race to the Top Grant Targets						
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	63%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	18%
Hispanic or Latino	69%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	16%
Students with Disabilities	46%	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%	15%
English Language Learners	53%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	16%
Economically Disadvantaged	71%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	16%
All Students	80%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	12%

note: numbers may not add due to decimal rounding

New York State will set ambitious goals for proficiency in science. Given the investment the State plans to make in improving teaching and learning in the STEM subjects, science proficiency levels are expected to increase commensurate with gains in math, as described above, especially given the comparability of baseline achievement levels. Targets for Grade 8 Science are shown below.

2009–2014 State Assessment Percentage Gain Targets (Baseline and Goal): 8th Grade Science Overall and By Subgroup

8th Grade Science Assessment: Baseline (Without Grant) Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	45%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	12%
Hispanic or Latino	49%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	12%
Students with Disabilities	38%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	8%
English Language Learners	22%	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	11%
Economically Disadvantaged	53%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	12%
All Students	68%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	9%

8th Grade Science Assessment: Race to the Top Grant Targets							
	Percent Proficient 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Black or African American	45%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	18%
Hispanic or Latino	49%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	16%
Students with Disabilities	38%	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%	15%
English Language Learners	22%	3%	3%	4%	4%	3%	16%
Economically Disadvantaged	53%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	16%
All Students	68%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	12%

note: numbers may not add due to decimal rounding

Goals for performance statewide on secondary-level Regents Examinations target similarly ambitious gains to achievement levels

for math and ELA, as well as science. The target high school exam gains illustrated in the table below reflect the same progress toward proficiency as do the Grade 8 goals above while reflecting the differences in baseline student achievement levels.

2009–2014 State Assessment Percentage Gain Targets (Baseline and Goal): Regents Exams Overall

	Regents Examinations: Baseline (<u>Without Grant</u>) Targets						
	Percent at or above 65 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Comprehensive English	82%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	5%
Integrated Algebra	72%	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%	13%
Living Environment	80%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	6%

	Regents Examinations: <u>Race to the Top Grant</u> Targets						
	Percent at or above 65 2008-09	Gains 2009-10	Gains 2010-11	Gains 2011-12	Gains 2012-13	Gains 2013-14	Cumulative Gain
Comprehensive English	82%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	8%
Integrated Algebra	72%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	17%
Living Environment	80%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	8%

note: numbers may not add due to decimal rounding

New York State’s Race to the Top strategy will make possible immediate and long-term increases in successful, college-ready high school completion. In addition to setting statewide graduation targets, the State has also set ambitious targets for indicators of post-secondary success.

As the table below illustrates, with the Race to the Top grant, the increase in graduation rate of 4.5% will be more than three times the otherwise anticipated gain of 1.3%. The spread between the goal and the baseline increases during the last years of the grant, not only because those students will benefit from a more mature set of reforms under RTTT, but also because they will benefit from

Race to the Top initiatives as early as their freshman year of high school, a critical year in preparing a student for success.

Placing emphasis on reforms that enable students to succeed in high school, in college, and in their careers, New York State has set post-secondary targets for college enrollment and college persistence rates to rising in tandem with high school graduation rates.

The State has set targets to reflect increases in the percent both of students and of graduates who enroll in college. Likewise, college persistence targets increase with graduation and enrollment rates, resulting in a marked increase in the percent of overall students who enroll and persist in post-secondary studies. An 8.3% gain in the college enrollment rate and 4.3% gain in the college persistence rate (both nearly three times baseline gains) are anticipated.

New York State has additionally set a target for the percentage of secondary-level ELA and Math Regents exams passed with a score at or above 75 points. This higher standard of achievement is recognized by one of the State’s two public institutions of higher education, the City University of New York (CUNY), as predictive of post-secondary readiness for high-school graduates. Specifically, CUNY requires remediation for matriculated students who do not meet this achievement bar, despite successfully meeting high school graduation standards.

Graduation Rate, College Enrollment and College Persistence Rate Targets, 2010-2011 – 2013-2014

	Actual Data: Baseline	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	5-Year Gain
Graduation rate: Four-year cohort high school graduation rate						
Goal	71% (07-08)	72%	72%	74%	76%	4.5%
Baseline	71% (07-08)	72%	71%	72%	73%	1.3%
College enrollment rate: Enrollment of HS <i>graduates</i> in an institution of higher education within 16 months of graduation						
Goal	80% (06-07)	81%	84%	86%	88%	8.3%
Baseline	80% (06-07)	81%	82%	83%	83%	3.1%
College persistence rate: Percent of students returning in the fall <i>who started a first-time, full-time program the year prior</i>						
Goal	72% (07-08)	73%	74%	75%	76%	4.3%
Baseline	72% (07-08)	73%	74%	74%	74%	1.6%
College readiness: Percent of students scoring at or above 75 on Regents Exams						

<i>Secondary-level mathematics</i>						
Goal	60 % (05-06)	66%	69%	73%	77%	17%
Baseline	60 % (05-06)	65%	67%	70%	73%	13%
<i>Secondary-level ELA</i>						
Goal	61% (05-06)	66%	68%	71%	74%	8%
Baseline	61% (05-06)	64%	66%	68%	70%	5%

Note: Graduation requirements in New York will ramp up through 2012 due to a policy phase-in requiring higher scores on the exit exam. It is within this context that we target a 76% graduation rate by 2013-14 in the State of New York (An incremental 3 percentage points above the target should New York not win funds).

Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(b)

Elements of State Reform Plans	Number of LEAs Participating (#)	Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)
B. Standards and Assessments		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	548	99.6
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:		
(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems	549	99.8
(ii) Professional development on use of data	549	99.8
(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers	548	99.6
D. Great Teachers and Leaders		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:		
(i) Measure student growth	547	99.5
(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems	547	99.5
(iii) Conduct annual evaluations	549	99.8
(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development	549	99.8
(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention	541	98.4

(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification	534	97.1
(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal	549	99.8
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:		
(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools	457	83.1
(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	467	84.9
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:		
(i) Quality professional development	548	99.6
(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development	547	99.5
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	427	77.6

Following their appointments, the Commissioner and his Senior Deputy travelled throughout the state to engage LEAs and better understand the challenges they face in raising student achievement. Through these conversations, they heard from teachers, school leaders, parents, superintendents, Board members, policy makers, and students. This invaluable knowledge was used to develop the finer points of the State’s RTTT plans which address the collective needs of the state evidenced by the strong participation of districts and charters schools across the state. The Commissioner and his Senior Deputy worked extensively with the State’s five largest districts which represent approximately 65% of the State’s low income students.

550 LEAs, including 126 charter schools, have committed to implement all or significant portions of the State Plan and signed New York State’s RTTT MOU. Because the various components of New York’s plan are designed to work together to create a comprehensive approach to improve teaching and learning, ensuring that participating LEAs are committed to all of those components will translate into the greatest impacts statewide and help the state to reach its ambitious goals. LEAs that did not commit to full implementation of the Plan, or that inserted qualifying language that materially changed the meaning of the MOU, were not counted for purposes of this section of the application. New York will give these LEAs time during the coming weeks to resubmit an MOU with the necessary commitments and become a participating LEA. (Please see Detailed Table on Participating

LEAs in Appendix A_1_ii_3.)

Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(c)

Signatures acquired from participating LEAs:			
Number of Participating LEAs with all applicable signatures			
	Number of Signatures Obtained (#)	Number of Signatures Applicable (#)	Percentage (%) (Obtained / Applicable)
LEA Superintendent (or equivalent)	550	550	100%
President of Local School Board (or equivalent, if applicable)	506	550	92%
Local Teachers' Union Leader (if applicable)	258	424	61%

[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]

Summary Table for (A)(1)(iii)

	Participating LEAs (#)	Statewide (#)	Percentage of Total Statewide (%) (Participating LEAs / Statewide)
LEAs	550	837	66%
Schools	1645	4146	40%
K-12 Students	2,014,281	2,457,646	82%
Students in poverty	1,097,960	1,171,801	94%

[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up and sustain proposed plans (30 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality overall plan to—

(i) Ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by— (20 points)

- (a) Providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans the State has proposed;
- (b) Supporting participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices, evaluating these practices' effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and replicating the effective practices statewide, holding participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary;
- (c) Providing effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its Race to the Top grant in such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement;
- (d) Using the funds for this grant, as described in the State's budget and accompanying budget narrative, to accomplish the State's plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other Federal, State, and local sources so that they align with the State's Race to the Top goals; and
- (e) Using the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State to continue, after the period of funding has ended, those reforms funded under the grant for which there is evidence of success; and

(ii) Use support from a broad group of stakeholders to better implement its plans, as evidenced by the strength of the statements or actions of support from— (10 points)

- (a) The State's teachers and principals, which include the State's teachers' unions or statewide teacher associations; and
- (b) Other critical stakeholders, such as the State's legislative leadership; charter school authorizers and State charter school

membership associations (if applicable); other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, civil rights, and education association leaders); Tribal schools; parent, student, and community organizations (e.g., parent-teacher associations, nonprofit organizations, local education foundations, and community-based organizations); and institutions of higher education.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. The State's response to (A)(2)(i)(d) will be addressed in the budget section (Section VIII of the application). Attachments, such as letters of support or commitment, should be summarized in the text box below and organized with a summary table in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(2)(i)(d):

- The State's budget, as completed in Section VIII of the application. The narrative that accompanies and explains the budget and how it connects to the State's plan, as completed in Section VIII of the application.

Evidence for (A)(2)(ii):

- A summary in the narrative of the statements or actions and inclusion of key statements or actions in the Appendix.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages (excluding budget and budget narrative)

(A)(2)(i)(a) & (b) New York is fortunate to have three of the nation's most passionate and effective education reformers at the helm of the State's education system who will provide the leadership needed to effectively implement our reform plans. Board of Regents Chancellor since April, 2009, Merryl Tisch, is a former first grade teacher and has been a Regents member since 1996. In addition to her education-focused service, she has received national recognition for her work in the areas of youth and family services, housing, poverty programs, and neighborhood preservation. In her acceptance statement, Tisch proposed a series of reforms that echo the principles of Race to the Top including a call for higher standards, rigorous school accountability, alternative pathways for aspiring teachers and principals, and a redesigned data-system. Chancellor Tisch has already demonstrated a powerful capacity to effect

change at the highest levels of New York's education system as she has worked with the seventeen-member Board of Regents, the Governor, and state legislators to push forward our education reforms.

Working closely with the Chancellor is the State's new Commissioner of Education, David Steiner, a nationally renowned expert on teacher preparation. Appointed in October 2009 as New York State Commissioner of Education and President of the University of the State of New York, Dr. Steiner previously served as the Dean of the Hunter College School of Education at the City University of New York. While at Hunter, Dr. Steiner gained a national reputation for his efforts to transform teacher preparation and improve teacher quality. He developed rigorous evidence-based approaches to prepare and support teachers in a diverse range of settings to lead their students to remarkable gains in achievement.

Immediately following his appointment, Dr. Steiner appointed Dr. John King as his senior deputy. Previously, Dr. King served as Managing Director with Uncommon Schools, one of the country's most successful charter management organizations, and was a founder of Roxbury Prep, an exemplary charter school in Boston. Under Dr. King's leadership, Roxbury Prep's students attained the highest state exam scores of any urban middle school in Massachusetts, closed the racial achievement gap, and outperformed students from not only the Boston district schools but the city's affluent suburbs.

Within weeks of their appointments, Drs. Steiner and King presented the Board of Regents with their vision for education in New York, fully aligned with and in service of the Regents' RTTT plans. The Commissioner and his Senior Deputy's vision described a redesigned and streamlined State Education Department that focused in parallel on serving the needs of LEAs while building their capacity to implement the State's RTTT plans. They envisioned several new critical functions: a dedicated RTTT management office to oversee the implementation of the State's RTTT plans and professional development offerings; a specialized team of experts focused on assisting districts with their school turnaround efforts (ETACIT); the Office of Innovative School Models (OISM) to help

create optimal policy and operating conditions for dramatic school intervention within the State; a new research function to identify promising practices and scalable innovations; a realignment of *The Regents' Research Fund*, an existing 501c(3) organization, to build the State's capacity to develop public-private partnerships; and the Office of District Services Statewide to ensure alignment and quality of all SEA services. Appendix A_2_i_a_1 shows the RTTT Organization Structure within NYSED.

NYSED Redesign

Beginning in early 2010, the Commissioner and Dr. King will shepherd the redesign of NYSED and transform it from a compliance-oriented agency focused on monitoring inputs to a service-oriented agency focused on supporting LEAs. State processes will be streamlined. The NYSED website will be maximized as a tool for efficient communication between NYSED and districts, schools, administrators, teachers, parents, and the general public; and as a portal for learning opportunities for all citizens available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. NYSED's capacity to accurately evaluate districts' effectiveness and diagnose districts' strengths and weaknesses will also be further developed in key areas of district need, such as special education, ELL services, curriculum design, use of formative assessments, and secondary school redesign.

Office of Accountability

NYSED's Office of Accountability will continue to be responsible for implementing the statewide accountability system, including implementing the Education Oversight Board Review process. In addition to identifying schools to implement one of the four Race to the Top turnaround intervention models, the Office of Accountability will support the Office of Innovative School Models and the ETACIT team in working with districts and schools to create comprehensive data profiles and analyses to inform intervention strategies.

Office of District Services

As a first step, school district superintendent Ken Slentz was recently appointed to the position of Associate Commissioner, District Services. In this role, Mr. Slentz will coordinate NYSED's efforts to move to a more service-oriented relationship with the State's LEAs and also oversee all efforts to build the capacity of its LEAs through coordinated professional development delivered through a regional network strategy leveraging BOCES, Institutions of Higher Education, networks of high-performing schools, charter management networks, and cultural institutions, museums, and contracted service providers. The Office of District Services will draft relevant RFPs for capacity building services and ensure the coherent, coordinated delivery of services. District Services will also oversee the deployment of district intervention teams Mr. Slentz brings sixteen years of experience in public and private P-12 education, most recently as the Superintendent of Schools in the West Canada Valley School District in New York. He has been a recognized leader in the technological, financial and day-to-day operations of school districts. One of his most noted strengths is his ability to build the capacity of his professional staff with minimal budgetary impact.

RTTT Management Office

NYSED's Race to the Top Management Office will include key NYSED leadership and staff members responsible for Race to the Top initiatives relating to each Four Assurance areas. The team will oversee the implementation and efficacy of New York State's plans and ensure LEAs and NYSED develop the capacity needed to implement and sustain the reforms beyond the grant period. Organizationally located within the Office of the Senior Deputy, the office will oversee all RTTT implementation work and resources, including the facilitation of all LEA capability building efforts, and it will be the source of supporting documentation, guidance, and metrics monitoring. The office will ensure that quality-assurance methods are in place throughout implementation while supervising and monitoring all related activities and timelines. The office will coordinate a cross functional executive project team that will ensure alignment across all RTTT projects and will quickly promote management decisions that allow flexibility tied to accountability for reform results. Additionally, the office will work closely with NYSED's Research Support Group and other offices to compile the

data needed to track participating LEAs progress in implementing the RTTT reforms and intervening where necessary. Coordinated by the RTTT management office, each RTTT project, as defined in our RTTT budgets, will have a dedicated team of NYSED staff members who have the functional expertise needed to implement specific plans, draft RFPs where appropriate, and select external partners where needed to bring in additional expertise and augment the State's capacity.

The RTTT management team will closely coordinate the work of the project teams and that of other existing and new support structures, including ETACIT which is described further in Section B; and contracted service providers. All of these groups will be aligned to provide coordinated yet locally-based support to LEAs as they implement RTTT plans and develop the capacity to sustain them beyond the grant period. Additionally, the State's unique BOCES network will be leveraged to promote communication, program development, and capacity building across districts.

The RTTT management office will ensure that all RTTT professional development activities are coordinated in a coherent suite of high quality offerings that build sustainable capacity within LEAs. The team will source and facilitate professional development offerings by proven external providers and maintain quality oversight. It will also leverage the professional development activities of BOCES, professional associations, cultural institutions, SUNY, CUNY, private institutions of Higher Education, and the contributions of individual teachers and principals. The RTTT management office will facilitate capacity development in three main areas: New York State's enhanced standards, curriculum frameworks, and redesigned assessments; the use of data to improve instruction; and revised professional standards for teachers and principals. The office will also ensure that offerings are aligned and complementary; consistent in format, where applicable; and accessible through the NYSED website.

Office of Innovative School Models (OISM)

The newly created Office of Innovative School Models (OISM) will open in February of 2010. Led by an Executive Director with

deep experience in both education administration and charter development, OISM will, in addition to overseeing the State's charter authorizing work, create optimal state-level policy and operating conditions for dramatic school intervention and ensure that LEAs can build on successful and innovative practices in areas such as school enrollment and placement to ensure equity; maximizing use of school time and schedule; and teacher scheduling. (Appendix E 2 ii 1). The office will also administer our state-level Innovative Secondary Schools Model Incentive fund program and will manage the RFPs to develop ETACIT and for virtual and blended schools.

External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround (ETACIT)

Through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process, New York will create ETACIT to leverage national expertise to support the implementation of school intervention models. ETACIT will report to Senior Deputy Commissioner King and, under his leadership, will work closely with the RTTT implementation management team. This specialized group will provide technical assistance to those districts engaging in school turnarounds by vetting potential lead partners and helping districts select partner(s) to best meet their needs. ETACIT will also coordinate with the RTTT management team in the identification and dissemination of best practices related to school turnaround and will coordinate with Mass Insight to replicate their successful model for turning around low-performing schools. (New York State is one of a handful of states selected to partner with Mass Insight, a MA-based non-profit organization focused on helping states turn around their lowest performing schools.) ETACIT will also be responsible for annually evaluating the efficacy of each participating LEA's turnaround school efforts and intervening where necessary.

NYSED Research Support Group

Under the leadership of Laura Smith, the newly appointed Assistant Commissioner for External Partnerships and Research, the NYSED Research Support Group, will package and disseminate information about proven best practices and successful, scalable models. Ms. Smith brings over 15 years of experience in urban education program and project management having served as an Eli &

Edythe Broad Foundation *Resident in Urban Education* for the San Diego City School district in the Residency's inaugural year and later working for the NYC Charter School Center and the NYC Department of Education.

The Research Support Group, fueled by a team of data analysts and statisticians as well as external evaluators, will work in conjunction with the Office of Accountability to analyze state-wide data to identify and disseminate best practices from:

1. Schools that are “beating the odds” by dramatically outperforming schools with comparable student populations
2. Promising school-level practices that have demonstrated success in driving outstanding student achievement improvement
3. Districts that have implemented human resource and school portfolio management practices that have resulted in high performance for schools and/or targeted populations in them

Additionally, the Research Support group will work closely with the RTTT management team to analyze data on participating LEAs performance so that appropriate actions can be taken where necessary to ensure RTTT funds are used effectively and according to New York's plan.

NYSED Office of External Partnerships

To complement NYSED's expanded research capacity, the Office of External Partnerships will also be overseen by Laura Smith and will facilitate strategic public-private partnerships, cultivate private investments in state-level reform initiatives, and ensure that NYSED takes full advantage of all available federal grant opportunities. Reporting to the Commissioner/Sr. Deputy, the Office of External Partnerships will leverage its close management relationship with the Research Support Group to ensure that all investments are aligned to evidenced-based strategies and that they are monitored through a rigorous evaluation process.

A (2)(i)(c) The RTTT management office will coordinate with existing control structures for purposes of fiscal administration and oversight. Several New York government entities are responsible for the management, implementation, and oversight of internal controls and for safeguarding taxpayers' money. This includes the Office of the State Comptroller (OSC) which will take an active role in monitoring the use of RTTT funds. NYSED's Office of Grants Finance will process approved subgrants for payment and maintain a tracking system for all subgrant payments. Monthly reconciliations are conducted between the Grants Finance's system and the Comptroller's system to ensure segregation levels, expenditures, encumbrances, and cash balances are accurate. The Grants Finance Office continuously monitors the availability of grant funds to assure that funds are obligated and expended within the appropriate time period for the fund source. All grants exceeding \$50,000 must be approved by OSC, and the New York State Attorney General must also approve grants exceeding \$50,000 to agencies other than public school districts, BOCES, or public libraries. For internal control, only grants administration and program staff can enter and approve subgrants on the tracking system and only Grants Finance staff can enter payment information and perform voucher, refund, and transfer functions.

NYSED has processes to guide staff on the procedures to be followed for those federal programs that require a performance and/or a fiscal report. The performance report is created by the program office responsible for the federal grant and they submit the final report to the Administrative Support Group (ASG) for review and recommendation of approval. For RTTT, this function will be performed by the RTTT Management team. Next, the Bureau of Budget Coordination reviews it and submits it to NYSED's Chief Operating Officer (COO). All reports with a fiscal component are approved by the COO.

NYSED monitors the State's nearly 700 districts by reviewing their annual financial statements, single audits and audits conducted by the Office of the State Comptroller. Other monitoring protocols include desk reviews, requests for additional documentation, and onsite reviews by program office staff and/or audit staff.

(A)(2)(i)(d) See Section VIII of the application – Budget Narrative

(A)(2)(i)(e)

New York State has a history of funding strong reform, including our Contracts for Excellence (C4E). Begun in 2007, C4E is an initiative of the Spitzer/Paterson gubernatorial administration designed to ensure that funding increases go hand in hand with increased accountability. C4E calls for the reallocation of funding, through a contract between NYSED and select school districts, to improve student achievement by implementing specific proven practices including Pre-K programs, middle and high school restructuring, teacher and principal quality initiatives, class size reduction, and increased instructional time. To further align state education resources to support reform plans, we see opportunities in the restructured 1003 A and G funds to supplement RTTT award dollars. The State has also identified additional opportunities to realign existing funds. As a result of a 2004 class action settlement with Microsoft, New York State expects to receive between \$70-85 million for distribution to public schools in the State. To qualify, schools must have at least 50% of their students receiving free and reduced price lunch. The money can be used for software, hardware, professional development, or computer services and NYSED anticipates that it will be targeted to support our P-20 data system development and implementation. We also have available, through ARRA Title I School Improvement Grant funds, approximately \$13 million in flexible administration funds that will be used to support the Curriculum Frameworks Strategy. Finally, NYSED will be receiving \$249 million (95% of \$261 million) in ARRA Title I School Improvement funds that must go to the lowest performing 5% of schools. Three tiers of schools are eligible for SIG funds: Tier I: The State's bottom 5% of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (or the State's bottom 5% lowest-achieving Title I schools, whichever is greater); Tier II: The State's Title I eligible (but not necessarily participating) secondary schools with equivalently poor performance as Tier I schools; Tier III [Note: only for SEAs that have sufficient funding for all Tier I and II schools and still have a surplus of SIG funds.]: Any state Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. SEAs will set exact criteria, which could include rewards

for schools with low absolute performance but high growth rates over a number years, or the bottom 10% of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. We will target the majority of funds to chronically low-performing schools, including high schools and their feeder schools, to complement Race to the Top funding, thus increasing the leverage of those dollars to implement the robust and comprehensive reforms that will dramatically transform school practice and culture to increase student outcomes.

(A)(2)(ii)(a) and (A)(2)(ii)(b)

New York State's Race to the Top objectives were developed through an open engagement and feedback process with key stakeholders. Over a three month period, the Chancellor, the Board of Regents Chair for the Race to the Top Committee, and the Commissioner of Education with his Senior Deputy, met with nearly 200 individuals and groups from around the State (Please see Appendix A_2_ii_b_1 for a List of NYS RTTT Engagement Meetings Held and Attendees). Included were school district superintendents and boards of education, BOCES district superintendents, our union partners, English Language Learner coalitions, non-profit school providers and charter school organizations, deans and faculty of colleges and universities, early childhood groups, parent associations, advocacy groups for the arts and culture, representatives for individuals with disabilities, civil rights groups, and members of the philanthropic community. In recent weeks, the State has received 98 letters of support from several of these groups and from other stakeholders across the State. Those letters consistently commend the breadth of vision and reform our State's Race to the Top plan promises to bring to the students of New York State. (Please see Appendix A_2_ii_b_2 for an index of Letters of Support the State has received as well as copies of the actual letters.)

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps (30 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its ability to—

- (i) Make progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms; (5 points)
- (ii) Improve student outcomes overall and by student subgroup since at least 2003, and explain the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed to — (25 points)
- (a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA;
 - (b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; and
 - (c) Increasing high school graduation rates.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(3)(ii):

- NAEP and ESEA results since at least 2003. Include in the Appendix all the data requested in the criterion as a resource for peer reviewers for each year in which a test was given or data was collected. Note that this data will be used for reference only and can be in raw format. In the narrative, provide the analysis of this data and any tables or graphs that best support the narrative.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages

(A)(3)(i)

Although the Regents *P-16 Education Plan* pre-dates Race to the Top by five years, the goals are noticeably similar, thus New York has created a remarkable foundation for RTTT's continued reforms. Recently, the Center for American Progress graded all the states

on school performance and ranked New York in the top-five on two important criteria: managing school innovation and improving college and career readiness. They also cited the State's strong academic standards and ability to move poor performing teachers from the classroom. As NYSED worked to implement the action steps in the Regents' 2005 plan, the policy reforms provided under the plan allowed superintendents across the State to embark on their own local reform efforts to catalyze student achievement within their communities. Collectively, during this second phase of our reforms over the past several years, New York has made significant progress within the assurance areas. A summary-to-date of our statewide achievements follows:

Standards and Assessments: New York has a long history of setting high expectations for all students through rigorous college- and career-ready standards and assessments. Our current student learning standards, considered to be among the most rigorous in the nation, were approved by the Board of Regents in 1996. (See Appendix A_3_i_1 for a complete listing of Learning Standards of New York State) To support educators in the use of the new standards, NYSED created the New York State Academy for Teaching and Learning, to facilitate the implementation of the new standards through a Statewide Peer Review process as a means of achieving quality standards-based instruction and high levels of student achievement.

To ensure New York's learning standards continually reflect modern college and career readiness skills, the Board of Regents requires that all learning standards are regularly reviewed, revised, and benchmarked to international standards. Beginning in 2007, the State conducted a comprehensive revision of its English Language Arts (ELA) and English as a Second Language (ESL) standards and then subsequently began the process to review and revise the standards for Career and Technical Education and Career Development (CDOS.)

Chaired by Regent Saul Cohen, formerly President of Queens College, and coordinated by Dr. Walter Sullivan, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Director of the Center for Educational Policy and Practice at The College of New Rochelle, the

Regents' Standards Review Committee includes numerous practitioners drawn from New York schools, higher education institutions, and other stakeholders. A research base is provided by a team of nationally recognized researchers, including Dr. Michael Kamil, Stanford University (Chair, Research Team); Dr. Dorothy Strickland, Rutgers University; Dr. Catherine Snow, Harvard University; Dr. Frank Vellutino, SUNY, Albany; and Dr. Nell Duke, Michigan State University. (Note that Drs. Kamil, Strickland, and Snow are also formally involved with the current National Governors' Association Common Core Standards initiative.) The committee's efforts are further supported by NYSED senior staff and the New York Comprehensive Center (NYCC), one of 16 regional comprehensive centers funded by the U.S. Department of Education that supports state education leaders as they strive to meet the goals of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and improve achievement outcomes for all students.

External input plays a vital role throughout the process. Through the revision of the ELA and ESL standards, feedback was considered from over 1,000 individuals who participated in one of six regional forums or responded to focused questions. Several national organizations also participated in the process. Notably, Achieve, Inc., and The Partnership for 21st Century Learning were awarded contracts to, respectively, evaluate the current learning standards and evaluate the work of the ELA/ESL panel against the 21st Century Learning criteria. Additionally, The College Board presented to the committee relative to their standards in terms of College Readiness.

Following the revision of the ELA and ESL standards, Career and Technical Education and Career Development (CDOS) was designated as the second content learning area to be reviewed. An extraordinary panel was brought together to begin the work. Matt Crosson, President of the Long Island Business Association and Bernard P. Pierorazio, Superintendent of Schools in Yonkers, along with Jerald Wolfgang, a leading career and technical administrator from upstate New York were selected to lead this review. Simultaneously, a Career and Technical NYSED committee met to address a number of implementation issues.

New York's assessment program has also been recognized as one of the strongest in the country. Currently, New York is one of only eight states nationwide to be *fully approved* under the U.S. Education Department's Title 1 peer review. All students, including students with disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELLs), are required to participate with appropriate testing accommodations. New York has been committed to continually enhancing its assessment programs. The State's Technical Advisory Group (TAG) is comprised of independent university measurement professionals who advise on all matters pertaining to testing, including: test development and validation; psychometric architecture; accountability system design; standard-setting; and computer-based testing.

The State's comprehensive assessment program is comprised of: grades 3-8 testing in English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics; elementary and intermediate assessments in science and social studies; intermediate assessments in foreign language; the State's Regents High School Examinations (End of Course); the New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) for severely disabled students; and the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) for English Language Learners.

The State's high school Regents examinations are a national exemplar for rigorous end-of-course achievement tests aligned to state learning standards. Designed to provide diagnostic information and assess students' knowledge and skills for career and post secondary education, "the Regents," as they are referred to by students and teachers, were first administered in 1878. Today, Regents exams are administered in all major subject areas: English Language Arts, Languages other than English, Social Studies, Sciences, and Math. The exams, generally three hours long, include multiple-choice, short-answer, writing prompt/essay, and, in science, extended performance tasks.

New York's high school exit criterion, based on successful completion of Regents exams, is a national model. Since 2003, students

have been required to pass five Regents examinations to graduate: Integrated Algebra (or Math A), Global History and Geography, U.S. History and Government, Comprehensive English, and any one science Regents. All students must meet the same sequenced credit requirements for a high school diploma. Diplomas are designated as either Local Diplomas or Regents Diplomas based on a Regents Scores. Initially, students could meet the requirements for a Local Diploma with a grade of 55-64 on the Regents examination, however, a 65 or above was required for a Regents Diploma. Beginning with students who entered ninth grade in 2008, general education students will no longer have the option to receive a local diploma. Additionally, the passing scores on Regents exams have increased each year since 2005 so that all students will be required to meet the 65 or above passing score on the Regents Examinations. New York State also offers the designation of diplomas as Advanced and as Career and Technical Education (CTE), both of which carry additional diploma requirements. (See Appendix A_3_ii_1 for complete detail of diploma requirements, as well as how requirements have changed in recent years.)

The Board of Regents has continually raised the standards for high school diplomas in order to increase college readiness and increase requirements in Science (including lab), Technology and Mathematics. Notably, although the number of credits required for graduation has increased since 2001 from 18.5 credits to 22 credits, New York's graduation rates for general education students has steadily increased. Similarly, the requirements for passing Regents examinations have increased over that same time period.

Data Systems: New York's existing data system, originally designed in 1998 to add transparency and track student progress over time, has recently undergone significant improvements. Known as the New York State Report Cards, the system provides annual individual student performance data on state English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies exams at the elementary level as well as Regents examinations, Regents competency tests, second language proficiency examinations, State English as a Second Language Achievement Tests, and State Alternate Assessments at the secondary level.

In 2008, the State engaged the Center for Educational Leadership and Technology (CELТ), a non-profit organization that helps schools develop and implement IT strategies and systems, to provide an analysis of our K-12 data collection and reporting processes. The state acted quickly on CELТ's subsequent recommendations and as a result, school districts can now download, manipulate and analyze their data using standard software.

While the CELТ recommendations and other modifications have been helpful, the Regents acknowledged that the State's data system needed to be redesigned to promote enhanced use of data both at NYSED and in the field. The Parthenon Group was hired to work with NYSED and newly established P20 Data Systems Steering and Executive Committees that include leadership from State school districts and higher education. The objective was to design a system to achieve three primary goals: track outcomes for every student and hold schools accountable for student outcomes across grade levels and into college; connect student data to teachers and principals; and provide data to help teachers improve their effectiveness and enhance their ability to improve student outcomes. Phase I of the project outlined the core objectives for the data system and the findings of a comprehensive fit/gap analysis which included mapping current systems, data and information flow; specifying core data sets; and identifying overlaps and gaps among the State's various data systems. Phase II of the project entailed developing a comprehensive implementation plan and budget and exploring implementation partners through an RFI. Phase III of the project will include the selection of an implementation partner and construction and implementation of the system and will begin in early 2010.

In developing a plan for the State's instructional reporting system, Parthenon has drawn on best practices from other leading states and on the work of the New York City Department of Education and its technically exemplary instructional reporting system and corresponding professional development initiative. The district's Achievement Reporting and Innovation System, known as "ARIS," puts real-time student data in the hands of over 80,000 educators every day. In order to ensure teachers and principals are able to use this data to drive gains in student achievement, New York City developed *Children First Intensive*, a comprehensive approach to

educator effectiveness in the use of data. This program focuses on the creation and support of “inquiry teams” in every school which are charged with becoming the school-based experts in using data to identify changes in instructional practice that will accelerate learning for a specific group of underperforming students. Based on lessons learned from that experience, inquiry teams work with school staff to implement and monitor system-level changes to benefit all students. The inquiry model was adapted from a program called SAM (the Scaffolded Apprenticeship Model of School Improvement through Leadership Development), which preliminary research suggests is successful in helping teams improve outcomes within and beyond the targeted group of students and in shifting school culture to support continual, evidence-based improvement of student learning.

While New York State currently has an integrated accountability system, in late 2008, the State applied to the U.S. Education Department (US E.D.) for approval to implement a growth model of accountability. Although US E.D. did not accept the proposal, due to concerns related to the model’s alignment of standards for schools compared to individual students and some details about on-track-to-proficiency growth targets, we remain committed to this concept and are continuing to pursue it. As the State works to build a new state-of-the-art data system, we are ensuring that our new system will include all the data elements necessary to allow New York to move to a growth accountability model which will provide us a refined method for tracking students’ performance as they progress from grade to grade.

Educator Effectiveness: New York has made broad strides in its efforts to increase teacher and principal effectiveness. The alternative certification policies put in place by the Regents, which enable non-traditional students to receive the education necessary to be certified as a teacher or principal, have made the expansion of numerous programs possible, benefitting thousands of students. In New York City, the *Teaching Fellows* program, a collaboration with The New Teacher Project⁸, has eliminated nearly all the

⁸The New Teacher Project was formed in 1997 to address the growing issues of teacher shortages and teacher quality throughout the country. TNTP has worked with more than 200 school districts and become a nationally-recognized authority on new teacher recruitment and hiring. TNTP assisted NYC in developing its

district's math and science teacher vacancies. Rochester's *Urban Teachers for Tomorrow*⁹ has had similar successes as has Buffalo's alternative teacher preparation program. *Teach for America*¹⁰(TFA), the nationally renowned alternative pathway program for teachers has also made a demonstrable impact on New York's classrooms. This year, a corps of 1,000 of the nation's top recent college graduates is working in underserved schools across New York City and in Westchester County to ensure that students facing the challenges of poverty are given the educational opportunities they deserve.

In order to improve the practice of novice teachers, founders from three of New York's most successful charter school networks have partnered with The Hunter College School of Education to develop *Teacher U*. This non-profit organization focuses on raising student achievement by teaching teachers through a rigorous curriculum that emphasizes tactical academic skills and character strengths. Additionally, Hunter College, in conjunction with the New York City Department of Education and *New Visions for Public Schools*, has just launched a Teacher Residency Program aimed at preparing public secondary school teachers in the sciences and English Language Arts.

Teaching Fellows program. 9,000 NYC Teaching Fellows now work in the city's schools, most serving high concentrations of low-income students. A 2007 Urban Institute study found that Fellows are largely responsible for a "remarkable narrowing" of the gap in teacher qualifications between high- and low-poverty schools.

⁹Urban Teachers for Tomorrow is a partnership with Rochester City S.D. and Robert Wesleyan College leading to a Trans B Certificate. Now in its ninth year, UTT is a highly selective program designed for professional with undergraduate degrees in fields other than education. It targets the areas of study (e.g. math, biology, chemistry, physics, earth science, and LOTE (Languages Other Than English)).

¹⁰Teach for America recruits and supports outstanding recent college graduates from all backgrounds and career interests to commit to teach for two years in urban and rural public schools. Teach for America has partnered with New York City since 1990 and has placed over 1,000 fellows in New York City Schools. NYC students taught by Teach for America fellows scored .02 standard deviations higher in Mathematics.

The State's efforts to develop a pipeline of effective school leaders have also progressed in several key areas. New Leaders for New Schools¹¹ is one of the country's pre-eminent alternative school leader certification programs and currently has 99 members working in New York City district and charter schools. Rochester is developing a principals' Leadership Academy to create career-long training based on higher standards and will be focused on leaders of high-need schools.

School Turnaround: New York State has consistently been given an "A" rating by Education Week's "Quality Counts" for its system of school accountability. Low-performing schools are identified through the State's Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) process and given necessary support and intervention, including tiered services and additional funding to support improvement efforts as well as access to opportunities for training of school leadership, teachers and parents. Schools farthest from achieving adequate yearly progress under No Child Left Behind are subject to closure if student performance does not improve. Since 1989, more than 300 schools have been identified for registration review and more than 60 schools have been closed. In addition, *Contracts for Excellence*, a program created by the state legislature in 2007, requires poorly performing districts to segregate state funding and use it for programs approved by NYSED geared toward closing the achievement gap.

In an effort to create new high quality education opportunities for families and replace failing schools, New York State has incubated and launched some of the most innovative new school models and school partners in the country, including 158 charter schools. In the largest five urban districts (New York City, Yonkers, Syracuse, Rochester and Buffalo), district superintendents have facilitated

¹¹Since 2001, the New Leaders for New Schools New York program has built a strong partnership with the New York City Department of Education by recruiting, training, and supporting the next generation of outstanding school leaders. NLNS has also formed partnerships with charter organizations across the city to support the training and placement of leaders in New York City's charter schools. 63% of New Leaders-led K-8 schools outperformed the district in English Language Arts (ELA) and math combined and 58% of New Leaders-led K-8 schools made 20+ combined ELA and math gains, compared to 36% of district schools

the creation of hundreds of new schools, a number of which have been designed to advance science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education. Since 2003, New York City, with nearly one third of the State’s students, has opened over 250 new small high schools and created multiple pathways to graduation for students who are over-age and without enough credits to graduate, contributing to an impressive 10% increase in the city’s high school graduation rate since 2005.

Most of the State’s new schools have been created in partnership with independent non-profit organizations or “intermediaries,” many of which have made such significant progress that they are now national exemplars. *New Visions for Public Schools* has helped create 133 new schools in New York City since 1993 with a focus on building staff capacity and ensuring the sustainability of high student outcomes. Similarly, *College Board Schools*, an initiative of *The College Board*, operates 17 schools in New York State — 12 in New York City, 2 in Buffalo, 2 in Rochester, and 1 in Yonkers. College Board Schools are designed to help middle school and high school students in underrepresented groups enter the pipeline to higher education. Finally, the *Institute for Student Achievement (ISA)*¹² works with over 45 schools in New York City and across the state, using a research-based educational framework that includes customized professional development for teachers and principals to help transform low-achieving schools into learning environments that prepare students to be college-ready.

Operating in Syracuse, *Say Yes* is another innovative partner organization that is taking a systemic approach to district reform. *Say Yes*, provides comprehensive supports aligned with what research indicates is needed to enable every child to achieve his or her potential, including the promise of free college tuition for eligible students. A critical component of the initiative is 25 to 40 hours of mandatory professional development for every teacher each year. Similar to a “medical rounds” model, *Say Yes* provides job

¹²ISA works with 80 small public high schools. ISA notes an increase in graduation outcomes with some schools attaining a graduation rate for Seniors at 90%. ISA works with over 46 schools and academies in New York State including Long Island, NYC, Westchester and Buffalo.

embedded professional development through direct work with students. Although *Say Yes* operates in other cities around the country, the Syracuse chapter is unique in that it is the first chapter to embrace an entire city school district, making it the largest school improvement program of its kind in the nation. Planning is already underway to expand to other cities across the State.

High-quality public charter schools have been a critical piece of New York's comprehensive reform strategy since the State first enacted its charter law in 1998, allowing the creation of independent public schools to operate within a five-year performance contract or "charter." Based on the strength of our charter law, the Center for Education Reform recently ranked New York 9th among the 40 states with existing charter laws citing our highly regarded authorizer opportunities, and the National Alliance for Public Schools ranked New York 8th in their January 2010 report. Today, there are 158 charters operating in New York and some of the country's highest performing charter management organizations (CMOs) support these schools. *Achievement First, Harlem Children's Zone*¹³, *KIPP* and *Uncommon Schools* are but a few that have demonstrated a sustainable and scalable ability to drive strong gains in student achievement. HCZ constitutes a unique full service school model now being replicated nationally.

Undoubtedly these organizations have bolstered the strength of the State's charter efforts. Recently, New York City's charters were heralded for verifiably outperforming their peer schools as found through a study by Stanford University economist Caroline Hoxby.¹⁴ In a subsequent study by Stanford University's Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO), it was found that the typical student in a New York City charter school learns more than their virtual counterparts in their feeder pool in reading and mathematics. (The composite virtual student is based on students in competitor traditional public schools, known as the charter school's feeder pool.) Particularly gratifying was the finding that Black and Hispanic students "do significantly better in reading and

¹³Harlem's Children's Zone is a community based not for profit that partners with the three Promise Academy Charter Schools. Students have shown gains such as: at Promise Academy 2, 100 percent of the third-graders were at or above grade level on the 2008 state-wide math test; at Promise Academy 1, 97 percent of the third-graders were at or above grade level in math.

¹⁴The New York City Charter Schools Evaluation Project by Caroline Hoxby, <http://www.nber.org/~schools/charterschoolseval/>

math compared to their counterparts in traditional public schools.”

To focus existing resources on the development of better education options, New York’s BOCES have created rich Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs for secondary students and adults leading to entry-level employment or post-secondary education. BOCES provide a diverse portfolio of innovative, high quality CTE programs in areas such as health, education and human services, digital media, engineering, and communications. Learning standards and national credentials are integrated into most CTE courses. Students can also earn college credit with ever-expanding articulation agreements with area colleges.

Funding Alignment

New York has long been committed to providing adequate state resources to enable the lowest achieving schools to substantially raise student achievement. These efforts have been bolstered by the federal funding realized through the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 as well as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Examples of New York’s commitment to the four reform areas of RTTT can be found in the following funding streams:

State Funds

Bilingual Education (\$12.5MM)- state funds are used to address the needs of LEP/ELLs consistent with the Department’s Strategic Plan for Raising Standards, with special focus on the implementation of the Seven Essential Elements for the Education of LEP/ELLs in high-need districts. Funds support activities in the areas of higher standards and new assessments involving LEP/ELLs; the preparation and certification of bilingual and ESL staff to incorporate the new standards and assessments into the curriculum for LEP/ELLs; LEP/ELL parent empowerment to increase their knowledge and understanding of the new requirements; capacity building at the school and district levels; and, most especially, the provision of equitable services for LEP/ELLs.

Charter Schools Development and Stimulus Fund (\$13.83MM total, \$5.53MM state) - state and federal funds provide

assistance to applicants for planning purposes and to approved charter schools for the acquisition, renovation or construction of school facilities. The Stimulus Fund makes these funds available for the specific purposes of providing start-up grants associated with the development and submission of a charter school application to the Board of Regents as the charter entity. The funds are also available for facilities grants for costs associated with school facilities.

Learning Technology (\$3.3MM) - state funds provide grants to public school districts and Boards of Cooperative Education (BOCES) for progressive integration of instructional technology in classrooms and library media centers and sustained professional development to increase the skills of teachers in the use of instructional technology in order to help students attain higher levels of performance in the New York State Learning Standards.

Computer Hardware Aid (\$38MM) - School districts are eligible for aid for the purchase or lease of micro and/or mini computer equipment or terminals for instructional purposes. School districts are eligible for aid for the purchase or lease of micro and/or mini computer equipment or terminals for instructional purposes.

Aid for Computer Software Purchases (\$46MM) - Each public school district may claim a maximum apportionment of Computer Software Aid to purchase and loan computer software for instructional purposes on an equitable basis to both public and nonpublic school students attending schools within the district's boundaries during the current school year.

Teachers of Tomorrow (\$25MM) - Awards and stipends to create incentives to retain and attract teachers, especially in STEM subjects and other areas where teacher shortages exist, and to assist subject matter specialists working in private industry to become certified teachers.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification (\$0.49MM) – New York funds grants for teachers of up to \$2,500 toward the cost of certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Transferring Success (\$0.31MM) – New York funds this program which seeks to validate and support the replication of exemplary education programs.

Contracts for Excellence (C4E) (\$854MM) -The C4E program was established in 2007 to provide additional accountability over increased State Aid for low performing school districts. C4E is a comprehensive approach to targeting fiscal resources to specific allowable programs proven to raise the achievement of the students with the greatest educational need. Districts are required to enter a contract and must document the schools, programs, and student subgroups to be targeted for funding, along with specific, achievable performance improvements that will result.

ARRA Funds

Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grants (SIG) (\$261MM) - New York is scheduled to receive a FY2009 grant award. These funds will be used primarily to complement RTTT investments in intervention models encouraged in the RTTT criteria, i.e., turnaround, restart, closure and transformation. These funds will also support New York's efforts to expand the use of data to improve instruction and recruit, train and retain effective teachers and principals.

In addition, New York has used NCLB Title I school improvement funds to support enrichment programs in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, provide professional development to teachers and principals, and provide grants to the lowest achieving schools to improve teaching and learning.

Longitudinal Data System (approximately \$20MM) - NYSED has applied for ARRA Longitudinal Data System funding to create teacher-student linkages and to develop a P-20 data system. This Data System will build a data base to support research and policy analysis and a process for tracking student progress.

Other Government Services Funds

“Say Yes to Education” (\$0.35MM) - is a grant to increase high school and college graduation rates for New York’s inner city youth by offering a range of services including after-school and summer programming, mentoring, tutoring, school-day academic support, family outreach, scholarships, and social work/psychological services.

Math and Science / Early College High Schools (\$1.38MM) - For the 2009-10 school year, \$1.38 million in discretionary Federal funding is provided to continue support to three math/science academies to provide expanded learning opportunities.

Title II-Part D Enhancing Education Through Technology (\$55.6MM) - These ARRA funds will be used to:

- Create a Technology Rich Environment through Student-Centered Active Learning Environments (SCALE) For 21st Century Learning
- Develop Online Formative Assessment In Support of Personalized Instruction and Data-driven Decision Making System
- Develop Online Learning and Instruction Connected With NYSED Virtual High School
- Ensure better use of Technology to Support Limited English Proficient/English Language Learners (LEP/Ells) and/or Students with Disabilities
- To implement a process for digital content providers to submit their high school level courses for State approval. These courses will then be used by school districts, charter schools, and registered nonpublic schools for instruction in the four core content areas (English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) leading to credit for students who successfully complete them. The courses will be delivered online or through other electronic means.

Other Federal Funds

Teacher and Leader Quality Partnership Program (\$5.6MM) - This program is designed to improve the academic success of New York's students by improving the quality of their teachers.

(A)(3)(ii) As a result of significant progress in implementing the Regents’ 2005 plan, New York State has made impressive gains. Student achievement is up: performance on math and ELA assessments demonstrates annual increases, and the percentages of students performing at the lowest level are down. The gap is narrowing: performance of black and Hispanic students continues to improve. Students with Disabilities are doing better - a large decrease in the percentage of below basic performance. ELL students’ performance in English continues to improve. There have been significant improvements in our urban areas. As the data below illustrate, the achievement gap in New York State is closing, and student achievement overall is rising.

(a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA;

Results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

New York students have consistently performed higher than national averages on both Grade 4 and Grade 8 Math exams from 2003 to 2009. On Grade 4 Math exams, in all years 2003 through 2009, average scale scores for all subgroups were at or above national averages.

While NYS has not demonstrated dramatic gains in Grade 8 Reading and Mathematics during this period, the percentage of students who are at or above Basic in Grade 8 Reading exceeds the national average and the percentage who or at or above proficient in Grade 8 Mathematics also exceeds the national average. Performance of ELLs on Grade 4 mathematics improved rapidly from 2003 to 2009, with the average scale score increasing from 4% below the national average to equal the national average:

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
NAEP: Percent in New York State at or above proficient										
Grade 4 Math	21%			33%		36%		43%		40%
Grade 4 Reading			35%	34%		33%		36%		

Grade 8 Math	24%	32%	31%	30%	34%
Grade 8 Reading		32%	35%	33%	32%

Results from State Assessments

New York State tested elementary students in Grade 4 and middle school students in Grade 8 in school years 1999-2000 through 2004-05. During the period 1999-2000 to 2004-05, the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency in elementary English language arts (ELA) rose from 59% to 70%, as illustrated in the table below. The percentage of students at or above proficiency in middle level ELA improved from 44% in 2001-02 to 48% in 2004-05.

Since the implementation of Grades 3-8 testing in the 2005-06 school year, performance in Grades 3-8 ELA continues to improve, with a 15 point increase in the percentage of students who were proficient – from 62% in 2005-06 to 77% in 2008-09. In elementary school mathematics, the percentage of students who scored at or above proficiency increased from 65% to 85% from 1999-2000 to 2004-05 while the percentage of students at or above proficiency in Grade 8 Mathematics rose from 40% to 56%. In Grades 3-8 Mathematics, the percentage of students who scored at or above proficiency rose from 66% in 2005-06 to 86% in 2008-09:

	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09
New York State 3-8 assessments: Percent scoring levels 3 or 4											
<i>Mathematics</i>											
Grade 3								81%	85%	90%	93%
Grade 4	67%	65%	69%	68%	78%	79%	85%	78%	80%	84%	87%
Grade 5								68%	76%	83%	88%
Grade 6								60%	61%	79%	83%

*New York State: Race to the Top:
Selection Criteria and Competition Priorities*

Grade 7								56%	67%	79%	87%	
Grade 8	38%	40%	39%	48%	51%	58%	56%	54%	59%	70%	80%	
<i>English Language Arts</i>												
Grade 3								69%	67%	70%	76%	
Grade 4	48%	59%	60%	62%	64%	62%	70%	69%	68%	71%	77%	
Grade 5								67%	68%	78%	82%	
Grade 6								60%	63%	67%	81%	
Grade 7								56%	58%	70%	80%	
Grade 8	48%	45%	45%	44%	45%	47%	48%	49%	57%	56%	69%	
<i>Science</i>												
Grade 4							80%	86%	85%	85%	88%	
Grade 8							68%	64%	65%	71%	68%	
New York State Regents Exams: Percent scoring at or above 65												
<i>Secondary-level Regents Exams</i>												
Comprehensive English							80%	77%	78%	78%	81%	82%
Mathematics A (<i>phasing out beginning 2008</i>)							81%	78%	79%	77%	76%	
Integrated Algebra (<i>introduced 2008 to replace Mathematics A</i>)										75%	72%	
Living Environment							79%	76%	76%	75%	75%	80%

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA

Results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

In closing long-standing student achievement gaps, New York State stands out among peers for its leadership as a “gap narrower” (“Gauging the Gaps: A Deeper Look at Student Achievement”, *Education Trust*, January 2010). The latest NAEP scores reveal that

New York significantly narrowed proportionately more of its gaps than did other states. Specifically, New York is in the top seven states when looking across Reading (2007) and Math (2009) performance relative to 2003 for both grades 4 and 8 and for three gaps considered among groups (African American-White, Hispanic-White and Low Income-High Income).

As the table below illustrates, between 2002 and 2007, the gap between the percentage of White students who score at or above proficient in Grade 4 Reading and the percentages of Black and Hispanic students who score at or above proficient declined by five and four percentage points respectively.

In Grade 4 Mathematics, NYS made even more dramatic gains with the percentage of all students who are proficient increasing between 2003 and 2009 by seven percent, of Black students by seven percent, of Hispanic students by ten percent, of English Language Learners by seven percent and of economically disadvantaged students by ten percent. Grade 8 Mathematics results similarly highlight the closing gap between high- and low-income students: economically disadvantaged students gained six percent from 2003 to 2009, while all students increased by two percentage points.

NAEP: Percent in New York State at or above proficient				
	<i>2003</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2009</i>
Grade 4 Mathematics				
Black or African American	12%	13%	18%	19%
Hispanic or Latino	15%	17%	25%	25%
Students with Disabilities	11%	11%	15%	13%
English Language Learners	6%	6%	12%	13%
Economically Disadvantaged	18%	21%	28%	28%
Female	31%	33%	42%	37%
Male	35%	39%	45%	43%
<i>All Students</i>	<i>33%</i>	<i>36%</i>	<i>43%</i>	<i>40%</i>

*New York State: Race to the Top:
Selection Criteria and Competition Priorities*

Grade 8 Mathematics								
Black or African American		10%		11%		10%		13%
Hispanic or Latino		16%		14%		15%		15%
Students with Disabilities		7%		7%		6%		10%
English Language Learners		3%		4%		2%		4%
Economically Disadvantaged		16%		19%		19%		22%
Female		31%		30%		29%		32%
Male		33%		31%		31%		36%
<i>All Students</i>		32%		31%		30%		34%
		<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>
		<i>2009</i>						
Grade 4 Reading								
Black or African American		14%		14%		17%		17%
Hispanic or Latino		16%		18%		17%		18%
Students with Disabilities		10%		11%		7%		8%
English Language Learners		3%		5%		3%		5%
Economically Disadvantaged		19%		18%		20%		20%
Female		40%		38%		36%		39%
Male		31%		30%		30%		33%
<i>All Students</i>		35%		34%		33%		36%
Grade 8 Reading								
Black or African American		12%		14%		11%		14%
Hispanic or Latino		15%		18%		16%		16%
Students with Disabilities		4%		8%		8%		9%
English Language Learners		4%		4%		4%		1%
Economically Disadvantaged		15%		18%		20%		19%
Female		35%		42%		38%		38%
Male		29%		28%		28%		26%
<i>All Students</i>		32%		35%		33%		32%

Results from State Assessments

The subgroup achievement gap in ELA narrowed for both elementary and middle school students. (Please see table below.) From 2005-06 to 2008-09, the percentage of black and Hispanic students meeting proficiency increased from 42% to 64% and 46% to 65%, respectively. This translates into gains of 22 and 19 points (vs. 15 points across all students). During the same period 2005-06 to 2008-09, students with disabilities meeting proficiency increased from 20% to 39%.

The subgroup achievement gap in mathematics also narrowed for both elementary and middle school students. From 1998-99 to 2004-05, the percentages of Grade 4 black and Hispanic students scoring at or above proficiency each more than doubled: from 26% to 54% for black students, and from 26% to 57% for Hispanic students. Gains toward narrowing the achievement gap are also seen across Grades 3-8 in mathematics from 2005-06 to 2008-09. The percentage of Black students performing at or above proficiency increased from 46% to 75% and the percentage of Hispanic students from 52% to 80%. The percentage of English Language Learners performing at or above proficiency similarly improved from 38% in 2005-06 to 67% 2008-09. Over the same period, students with disabilities also made gains to close the achievement gap, raising the proficiency rate from 30% to 58%. Over the period 2005-06 to 2007-08, the percentages of black and Hispanic students scoring below basic decreased significantly: from 21% to 9% and 18% to 7%, respectively. As with black and Hispanic students, a smaller share of students with disabilities showed serious academic difficulties: the percentages scoring below basic decreased from 37% in 2005-06 to 20% in 2007-08. Regional achievement gaps have also improved: From 2005-06 to 2008-09, the percentage of students performing at or above proficiency on math assessments in New York City increased 25 points from 57% to 82%. During that period, the other large cities gained 30 points, from 35% to 65%. When compared against the all-schools improvement of 20 points from 66% to 86%, these numbers highlight rapid increases in student achievement and an increasingly narrow achievement gap. On ELA assessments, New York City

students showed 18 points improvement, from 51% in 2005-06 to 69% in 2008-09, as compared to 15 points from 62% to 77% across the State. The other large cities improved from 37% to 57%, a gain of 20 points. These numbers highlight a narrowing achievement gap between students in city schools and their peers in the rest of the State.

New York State Assessment: Percent Scoring 3 or 4 on Grades 4 and 8 Math, ELA and Science, 2001-02 to 2008-09								
	<i>01-02</i>	<i>02-03</i>	<i>03-04</i>	<i>04-05</i>	<i>05-06</i>	<i>06-07</i>	<i>07-08</i>	<i>08-09</i>
<i>Grade 4 Math</i>								
Black or African American	45%	62%	53%	73%	62%	65%	72%	78%
Hispanic or Latino	49%	65%	67%	76%	67%	70%	77%	82%
Students with Disabilities	37%	48%	49%	55%	45%	47%	53%	61%
English Language Learners	29%	44%	48%	59%	50%	54%	64%	71%
Economically Disadvantaged	51%	69%	68%	77%	71%	71%	76%	82%
<i>Grade 8 Math</i>								
Black or African American	21%	26%	33%	31%	28%	34%	48%	63%
Hispanic or Latino	23%	28%	37%	36%	33%	40%	55%	69%
Students with Disabilities	15%	16%	19%	19%	17%	21%	31%	46%
English Language Learners	14%	17%	24%	24%	22%	26%	41%	53%
Economically Disadvantaged	27%	34%	39%	38%	39%	43%	56%	70%
<i>Grade 4 ELA</i>								
Black or African American	42%	48%	44%	54%	52%	51%	57%	65%
Hispanic or Latino	42%	48%	46%	57%	56%	51%	57%	65%
Students with Disabilities	30%	23%	22%	28%	27%	28%	30%	38%
English Language Learners	14%	12%	21%	31%	27%	23%	32%	41%
Economically Disadvantaged	44%	52%	46%	57%	59%	54%	58%	67%
<i>Grade 8 ELA</i>								
Black or African American	21%	26%	27%	26%	28%	37%	37%	52%
Hispanic or Latino	22%	26%	30%	28%	32%	38%	37%	53%

Students with Disabilities	9%	8%	8%	10%	11%	16%	13%	25%
English Language Learners	3%	2%	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	13%
Economically Disadvantaged	24%	29%	29%	30%	36%	39%	39%	55%
<i>Grade 4 Science</i>								
Black or African American				65%	75%	73%	72%	79%
Hispanic or Latino				63%	73%	72%	73%	79%
Students with Disabilities				57%	67%	64%	64%	69%
English Language Learners				40%	54%	51%	55%	63%
Economically Disadvantaged				68%	81%	76%	76%	81%
<i>Grade 8 Science</i>								
Black or African American				42%	36%	39%	48%	45%
Hispanic or Latino				43%	38%	40%	51%	49%
Students with Disabilities				41%	36%	36%	43%	38%
English Language Learners				22%	16%	18%	27%	22%
Economically Disadvantaged				50%	48%	46%	56%	53%

(c) Increasing high school graduation rates.

From the cohort 2000 to 2004, the overall student's graduation rate increased from 66% to 71%. Gains have been accelerating over time, posting 2 points annually since cohort 2002. The graduation rate of students earning a Regents diploma is 59%. Of diplomas awarded to the cohort 2004, then, only 16% are Local diplomas. From cohort 2001 to 2004, New York City, Rochester and Yonkers schools have exhibited 10%, 9%, and 5% gains, respectively, in 4-year graduation rates. Graduation rate of English language learners increased 6 points from 2005 to 2008, while the overall graduation rate increased 5 points during that period. From 2004 to 2008 (cohorts 2000 through 2004), New York City schools increased their minority graduation rate 12 points from 44% to 56%, during which time the overall graduation rate improved 10 points. At the high school level, New York has also been reducing the

graduation achievement gap, with the percentage of Black students graduating within four years increasing by 10 points between 2004 and 2008 and the percentage of Hispanic student increasing by 11 points during that period.

4-year Cohort Graduation Rates					
	<i>03-04</i>	<i>04-05</i>	<i>05-06</i>	<i>06-07</i>	<i>07-08</i>
Cohort (Year of Entry to HS)	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Student Subgroups					
Black or African American	44%	45%	48%	51%	54%
Hispanic or Latino	41%	42%	45%	48%	52%
Students with Disabilities	42%	38%	43%	40%	42%
English Language Learners		30%	30%	27%	36%
Economically Disadvantaged			56%	60%	58%
Largest School Districts					
NYC		47%	49%	53%	56%
Buffalo		52%	50%	45%	52%
Rochester		39%	37%	44%	48%
Syracuse		50%	48%	49%	47%
Yonkers		53%	55%	57%	58%
All students	66%	66%	67%	69%	71%

Source: June 2009 Regents Meeting Materials

SELECTION CRITERIA: PROGRESS AND PLANS IN THE FOUR EDUCATION REFORM AREAS

(B) Standards and Assessments (70 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards (40 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B)—

(i) The State’s participation in a consortium of States that— (20 points)

- (a) Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and
- (b) Includes a significant number of States; and

(ii) — (20 points)

- (a) For Phase 1 applications, the State’s high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or
- (b) For Phase 2 applications, the State’s adoption of a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State in a high-quality plan toward which the State has made significant progress, and its commitment to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way.¹⁵

¹⁵ Phase 2 applicants addressing selection criterion (B)(1)(ii) may amend their June 1, 2010 application submission through August 2, 2010 by submitting evidence of adopting common standards after June 1, 2010.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (B)(1)(i):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a standards consortium.
- A copy of the final standards or, if the standards are not yet final, a copy of the draft standards and anticipated date for completing the standards.
- Documentation that the standards are or will be internationally benchmarked and that, when well-implemented, will help to ensure that students are prepared for college and careers.
- The number of States participating in the standards consortium and the list of these States.

Evidence for (B)(1)(ii):

For Phase 1 applicants:

- A description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards, and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.

For Phase 2 applicants:

- Evidence that the State has adopted the standards. Or, if the State has not yet adopted the standards, a description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

In April 2009, Governor David Paterson and former Education Commissioner Richard P. Mills signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) (A copy of the MOA can be found in Appendix B_1_i_1) along with Governors and State Commissioners of Education from 48 states, 2 territories and the District of Columbia committing to develop a common core of state standards to ensure college and career readiness for all in English-language arts and mathematics for grades K-12 (for a complete list of States Participating in the Standards Consortium, see Appendix B_1_i_2). The Common Core State Standards Initiative is a state-led effort coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School

Officers (CCSSO) in collaboration with Achieve, Inc., the College Board, and ACT. (A copy of the Draft Standards is included in Appendix B_1_i_3)

Evidence that common core standards are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness

The Common Core State Standards Initiative has provided to states and to the public multiple references citing the national and international benchmarks used to determine what students should know and be able to do in ELA and Mathematics by the time of high school graduation in order to be college and career ready. (See Appendix B_1_i_3 for a representative list of the works consulted in the drafting of Common Core State Standards for ELA and Mathematics.) The process developed by the Initiative includes a rigorous validation process led by national and international experts called the “Validation Committee for the Common Core State Standards Initiative.” NYSED has implemented an additional check on the validity of these standards by vetting them through the Board of Regents Standards Review Initiative (SRI). (See Appendix B_1_i_4) The State is committed to ensuring that the standards meet our criterion of success for all students in New York State to be college and career ready, particularly that they include strategies to support English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities.

B(1)(ii)

The New York State Board of Regents has approved a process for review and adoption of the Common Core Standards by July of 2010 (See Appendix B_1_ii_1 for the December 2009 Regent Item on Common Core Standards). New York State will implement a high-quality plan to receive feedback from the public on the Common Standards; adopt the standards, and implement the standards through a strategic practitioner and district-focused capacity building initiative. Additional information about New York State’s plan to implement the standards can be found in section B (3) of this application.

The legal process in New York State for adopting standards

The New York State Board of Regents has broad authority over the education system including student learning standards. Under State Education Law §211, the Board of Regents and Education Department are required to periodically review and evaluate all existing New York State Learning Standards to determine the extent to which the student skills and knowledge needed for success in employment, postsecondary education, and citizenship are included. The review of standards is the responsibility of the Regents. (Additional information on the legal authority for the Board of Regents to develop and approve standards can be found in Appendix B_1_ii_2.)

The State’s plan for adopting Common Core State Standards

Under the leadership of Regent Saul Cohen and Dr. Walter Sullivan, the Standards Review Committee (SRC), as described in Section A, has been developing ELA and ESL standards over the past two years, and has taken a proactive role in the development of the Common Core standards. The Committee provided ongoing feedback to CCSSO/NGA on the draft Common Core standards and conducted a side-by-side comparison of the draft Common Core ELA standards and the State’s draft ELA/ESL standards. The SRC will play an active role in the adoption of the Common Core standards by reviewing both the ELA and Math standards and making recommendations to the Board of Regents regarding the possible inclusion of 15% additional standards to ensure that the new standards meet and exceed those already in place for New York State students. New York is implementing the following plan for adopting Common Core State Standards and additional New York State standards, as directed by the Board of Regents:

GOALS:

The New York State Board of Regents has approved a process for review and potential adoption of the Common Core Standards in July, 2010.

I. Activities and Timeline:

1. Spring, 2009: Since joining the coalition of states in April 2009, NYSED has provided feedback to NGA/CCSSO through three written responses (July 2009; October 2009; and December 2009) and through participation in various NGA/CCSSO meetings.
2. Summer, 2009: Interim Commissioner Huxley provided feedback on the first official draft of the College and Career Readiness Standards
3. Fall, 2009: Commissioner David Steiner provided feedback on the draft ELA and mathematics common core standards and encouraged NYS stakeholders to comment via the Core Standards Survey Website
4. October, 2009: The Curriculum and Instruction Division launched a NYS Common Core Standards website with a Toolkit including a video introduction from Commissioner Steiner with supporting documents outlining the framework for review and adoption. In addition, monthly email blasts to the field were begun to inform them of the progress of the Common Core Standards work.
5. October, 2009: The Board of Regents discussed New York State's involvement in the Common Core State Standards Initiative process and the impact on New York State at their October 13th, 2009 full board meeting.
6. October- December 2009: Release of feedback surveys and supporting materials to the field on the Math and ELA draft standards;
7. December 2009: Standards Review Committee presented the final draft ELA/ESL learning standards to the Board of Regents
8. December 2009: Full Board of Regents approved a timeline and actions for review and adoption by July 2010 of Common Core Standards at public Regents meeting. (See Appendix B_1_ii_1: Common Core Standards Board of Regents Meeting.)
9. January-February 2010: Release of Common Core Standards. Statewide public review and comment period. Standards will be posted on the Curriculum and Instruction Division's Online Toolkit for public comment; 8-12 Regional Forums conducted

Statewide; Live audience discussion for ELA and Math Standards; Standards Review Initiative Leadership Team will continue formal review; Board and Leadership will review standards against the draft ELA/ESL learning standards and mathematics standards and submit formal response to the NGA/CCSSO informed by the statewide public comment, work of the Standards Review Initiative Committee and the NYSED Mathematics Advisory Committee.

10. Phase II - March 2010- April 2010: Propose a revised set of NYS Learning Standards for ELA/Mathematics; Review final NGA/CCSSO Common Core Standards against the draft ELA/ESL learning standards, 2005 Mathematics Core and the SRI Working Principles. (See Appendix B_1_i_4.) The Standards Review Committee will determine if there is a need to augment the Common Core Standards by up to 15%. If yes, NYSED will compile a proposed draft with input from cognitive psychologists, members of the Standards Review Committee and NYSED's Mathematics Advisory Council for statewide comment; the Common Core Standards Initiative Website will also be utilized for public comment
11. May 2010: 30-day statewide public review and comment period for new revised standards (8-12 Regional Conferences, etc.), including the additional 15%; Update Board of Regents
12. July 2010: Revise Standards Based on public comment and produce final set of standards and grade by grade performance expectation. The new standards and grade by grade indicators for P-12 (Common Core 85% +New York State 15% as judged necessary) will be presented to the Board of Regents for adoption.

Rationale: The Board of Regents has developed a statewide process for the ongoing review of standards which is integrated with public comment and input from experts. This process results in informed standards tied to college readiness and to international best practices for all students, with a particular commitment to the needs of English Language Learners. It also builds statewide support for adoption and consensus around the vision of college and career readiness for all students thorough implementation of: (1) standards, (2) curriculum frameworks, (3) curriculum and (4) aligned assessments – summative, interim and formative – throughout

the state. Practitioners, researchers, and policy makers are partnered at all points in the process to ensure momentum for implementation, critical to the ultimate goal of improved student outcomes.

Parties Responsible: Standards Review Committee, Board of Regents, Commissioner and Senior Deputy for P-12 Education.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (10 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State's participation in a consortium of States that—

- (i) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice); and
- (ii) Includes a significant number of States.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (B)(2):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a consortium that intends to develop high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards; or documentation that the State's consortium has applied, or intends to apply, for a grant through the separate Race to the Top Assessment Program (to be described in a subsequent notice); or other evidence of the State's plan to develop and adopt common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice).
- The number of States participating in the assessment consortium and the list of these States.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

NYSED and the Board of Regents intend to apply with a consortium of states to the US E.D. Assessment Program to develop and adopt common, high-quality assessments. At their January meeting the Board of Regents endorsed New York State’s participation in a consortium of States that will work toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments aligned with a common set of K-12 standards. (See Appendix B_2_i_1 for New York’s Common Assessment Consortium Policy.) New York State has signed Memoranda of Understanding/Agreement with three consortia; each of which represents multiple states, ranging from 13 – 37 states. (Please refer to Appendix B_2_i_2 for a copy of the three MOU/MOA.) New York has committed to each of these three consortia as they currently present multiple opportunities for assessment development which we are committed to exploring. New York will assess all three consortia and determine which one will ultimately meet the State’s overall goals and participate with that consortium in the Race to the Top Assessment competition. Each consortium is governed by its participating states. A summary of each one is listed below.

Consortia	Lead State & Governance Structure	Key Elements	Number of Participating States
1. Balanced Assessment for the Common Core Standards	Maine (Coordinating) with multiple state governance structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated balanced assessment system based on Common Core standards and curriculum frameworks • Integration of standards-based curriculum, assessment, instruction and teacher development • Based on evidence of actual student performance • Teacher involvement in development of curriculum and scoring • Continuous improvement tied teaching and learning • Multiple measures to evaluate students and schools • Integration of new technologies • Emphasis on student growth measures over time • Includes High School Focus 	Approx. 37

2. Assessment Consortium	Florida (Lead State) – Multiple State governance structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internationally benchmarked • Teacher, district, state involvement in development • Build toward college- and career-readiness • Aligned with Common Core Standards • Use technology • Cost-effective 	Approx. 13
3. Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER)	Multiple State Governance Structure- currently includes: Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computer-adaptive summative assessment—designed to be compatible with concurrent participation in other consortia • Teacher, District , State involvement in Development and design • Open source software • Incorporates international benchmarking • Measures school and district effectiveness • Designed to complements formative and benchmark assessment systems 	Approx. 23

New York’s existing assessment system includes some of the primary elements discussed by US E.D. as key practice areas for the assessment consortium. These include:

- Individual student achievement as measured against standards that builds toward college and career readiness by the time of high school completion.
- Regular reporting of the results of state assessments in grades 3-8 and high school, to be included in public school report cards for all students and all subgroups throughout the state.
- The development of capacity through our P-20 data system with an aligned Teacher and Principal evaluation system to measure and support student growth.
- A commitment to close the achievement gap for all students and subgroups.

Our current testing regimen for grades 3-8 and High School Regents Exams in ELA, Mathematics, Science, American History and Global Studies are evidence of our commitment to assessments that predict college and career readiness for all students. New York State is among the few states that *require* passing scores on high school summative exams (i.e., Regents exams) as a prerequisite for graduation; however we are committed to increasing the alignment of our assessments to college success. While our current state assessments have shown some alignment to college entry work through research led by City University of New York, the Chancellor and Commissioner have publicly committed to increasing the rigor of those exams, their alignment to NAEP, and alignment to college and career readiness. (See Appendix B_2_1 for the Board of Regents Assessment Policy.)

Working within a consortium of states and ideally funded through a RTTT assessment award (\$350 million), New York envisions the following process for developing common assessments: an initial six-month design process would define an explicit framework for articulating clear models of student proficiency and growth, the evidence required to judge students proficient, and the tasks that will effectively elicit that evidence. This foundational design work would be followed by a three-month process to develop task templates for all components of the system: formative performance tasks, summative performance tasks, and summative multiple choice assessments. This would be followed by a 15-month process to develop and field test performance tasks and test items, which would then be calibrated and scaled. Standards setting panels would define common achievement levels and set cut scores in time for operational administration of the comprehensive system the following school year. Technology partners would work in parallel over this 24-month timeline to develop the next-generation assessment platform to support the administration and scoring of the multiple item types required by this comprehensive assessment model. Our objective is for new summative assessment field test and development to be complete by summer 2012 and new common summative assessments to be administered statewide in the 2012-13 school year.

Reform Plan Criteria

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments (20 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for supporting a statewide transition to and implementation of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation, and high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) tied to these standards. State or LEA activities might, for example, include: developing a rollout plan for the standards together with all of their supporting components; in cooperation with the State's institutions of higher education, aligning high school exit criteria and college entrance requirements with the new standards and assessments; developing or acquiring, disseminating, and implementing high-quality instructional materials and assessments (including, for example, formative and interim assessments (both as defined in this notice)); developing or acquiring and delivering high-quality professional development to support the transition to new standards and assessments; and engaging in other strategies that translate the standards and information from assessments into classroom practice for all students, including high-need students (as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

To support the transition to enhanced common standards and high-quality assessments, New York has developed a plan to strengthen and align our educational core – our standards, curriculum, and assessments – and create the foundation upon which all our other reforms will be based. While we intend to adopt the new Common Core standards, we know that rigorous standards alone are not enough. To ensure the successful implementation of these new standards, we must provide our educators with clear, content-rich, sequenced, spiraled curriculum guides aligned to the standards. We must also develop rich formative and interim assessments that ask students to do rigorous performance tasks and that provide practical, informative data for students, educators, and parents.

Many of our global competitors, including Japan, Korea, Singapore, and the United Kingdom, have already aligned their standards, curriculum, and assessments and unlocked the inherent synergies between these central elements to drive higher gains in student achievement. In creating higher standards and aligned curriculum frameworks and assessments, we must specifically address the learning needs of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities.

To ensure our students are prepared for the 21st century, New York will also broaden its curricular portfolio by developing curricula and assessments in the Arts, Economics, and Multimedia/Computer Technology. We will also prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) by equipping students for higher level mathematics and science work by implementing a blended Grades 3-8 science testing program.

New York's educators will be supported in using the new standards, curriculum guides, and assessments through rich, on-going pre- and in-service professional development. All professional development activities will be coordinated by NYSED's Office of District Services. Led by one of the State's leading practitioners, Ken Slentz, this office will draft relevant RFPs for capacity building services and ensure the coherent, coordinated delivery of services across all RTTT projects and non-RTTT activities. We intend to leverage the expertise of partner organizations including, but are not limited to BOCES, Institutions of Higher Education, networks of high-performing schools, charter management networks, cultural institutions and museums, and external service providers.

The State's professional development activities will use evidence-based modalities shown to result in effective transfer of knowledge. Key models will include learning communities of teachers, student achievement data analysis focused on strengthening teacher practice, technical assistance from national experts, and self-reflection on practice. Professional development partner responsibilities will include codification of content and best practices, preparation of training materials, and delivery of training. Partners will embed data-based inquiry into all of their sessions. Furthermore, partners will be expected to provide self-assessments

so that teachers and principals can easily identify their own development needs within a given area (use of data to drive instruction, translating rigorous standards into instruction, developing and using formative assessments) contributing to the creation of individual development plans for both teachers and principals as described in Section D. Finally, partners will integrate the latest technologies into their offerings, to include online learning modules and the use of video to demonstrate best practice.) Ultimately, LEAs will make the ultimate decision to select the best PD partners given their strategic needs as outlined in their district diagnostic.

Drawing on the BOCES network structure, existing networks of high-performing schools, and charter school management organizations, we intend to fully leveraging the power of a regional network strategy for the delivery of professional development offerings, bringing together educators from within and across districts and charter schools to work together to address their development needs, whether by analyzing data together, reviewing and discussing individual case studies, or collaborating to develop new instructional approaches.

Funded with Title IID monies, the Office of District Services will also oversee the redesign of NYSED’s online Virtual Learning System (VLS) which will house comprehensive resources and professional development offerings. The transformed VLS will incorporate best in class functionality of today’s most robust learning content management systems and will aligned with NY-SIRIS to fully leverage collaborative learning opportunities.

The below table summarizes the State’s overall strategies with regards to effectively implementing rigorous new common standards and assessments.

New York’s Standards and Assessment Strategy Summary

Policy changes specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board of Regents Standards Review Initiative
--------------------------------	--

to Standards and Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board of Regents approval of timeline and actions for review and adoption of Common Core Standards by July 2010 • Board of Regents Common Assessment Consortium Policy
Participating district requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate with the State regarding adoption and implementation of the Common Core standards • Participate in professional development regarding the Common Core standards and State curriculum frameworks • Participate in any growth model developed by the State and approved by USED
RTTT Funded projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum framework development and implement • Professional development network strategy • Adoption of Common Core Standards • Development and implementation of K-12 formative assessments
District-level RFPs or competitive grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

The State’s plan for supporting the transition to enhanced common standards and high-quality assessments is encapsulated in the following three primary goals and supporting activities.

GOAL I: All New York State LEAs will implement the new Common Core Standards in ELA and Math

Activity One: Through the process of adopting the new Common Core standards in ELA and math, the Board of Regents will engage stakeholders in LEAs, higher education, our unions, and related experts to lay the groundwork for a smooth implementation over the next several years of both the new standards and new, aligned formative, interim and summative assessments. New York has developed a regional process, leveraging our BOCES, which will be used to engage stakeholders and inform implementation planning. This has proven to be critical in the successful implementation of our current standards and assessments. An existing

web-based tool will be leveraged to facilitate the dissemination of information, stakeholder communications, and the collection of feedback. Implementation metrics will include benchmarks to ensure that the needs of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities.

The Commissioner and his Senior Deputy will also use existing structures for regular and ongoing consultations with LEA leadership. In parallel, our teaching standards will be revised (See Section D for a full description) to capture the knowledge and skills teachers will need to effectively support students in reaching the State's new student learning standards. Additionally, USNY – New York's nationally unique network structure of all education entities statewide – , provides a platform for the informed and coordinated inclusion of all institutions of higher education, cultural institutions, museums, research organizations, and public television stations throughout the State. As the timeline for the Common Core Assessments is developed, a similar engagement strategy will be used.

Rationale: In order to develop state-wide momentum and support for more rigorous learning standards and high-quality formative, interim and summative assessment, New York has learned that educational and stakeholder communities must be broadly engaged to create the public support needed to effectively implement the standards and change practices at the school and classroom levels. From the State's past experience implementing high-quality standards and assessments, it is our firm belief that a strong implementation begins with a transparent process that involves and integrates key stakeholders statewide including representatives of Bilingual Education and the education of Students with Disabilities.

Responsible Parties: Board of Regents, Regents' Standards Review Committee, Commissioner, Senior Deputy for EMSC, District Leadership, RTTT Management Team, NYSED Office of Vocational and Educational Services for Students with Disabilities, USNY institutional member leadership

Timeline: Engagement around the Common Core standards will begin January 2010 and continue through Fall 2010.

Activity Two: Develop sequenced, spiraled, content-rich Pre-kindergarten-Grade 12 curriculum frameworks and grade by grade performance expectations beginning with English language arts and mathematics.

The development of aligned curriculum frameworks, which will include strategies for teaching students with disabilities and English Language Learners, will help to ensure all students have access to a world-class curriculum. In 2007, a major theme during New York's statewide public comment period on the Standards Review Initiative was the need for a greater level of specificity in the student learning standards. The curriculum frameworks, aligned to the standards, will provide the needed specificity and also enable the development of high-quality professional development and formative and summative assessments, all of which will be aligned to the standards. The curriculum frameworks will include, but not be limited to:

- Grade-by-grade student expectations (standards and performance indicators), including the knowledge, skills, and understandings that students are expected to achieve at each grade;
- Grade-level learning examples, which include developmentally appropriate instructional strategies and sample tasks to demonstrate how students can achieve standards, including resources for teachers of students with disabilities and English language learners;
- An appendix of recommended authors and reading at each grade level to inform local curriculum development;
- Formative assessment tools at each grade level to permit teachers to measure ongoing student grade-level achievement;
- Alignment tools to analyze existing programs and resources against new learning expectations.

Districts and charter schools will be supported in the implementation of the curriculum frameworks aligned to the revised standards through comprehensive professional development offerings delivered.

Rationale: The development of world-class curriculum frameworks and assessments along with the necessary professional development are important factors in helping teachers provide effective instruction and quality education programs (citation: *Don't Forget Curriculum*, Grover J. "Russ" Whitehurst, The Brookings Institution, October 2009). The State's previous experiences also indicate that the successful review and revision of learning standards require multiple and complex initiatives to assure proper implementation.

Timeline: Summer 2010: The RTTT management office will begin the process of developing statewide curriculum frameworks for grades P-12 based on the Common Core ELA and math standards by authoring an RFP and selecting external providers to build the frameworks.

September 2010-August 2011: English language arts and mathematics curriculum frameworks will be developed by external providers, which will include curriculum guidance for teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities. RFP for related professional development to support LEAs in implementing the new curriculum frameworks aligned to new standards issued in parallel.

September 2011-2014: Additional curriculum frameworks will be developed, beginning with science and technology.

Ongoing, but fully completed by 2014: All completed curriculum frameworks and products will be transferred to the Virtual Learning System (VLS.)

Responsible Parties: NYSED, RTTT Management Team, BOCES, Regional Special Education Technical Assistance Support Centers including Bilingual special educators to improve results for students with disabilities/limited English Proficiency, NYSED Office of Bilingual Education, leaders of participating districts, and Institutes of Higher Education.

GOAL II: New York will develop a comprehensive assessment system integrating formative, interim, and summative assessments (developed through a consortium of states) aligned to the Common Core Standards to build vertically toward college and career readiness. The system will support instructional decisions, teacher professional development and evaluation, and accountability.

At the January, 2010 meeting of the Board of Regents, the Board adopted a recommendation for New York State to join a consortium of states to develop Common Summative assessments based on the Common Core Standards (Appendix B_1_i_3). Following this meeting the State has signed MOU/MOA's with three consortia with the purpose of developing Common Summative Assessments to evaluate the Common Core Standards.

Activity One: Participate in a consortium and develop a proposal for the Race to the Top Assessment Program.

Timeline: January 2010 – April/May 2010: NYSED will collaborate in a consortium to develop a multi-state proposal for the Federal Race to the top Assessment Competition.

April/May 2010: RTTT Common Assessment application submitted. Since these consortia are in the earliest stages of development, the implementation timeline will be developed with collaborators over the next three months.

Rationale: In order to prepare students for college readiness and 21st century careers, educators must be able to measure students' progress toward attainment of this goal. As students progress through our K-12 system and formative and interim assessments are administered and the results incorporated into the statewide data system, teachers and leaders will be able to continually use classroom-level data to differentiate instruction. Additionally, principals will be able to develop data-driven coaching strategies for teachers allowing for a continuous process of improvement.

Parties Responsible: Commissioner, RTTT Management Team, Deputy Commissioner for P-12, District Leaders, P-20 Data

Team, ETACIT, BOCES , external service providers, Assistant Commissioner for Standards, Assessments and Reporting, and the Associate Commissioner of Instructional Support and Development.

Activity Two: Develop formative and interim assessments aligned to both the Common Core Standards and related Common Summative Assessments (to be designed with a consortium of States.)

As indicated earlier in this section, each consortium has key elements aligned to New York’s overall goals; however we anticipate that not all the consortia will pursue the development of aligned formative and interim assessments. Given that these Common Assessment consortia are in their early planning stages, we expect that the activities described below will not be necessary because it is our assumption that New York will be part of a consortium that is intent on developing aligned formative, interim and summative assessments. However, we offer the below description of activities in the event our consortium does not develop formative and interim assessments. As such, New York will develop these assessments independently through the activities described in the following paragraph.

In collaboration with the field, including teachers, district leaders, principals, parents, institutions of higher education, industry experts, Bilingual Education experts, and providers of educational services for Students with Disabilities, NYSED will develop a comprehensive set of formative and interim assessments in English Language Arts and Mathematics complementary to the Common Assessments developed in the consortium. These assessments will reflect sequenced, spiraled, content-rich curriculum frameworks that clearly identify the knowledge and skills required at each grade level (including early literacy in grades K-2) and; through New York State’s instructional reporting and improvement system, provide teachers with timely, accurate, and actionable information they can use to design and implement differentiated instructional strategies. Schools and districts will have the option to use a series of formative assessment tools, including a beginning of year diagnostic assessment, one-time or ongoing literacy

assessments, and a bank of performance tasks and multiple choice items that can be integrated into curriculum and classroom instruction throughout the year. Professional development opportunities will be provided to LEAs to support them in implementing the new assessments.

If needed, new formative and interim assessments will be developed through a two-tiered strategy: 1) issue an RFP to collect and peer review (through the New York State Academy for Teaching and Learning) performance-based formative assessment tasks developed by educators and aligned to the new Common Core standards that could also be embedded within the curriculum frameworks once completed and; 2) issue an RFP for external providers to develop item banks of performance-based formative assessment and interim assessments, also aligned to the standards and curriculum frameworks. These new assessments, specifically those developed by external partners, will leverage advances in technology which now make it possible to capture more complex performances in assessment settings by including simulation, interactivity, collaboration, and constructed response (Mislevy, Almond, & Lukas, 2003). All new assessment tools will be made available through the VLS.

NOTE: RTTT and its related competitions in Assessments and Innovations present all states and the assessment field in general with an unprecedented entrepreneurial opportunity. We expect that there will be major advances in products and services in formative, interim and summative assessments and will seek to build on new platforms that will forge stronger alignment of learning standards and curriculum and further leverage our P-20 instructional reporting and improvement data system. This opportunity for innovation is promising and New York State intends to build on the expertise of current expert partners such as Wireless Generation, Intel and others; however as the landscape of new platforms unfolds, we recognize the need to be continuously strategic in our approach to assessments and to be active participant-leaders in the common assessment consortium. Given this, we expect that the details of our assessment strategy will develop further over the next six months and we present the above plan as an interim framework for the introduction of formative and interim assessments in this RTTT application.

Rationale: Developing a comprehensive assessment system aligned to the fewer, clearer, higher Common Core standards in ELA and math will help students develop a deeper and more coherent understanding of how the big ideas and critical skills in each content area together build toward college and career readiness. The Common Core supports this approach by focusing on core standards and articulating how students should apply them in a range of increasingly challenging interdisciplinary problem contexts and with a variety of increasingly complex texts. Sample tasks, exemplar texts, and student writing samples illustrate clearly the range, quality, and complexity of tasks that students should independently be able to perform in multiple content areas to demonstrate progress toward college and career readiness. This use of exemplar tasks to define proficiency in rich and varied ways has been a hallmark of the best work of the standards reform movement (e.g., NCEE New Standards and their associated performance tasks). Such frameworks better support the development of performance-based assessment systems, which can support more valid inferences about students' developing college and career readiness by using authentic tasks that align closely to the real-world tasks they will face after high school. Performance-based assessment systems are currently used widely by the countries that score highest on international assessments like the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). The College Board incorporates challenging performance tasks that reflect the kinds of tasks faced by expert practitioners in the field into its Advanced Placement tests. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) continues to expand its use of rich performance tasks to measure student achievement.

By introducing task-based assessments aligned to the Common Core standards in a formative context during the two school years before this kind of assessment is used for summative and accountability purposes, New York will prepare teachers and principals to align curriculum to new standards and to prepare students for this new and more rigorous kind of task-based assessment.

Responsible Parties: Board of Regents Elementary, Middle, Secondary, and Continuing Education (EMSC) committee; Senior Deputy Commissioner; Assistant Commissioner of Standards, Assessment, and Reporting; Associate Commissioner of Instructional

Support and Development, and contracted external service providers.

Timeline for Key Activities:

January 2010: New York State signs MOU/MOA with 3 Consortium for the development of Common Assessments tied to the Common Core Standards

April – May: New York State applies for the Federal Assessment Program as part of a multi-state consortium

July 2010: Following adoption of the Common Core Standards, curriculum framework development will begin. Participating districts will be funded to choose formative and interim assessments for use in concert with teacher and leader professional development initiatives.

August 2010: Two RFPs, based upon the Common Core standards, will be drafted and released for performance-based formative assessment collection, development and dissemination

December 2010: RFPs will be awarded and task collection, development, and dissemination will begin.

Activity Three: The Board of Regents College and Career Readiness Working Group will improve the alignment of New York State's Regents exams with college and career ready expectations. Established in early December 2009, the Working Group has been tasked with ensuring that the NYS assessment system is vertically aligned and that New York's graduates are truly prepared for success in college and/or meaningful employment in the 21st century global economy. They have convened experts from early childhood, K-12 education, higher education, and industry. As part of this effort, they will draw on international models of excellence in assessment that incorporate multiple measures of achievement and performance (e.g., hands on science experiments, multimedia presentations, research projects, essays). It is anticipated that this redesign will include recommendations for the

expansion of New York's Standards Review process to include Science, Economics (including Statistics), Technology and Multi Media, Arts, and Social Studies tied to career, college and workforce competencies. In addition, the Working Group will align New York's policies and criteria for the General Education Development Credential (GED) to better prepare those older students who opt for the GED.

NOTE: New York State is not including a RTTT funding request for this activity in this application, but is including it here to show the State's efforts to increase the overall alignment of our college readiness standards and assessments.

Rationale: As the State moves towards the implementation of the Common Core Standards and Assessments in ELA and Math this work will support the overall alignment of our secondary education platform to high school exit criteria and college entry.

Responsible Parties: Board of Regents, Board of Regents EMSC Committee, College and Career Readiness Working Group, Commissioner, Senior Deputy Commissioner.

Timeline: The College and Career Readiness Working Group will begin its work in the first quarter of 2010.

GOAL III: New York State will develop, disseminate, and implement a statewide network strategy for sustained intensive professional development on the new standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessments with the goal of reaching all teachers and leaders in the State.

Activity One: As explained in Section A, the RTTT Management Office will coordinate the implementation of regionally-based professional development activities based on the new aligned standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessments, across the four assurance areas using a regional network strategy. The state will expand both its online Virtual Learning System (VLS) as well as work with BOCES, Special Education Technical Assistance Support Centers, Bilingual Education Coaches and Trainers, Regional

Planning Councils, and District Superintendents to plan for the effective deployment of technical assistance to meet the needs of LEAs to implement the standards, curriculum frameworks and assessments. The State will ensure that professional development includes strategies for English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. The regional network will include both online modules for teachers hosted through VLS and a train-the-trainer model in which LEAs participate in face-to-face professional development modules. As described in Sections A, C, D and F, the essential goals and elements of the State’s professional development activities will be supported and aligned across the four assurances by the RTTT Management Office so that all policies and practices work in alignment to drive improved student achievement for all students. In addition, we will leverage our comprehensive portfolio of USNY assets to provide teacher and school leader development through Public Television, museum courses, and library resources to further support and embed capacity building activities and provide access to implementation resources.

The RTTT Management team will use a data driven decision process to ensure the strategic allocation of resources to optimize the statewide impact of our limited resources. They will rigorously and continuously review the State’s RTTT-related professional development offerings and use an aggressive portfolio development and management approach in the overall coordination of RTTT professional development activities, increasing the offerings of providers who generate results, while decreasing or eliminating those that do not deliver desired outcomes.

Rationale: To ensure that each pre-service and in-service educator has equal access to resources and tools to help promote all students’ attainment of the state learning standards, it is necessary to develop a system of high quality professional development across the state and available in each district. By establishing a customer service-driven network that covers all districts of the state we can reach urban, suburban and rural districts and provide personalized service to districts to anchor consistent practice for results across all subgroups of students. In order to ensure that the needs of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities are a

primary consideration, we will emphasize the development of specific strategies for classroom coaching and teaching subject area content to these students.

Responsible Parties: NYSED Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, NYSED Office of Higher Education, RTTT Management Office, BOCES, Regional Special Education Technical Assistance Centers, Office of Bilingual Education, LEAs, USNY leadership

Timeline: Summer 2010: NYSED's RTTT Management office will issue an RFP for the development of online professional development course offerings for P-20 educators aligned to the new Common Core learning standards, curriculum frameworks, assessments, and subsequent state regulations.

Summer 2010: Communicate through all USNY partners' resources and practices available to support the transition to the new standards and assessments. Engage all stakeholders including teacher and leader representatives and school boards in the dissemination of this information, leveraging the NYSED web sites and email distribution lists to promote this work.

Spring 2011: NYSED will facilitate the development of train-the-trainer models, engaging external service providers where necessary, BOCES, Special Education and Bilingual Education expert trainers to provide professional development in using learning standards to improve instruction

Spring 2011- Fall 2014: NYSED will expand the use of its Virtual Learning Space (VLS) web portal to include professional development opportunities for P-20 educators and promote the availability of these opportunities throughout the State. VLS offers the full text of New York State's learning standards with their key ideas and performance indicators, as well as alternate performance indicators for students with severe disabilities. It provides resources that classroom teachers can use to support preK-

12 standards-based instruction, such as sample tasks, learning experiences and lesson plans

Spring 2011- Fall 2014: The Commissioner will work with USNY institutions to develop strategic supports for the integration of the new curriculum frameworks and standards across the USNY organizations. For example, Libraries will be asked to prioritize the purchase of materials that align to the new frameworks to support students and teachers in the schools; after school providers will be engaged to support these standards in the development of their activities.

Responsible Parties: NYSED, RTTT Management Team, NYSED Special Education Technical Assistance Support Centers, Office of Bilingual Education, BOCES, Institutes of Higher Education, USNY institutions, LEAs.

GOAL IV: New York will ensure vertical and horizontal alignment of learning standards across all content areas and develop aligned curriculum frameworks and assessments, beginning with Science, Technology, Economics and the Arts, then expanding to other content areas.

Activity One: NYSED will review and revise its standards in other content areas and develop aligned curriculum frameworks and assessments. If a national Science Standards Consortium is formed in the future, New York intends to participate. Barring the development of interstate consortia, the NYSED Office of Curriculum and Instruction will engage in a review of the State's current standards beginning with Science and Technology, supported by the Regents Standards Review Committee to develop the timeline and resources to achieve this goal. The same process for implementing frameworks for the Common Core standards will be implemented for these standards.

Rationale: All students must be prepared with 21st Century competencies to succeed in a global economy. Science and Technology literacy and advancement are key goals in our Regents recommendations for reform. Our goal is to align all of our standards and

assessments, to meet college ready skills throughout the curriculum. To conclude this work after the adoption of ELA and Math Common Core standards will not be sufficient to ensure college and career readiness for all our students.

Timeline:

- End of SY 2011-2012: Revised standards and complete Science and Technology curriculum frameworks disseminated
- End of SY 2012-2013: Revised standards and complete Economics, the Arts, Social Studies, and Languages other than English curriculum frameworks disseminated.
- End of SY 2013-2014: Revised standards and complete curriculum frameworks in other content areas as approved by the Board of Regents disseminated.

(C) Data Systems to Support Instruction (47 total points)

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points – 2 points per America COMPETES element)

The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.

Evidence:

- Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

Detailed evidence for all Elements in Appendix C_1_1

Element	NY Current State	Comments
1. A unique statewide student identifier	Yes	New York State has a P12 unique student identifier system in place that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system . This identifier is randomly generated from a combination of multiple data elements.
2. Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information	Yes	New York State collects P12 student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information .
3. Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete P–16 education programs	Partial	New York State collects P12 student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete education programs . It collects aggregate % of high school graduates attending college and the number of first-time college students taking remedial work, persisting to the second year, and graduating. Finally, student-level higher education data have been retrieved from the National Student Clearinghouse and specific higher education institutions and analyzed by The Parthenon Group for policy-related analyses and consideration by the Board of Regents. This analysis was readily completed in approximately three months.
4. Capacity to communicate with higher education data systems	Partial	The New York City Department of Education provides electronic student-level transcript information to the City University of New York (CUNY), demonstrating capacity to communicate with higher education . In addition to Element (3), New York State has thoroughly evaluated Request for Information (RFI) proposals from several vendors to integrate P16 data statewide. New York State’s 2009 IES grant proposal also includes funding for this functionality.

5. State data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability;	Yes	New York State has a P12 State data audit system in place to assess data quality, validity, and reliability . “Level 0” (a statewide web-based application that standardizes the loading of data elements by school districts) provides single-year and year-to-year edit checks and reports. Year-to-year “reasonableness” checks are provided to users via reporting tools provided by “Level 2” (the repository for all statewide student-level data) and “PD Data System” (a tool for reporting students with disabilities-related data). Finally, Department personnel conduct additional checks and provide notifications to schools that appear to have unusual year-to-year changes on critical data elements.
6. Yearly test records of individual students with respect to assessments under section 1111(b) of the ESEA	Yes	New York State collects yearly test records of individual students under section 1111(b) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)) . These include Performance Level and item response data for the elementary/middle-level assessment program in English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies, as well as scores obtained on New York’s secondary-level Regents examinations.
7. Information on students not tested by grade and subject	Yes	New York State collects information on students not tested by grade and subject .
8. Teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students	Partial	New York State has a unique teacher identifier system within the TEACH online services system. TEACH maintains information on teacher certification, preparation programs completed, and professional development information. New York has developed a plan to link individual students to course enrollment to student performance to the teachers responsible for instruction and has begun implementing pilots, with full deployment planned for the 2011-12 school year. For the 2010-11 school year, we will have teacher/student linkages in place for grades 3-8 ELA and math, as well as for teachers assigned to secondary-level courses that lead to Regents exams. New York City has been using a teacher identifier linked to student data for the past two years as part of its performance evaluation and incentive system, and the State plans to leverage this expertise.

9. Student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned	Partial	As described in Element (8), New York State has a pilot program in place to link students to teachers and courses, and to integrate them into the P16 data system, and a plan to report student transcript information, including courses and grades , for the 2010-11 school year. New York City has already created linkages among students, courses, and teachers.
10. Student-level college readiness test scores	Partial	New York State collects student-level college readiness test scores (SAT, ACT, AP) in the statewide longitudinal data system. Arrangements are in place with the College Board to receive and store all PSAT and SAT scores, beginning with the current school year.
11. Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education	No	New York State collects aggregate percentages of high school graduates attending college the fall after graduating and the number of first-time college students taking remedial course work, persisting to the second year and graduating . This allows an analysis of higher education graduation rates by race/ethnicity and persistence by amount of remedial work. College entry and persistence analysis was completed in approximately three months by The Parthenon Group.
12. Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary	No	As stated in Element (11), New York State is able to analyze higher education graduation rates by race/ethnicity and persistence by amount of remedial course work. In addition, as described in Element (3), Parthenon conducted a student-level analysis of the demographic, enrollment, and assessment variables that predict success in postsecondary education .

Reform Plan Criteria

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data (5 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan to ensure that data from the State's statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage, as appropriate, key stakeholders (e.g., parents, students, teachers, principals, LEA leaders, community members, unions, researchers, and policymakers); and that the data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of efforts in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness.¹⁶

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

New York State has a strong P-20 data vision. The state will track relevant data for all students throughout their lives from Pre-K to higher education and beyond, including other agencies (e.g., social services, department of labor). This longitudinal data system will provide complete, efficient and timely information to those who are responsible for ensuring New York's students receive a world class education, promoting improved practice and decision-making at all levels of the education system:

- Timely information for **educators** (teachers and principals) will drive instructional decisions, including targeted instruction to students, and identify program improvement and professional development opportunities. **Principals** will use information from the system to provide operational support and performance feedback to teachers. Information will link **educators** and their student outcomes to teacher preparation programs to identify improvement opportunities, inform curricular and content delivery decisions, and provide data to inform the development and implementation of higher education accountability systems.

- Information for **parents** will help them understand their children’s progress through school, toward graduation, and toward college readiness.
- Information will be available for **researchers** to conduct analyses for better policy decision-making and to **policy-makers** to select priorities and allocate resources more effectively, particularly to help close the achievement gap for underperforming groups. The system will allow tracking of and return on investments in a systematic way by linking interventions and outcomes, thus permitting data-informed decisions to reallocate resources away from under-performing initiatives and into innovative, high-performing ones.
- Information will be available to demonstrate compliance with accountability and other program initiatives and requirements from the **Federal and State Government**
- Information will be available to **postsecondary institutions** to inform performance and programmatic improvements

A summary of our strategies to access State-level data and assure our LEAs have the capacity to use data to drive instruction, are summarized in the table below.

Summary of New York’s Strategy for accessing and using data (C(2)) and using data to improve instruction (C(3))

Regulatory changes specific to data systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkage of student and teacher data • Linkage of data across K-12 and Higher Ed consistent with FERPA
--	--

Participating district requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the longitudinal data system developed by the State • Collect data as required by the State, including but not limited to, teacher and student absences and ACT/SAT scores • Implement or enhance a local instructional improvement system and make data from such system available to researchers, consistent with FERPA and other applicable confidentiality and privacy mandates • Use formative assessments, as developed and/or approved by the State, that are aligned to State standards and collect and use data from such formative assessments to inform instruction • Provide professional development for teachers and administrators on using data to improve instruction
RFPs or competitive grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

Please See Appendix C_2_1 for the overarching objectives of New York’s next generation data system. The plan to achieve these overarching goals is as follows:

GOAL 1: Enhancement of current P-12 system to include all data elements to drive instructional reporting

Activity One: NYSED personnel will work with all responsible parties to expand current data model to include all required data student and teacher information

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Contractors, Regional Information Centers

Timeline for completion: June 2011

Activity Two: NYSED will also unify naming conventions and cross-walk tables for P-16 course codes that will form the basis for electronic transcripts and early warning initiatives.

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Contractors, Regional Data Centers, LEAs, Representatives from higher education

Timeline for completion: June 2012 (N.B.: Some early warning initiative work will be complete before 2012; some schools and

districts (e.g., NYC) have established some early warning systems already.)

The funding for activities associated with this goal will come from the SFSF funds (ARRA), IES grants, funding from The Gates Foundation, action settlement with Microsoft, and the yearly capital expense budget of NYSED

GOAL 2: New York - Statewide Instructional Reporting and Improvement System (NY-SIRIS) construction and rollout; clear, simple, and insightful reporting to all stakeholders

Activity One: NYSED will phase in LEAs so as to completely implement a comprehensive instructional reporting system over 3 years. These tools and reports will allow users to customize the user experience, prioritize the display of useful information, and utilize the latest social media technologies to save and share information with others. NYSED will work with representatives from P-16 (building on momentum from current P-20 data work and the P-16 Data System Executive Committee Memorandum of Understanding signed by leadership from NYSED, key districts, and higher education), other State agencies, students and parents, teachers and other union leaders, the School Boards Association, and executive and legislative liaisons, to ensure that clear and effective dashboards, analyses, and portal-based tools are available to support insight and continuous improvement.

NYSED has already created a P-20 research committee, with representation from districts, researchers and universities that is tasked with identifying data and research that is critical to driving policy decisions. NYSED is committed to leveraging best practices from other states (e.g., TX, KY, AR) and organizations such as *Achieve, Inc.* and *New Visions for Public Schools* to identify critical information for each stakeholder group and make the information available in an efficient, user-friendly and timely manner. Parents, teachers, administrators, and other advocates will have seamless access to school and system performance data so that they can make better and more informed decisions. For these groups the focus will be on creating relevant, simple and easily accessible reports. NYSED will also work to raise awareness of the available reports to ensure that all key stakeholders know how to access,

analyze and use the information.

The Texas High School project demonstrates the usefulness of easy to access information. The data and reporting system is web-based and thus accessible from anywhere. The reports and dashboards are simple and easy to understand with a well-defined set of data elements for each stakeholder group including Parents (who are most interested in knowing the progress of the child and if s/he is on track to complete the grade). Arkansas has a user-friendly web-based portal where data elements and access are automatically linked to pre-defined role e.g., teachers, principals, counselor/registrars etc. Kentucky officials developed succinct, easy-to-read and easy-to-interpret reports that the state shares with high schools to show how their graduates perform in postsecondary education. These are now widely used by educators and policymakers. New York will continue to work actively to adopt and build upon these best practices. See Section C(3) for additional details. Funding for this project will be provided by the RTTT grant.

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Contractors, BOCES, Regional Information Centers, NYCDOE, some of the other Big 4 LEAs. The parties will remain the same for the full rollout except that a much larger number of LEAs will now be involved.

Timeline for completion: June 2012 (for Pilot) and June 2013 (full rollout)

GOAL 3: Promote the effective use of longitudinal data to inform decision-making and practice

Activity One: New York will provide professional development through a statewide network. NYSED will design and help implement pre-service training, ongoing professional development (PD), teacher evaluation and accountability systems, and systemic change management operations at the LEA level. The RTTT Management Office will coordinate regional networks and external providers selected through an RFP process, to provide professional development and tutorials in multiple formats, leveraging online technologies, to increase teacher and administrator capacity to use existing reports and create and use their own reports with the goal of adapting classroom practices to drive gains in student achievement. Funding for this project will be provided

by the RTTT grant. See C(3) for more details.

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Regional Data Centers, LEAs, Representatives from higher education

Timeline for completion: June 2014; PD will begin in 2012 in parallel with the roll out of NY-SIRIS

Activity Two: Under the purview of New York’s P-20 Data System Executive Committee and Steering Committee, NYSED will establish 3 taskforces – (1) Data Systems, (2) Legal and Policy, and (3) Research – to promote the optimal capture and use of longitudinal data. The taskforces, whose initial membership has been identified, will include cross-functional representatives from K-12, higher education, NYSED, and future participating non-education agencies (e.g., Department of Labor). The taskforces will be responsible for encouraging a cohesive, strategic approach to the capture and use of data by advising the Commissioner and P-20 Executive Committee on the following matters:

Data Systems Taskforce	Legal and Policy Taskforce	Research Taskforce
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure Maintenance of Systems Governance • Provide Guidance on Systems Development and Data Warehouse Work • Define User Application and Reporting Systems Design • Refine Data Standards & Definitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify Policy Priorities • Assess Legal & Policy Considerations Related to Student Data • Assess Legal & Policy Considerations Related to Teacher Data • Determine Data Sharing Business Requirements • (Matrix with other two taskforces to ensure effective integration of legal and policy considerations across P-20 work) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set the Research Agenda • Define Report Format for Data Analyses • Analyze Student and Teacher Data

Responsible Parties: P-20 Executive and Steering Committees, NYSED

Timeline for completion: Will begin in spring 2010 and continue beyond RTTT grant period

GOAL 4: Integration of Higher Education (public and private)

Activity One: Building upon the enhanced P-12 system, NYSED will work with representatives from higher education (both public and private) to define, collect, and report key data elements and early-warning indicators, including all data indicated in Element 3 and Element 11 of Section C(1). NYSED will support system enhancements on the higher education side as needed. Best practices from states such as FL, which has a history of building an information-rich “data warehouse” that connects K-12, postsecondary, and workforce information, will be leveraged. See Appendix C_2_10 for details on SUNY and CUNY enhancement and integration plans. Funding for this project will be provided by the RTTT grant

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Representatives from higher education (public and private), Contractors

Timeline for completion: June 2014 (End of 2012 for SUNY/CUNY, and June 2014 for privates)

GOAL 5: Adoption of Growth Model

Activity One: NYSED will work with contractors, researchers, policy-makers, representatives from collective bargaining groups, and LEA’s to design and implement a growth and value-added model. Growth information will then be provided to stakeholders to inform them of students’ progress through the NY-SIRIS instructional reporting system. The information will be used in the updated teacher evaluation system discussed in section D(2) of this application; it will also provide teachers and principals with critical information regarding individual students and groups of students to inform instructional planning and delivery, and it will permit policy-makers to understand performance patterns more completely, thus increasing the capacity at both the LEA and State levels to identify investment and intervention priorities and to measure the return on investments and interventions. Funding for this

project will be provided by the RTTT grant.

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Contractors, representatives from collective bargaining groups, LEAs, Representatives from higher education

Timeline for completion: June 2013

GOAL 6: Integration of non-education systems

Activity One: NYSED will work with representatives from early childhood, K-12, organizations that represent students with disabilities and other underperforming groups, higher education, workforce, military, health, human services, and criminal justice to ensure adequate links and data mapping abilities between systems. NYSED will incorporate best practices from states such as FL that have consistently improved their data systems, including linking data systems across the P-20/Workforce pipeline e.g., Florida Board of Governors, Department of Children and Families, the Department of Juvenile Justice, the Department of Corrections, and others. Funding for this project will be provided by RTTT

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Contractors, Representatives from Non-Education Systems, Representatives from higher education

Timeline for completion: June 2014

GOAL 7: Establish Between-State Data Sharing Arrangement and Protocol

Activity One: NYSED will design and implement data transfer protocols between state agencies. Preliminary plans have been developed in discussions with some Northeastern and mid-Atlantic state educational agencies.

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Contractors, Representatives from Regional State Education Consortia, Representatives from higher education

Timeline for completion: June 2014

Performance Measures Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.	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
(Enter measures here, if any.)					

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction (18 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan to—

- (i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;
- (ii) Support participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and
- (iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (*e.g.*, students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals,

activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note the location where the attachment can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages

The foundational elements of New York State's Race to the Top Strategy are the development of rigorous curriculum guidelines based on Common Core standards, world-class formative, interim, and summative assessments, and high-quality professional development and teacher training. To inform all of the State's efforts – most fundamentally the effort to provide the State's students with an unrivalled educational experience – New York will create a best-in-class Statewide Instructional Reporting and Improvement System (NY-SIRIS) focused on improving instructional practice. New York's commitment to developing the strongest teaching corps in the nation will be well-served by NY-SIRIS. The State's teacher effectiveness efforts, detailed in Section D, will be informed by student performance data on formative, interim, and summative assessments. This data will be linked to teachers and the programs that trained them, allowing the State and our partners to continually monitor, modify, and improve professional development and teacher training programs.

Informed by best practices across the State and nation, New York's system will provide robust student, teacher, school, district, and state-level information to teachers, administrators, the public, policy makers and researchers. For LEAs the system's linkage of student and teacher course level performance data, tracked over time, will permit teachers and school and district administrators to identify progress and problems for a single child, a classroom, specific groups of children (including at-risk populations), or an entire school or district. The statewide system will build upon the successes experienced in New York City (ARIS) while allowing LEAs to customize the system as needed; in addition to providing a set of standardized reports and analyses, the system will be flexible to maximize the instructional benefit to individual schools and districts, allowing each LEA to include its own unique data,

create customized reports, and pilot district-wide formative assessments. Data will be uploaded daily for rapid-time analysis, and educators will be able to work together in teams, communicate through the instructional reporting system, diagnose problems at all levels of the school, examine and implement best practices to solve them, and evaluate and share results system-wide. Early Warning Systems will identify students who are or are likely to be off track for promotion and graduation and will flag these students for intervention.

The system will be particularly valuable for traditionally underserved target populations including Black and Hispanic students, English Language Learners (ELL), Long-Term ELLs, Students with Disabilities (SWD), and Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFEs), enabling their teachers to identify and exchange information about research-based or other promising interventions being used in individual schools. System roll out will prioritize turnaround school districts and schools that are persistently low performing; educators in these schools will receive additional targeted professional development in the use of data to inform instruction and close the achievement gap. To these and all of New York State's other districts and schools, proper analysis of student performance available through the system, combined with robust and comprehensive professional development for school and district staff, will be critical components in the effort to increase student achievement.

To successfully implement and roll out the best-in-class data system and ensure that the system is used widely and accurately, the following 3 key activities will be completed:

- (i) Create a Comprehensive Instructional Reporting and Improvement System.
- (ii) Provide integrated professional development through a statewide network
- (iii) Make the data from the instructional improvement system and the longitudinal data system fully accessible electronically to researchers

(i) GOAL 1: Create a Comprehensive Instructional Reporting and Improvement System

To ensure that the instructional reporting system is comprehensive, New York State is committed to completing its longitudinal data system to include all necessary data elements for NY-SIRIS. The state is in the process of matching teacher data with student data and is also creating links among and between early childhood, P-12, higher education, and workforce data. We will begin matching teacher, student and course information in the 2010-11 school year. During the period of the grant, we will link P-12 data with data from SUNY and CUNY (who have signed the P-16 Data System MOU and participate on the P-16 Data System Executive Committee), and with data from four leading independent colleges and universities.

The technical capacity of New York City's instructional reporting and improvement system provides a national model that New York State will build upon for NY-SIRIS. New York City's system currently provides over 80,000 educators with a single, secure, and comprehensive online platform to analyze data they can use to improve student outcomes, share what they have learned by publishing documents and taking part in discussions and blogs, and find and work with other educators facing similar challenges. The parents of the City's 1.1 million students can also log-in and access secure, individualized reports on their children. The system uploads new data every day to ensure rapid-time usability. Because this system is an excellent technical model, NYSED intends both to adopt this system and expand it statewide, and at the same time incorporate the best practices from other instructional improvement systems across New York and in other states nation-wide. NYSED will also take advantage of the system's technical capacity as the State develops its student growth model, likely to resemble Colorado's model.

NY-SIRIS will allow users to take the following key actions:

- Examine rapid-time school, and student data, including formative/interim assessments (plus those outlined in section (B)(3)).

- View standardized reports using the data or create custom reports drawing from the entire data repository.
- Utilize a complete profile of individual students as they progress across grades, with data on classroom performance, number of credits toward high school graduation, demographics, attendance, discipline, and additional data as desired.
- View performance on individual assessment items for all State tests across a classroom, school, demographic group, etc.
- Diagnose students' learning needs, set classroom goals for improvement, and measure success.
- Access a library of instructional resources (including specific instructional tools, books, interventions, and best practices) that are research-based and proven to work. In addition, resources can be contributed by teachers statewide to address problems identified for one student, a group of students, a classroom, or a school or district.
- Identify educators who have similar interests and face similar challenges and collaborate on solutions.
- Organize and share work documents with team members and collaborators.
- For parents, log-in to see their student's current and past performance.

Activity 1: New York State will continue current longitudinal data system enhancement work described in the preceding paragraphs and will leverage New York City's instructional reporting model to build pilot programs in other districts across the state, with initial rollout to prioritize both LEAs with low-performing schools as defined in section E of this application and LEAs with high percentages of low-performing students. As well as having access to a set of standard reports and analyses, LEAs will have the capability to enter their own local data into the statewide system, which will allow schools and districts to create their own customized reports and utilize best practices that have been developed locally.

The New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) is already committed to creating pilots with other large and small school districts in the State. After the changes are made and perfected in the pilots, the system will then be expanded to the entire state.

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Contractors, BOCES, Regional Information Centers, NYCDOE, some of the other Big 4 school districts (for pilot). Parties will remain the same for the full rollout except that a much larger number of LEAs will now be involved.

Timeline for completion: June 2012 (for Pilot) and June 2013 (full Statewide rollout)

C(3)(ii) GOAL 1: Provide integrated professional development through a statewide network

New York State will create a proven, sustainable system to provide ongoing professional development for educators in using instructional systems to analyze data and then, once student deficiencies are identified, to take the appropriate, research-driven actions to improve student achievement or school climate. To deliver this professional development, we will build on successful Inquiry Team models from places such as New York City and Southern California. These models include tiered layers of leaders, plus experts in data, curriculum and assessment, and instruction, that are responsible for school-based inquiry teams. The model is data- and evidence-driven, emphasizes principal leadership and teacher cooperation, and is sustainable. It makes time for teachers to work actively together – using the data, analyzing the results, and making adjustments in their instruction as needed. Schools are held accountable for utilizing the system and for their results through a quality review process and a subsequent rating.

New York City’s Collaborative Inquiry Network, now two and half years old, emanates from the central administration, which provides a four-person team consisting of a network leader, data expert, achievement facilitator, and curriculum expert to work with groups of 25-35 schools in a single network. Each four person network team is responsible for providing the professional development and ongoing coaching required for each of the 25-35 school-based teams. Each school-based team has multiple teams working with different students on different issues, and uses the instructional improvement website to create its own inquiry site. Each team accesses student data to create customized reports around specific problems and view detailed information used to devise new instructional strategies. Each team analyzes the data for groups of students with learning deficits, investigates and uses research-based instructional strategies to solve specific problems, and evaluates the success of the strategies used. The team posts

information on results, which is shared with other inquiry teams city-wide. This inquiry team approach has already been shown to work effectively in Southern California and several other places.¹⁷

Activity One: In expanding the instructional reporting and improvement system to all school districts, the State will create one single collaborative network of regional implementation teams that will support districts and the district-based networks in each region. The State already has school and district support networks that consist of the 37 BOCES, plus Regional Information Centers (RICs), Special Education Technical Resource Centers, and Bilingual Education Technical Assistance Centers, many of which are affiliated with the BOCES. These networks, all of which are funded by the State and report to NYSED, already have data, curriculum, assessment, and instructional experts working with districts. The services of these various networks will be integrated into a single coordinated effort, and aligned with other professional development and capacity building initiatives, by the RTTT Management Office.

Responsible Parties: NYSED, RICs, BOCES and affiliates

Timeline for completion: June 2013

Activity Two: The regional implementation teams will promote in all of New York’s school districts the use of the instructional improvement system and development of inquiry team networks that extend from the region to the district and school level.

Regional implementation teams will prioritize work in districts with the lowest performing schools and will contribute to school

¹⁷Vescio, Ross, Adams, “A Review of Research on the Impact of Professional Learning Communities on Teaching Practice and Student Learning,” Teaching and Teacher Education, January 2008.

Saunders, Goldenberg, Gallimore, “Increasing Achievement by Focusing Grade-Level Teams on Improving Classroom Learning: A Prospective, Quasi-Experimental Study of Title I Schools,” American Educational Research Journal, January, 2009.

improvement intervention initiatives as described in section E of this application to ensure that the use of data to inform instruction is embedded in the educational core in turnaround schools.

Responsible Parties: NYSED, RICs, LEAs

Timeline for completion: June 2013

Activity Three: The system will create reports to monitor students to determine whether they are “on-track” toward high school completion and other postsecondary goals and will provide those reports to teachers and administrators for use in developing instructional, intervention, and recovery strategies and for communicating with parents. The system will consider enrolled courses, grades, accumulated credits, as well as other “portfolio”-type assessments of student progress. As a complement to tracking students, there will be an “Early Warning System” that includes the early indicators (some as early as elementary school) that predict the likelihood that a student will drop out prior to completing the P-16 system. Such indicators include frequency of lateness and/or absences, frequency of disciplinary actions, number of credits accumulated, below-average performance on 8th grade and other State and local assessments, overage status, and for English Language Learner (ELL) students who are not making adequate progress in English acquisition. Such indicators will help teachers and principals identify and take corrective actions quickly to help a student or a group of students get back on track. This Early Warning System will be a critical support to school turnaround and teacher effectiveness initiatives focused on narrowing the achievement gap in traditionally underserved student groups, including ELL students, Students With Disabilities, and Black and Hispanic students.

Responsible Parties: NYSED

Timeline for completion: Completed as part of the longitudinal data system prior to full implementation of the instructional reporting system – June 2012

Activity Four: The State’s accountability system will be changed to require all schools and districts to join this Statewide

Collaborative Inquiry Network and utilize the instructional improvement system. Participation will be factored into the formula by which schools are judged to make adequate progress.

Responsible Parties: NYSED

Timeline for completion: June 2013

C(3) (iii) GOAL 1: Make the data from the instructional improvement system and the longitudinal data system fully accessible electronically to researchers through NY-SIRIS

Activity 1: Create and publish de-identified school and district aggregate tables that allow for reporting, research and policy analysis. These tables will be made available electronically to ensure that they are available to all researchers.

Timeline for completion: June 2011

Activity Two: Supplement this information with specific data tables that facilitate data analysis of crucial results, including different types of students who are in the achievement gap – English Language Learners, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, students in the different racial/ethnic groups (including by gender), etc.

Timeline for completion: June 2011

Activity Three: Provide access to the instructional reporting and improvement system so that teachers and school leaders can view detailed information about their own classrooms or schools, including unique local data, and create customized reports. Enable School Improvement Teams to create their own websites with data analyses, practices they used to improve instruction, and subsequent evaluations. Allow this information to be shared with other teams system-wide.

Timeline for completion: Pilots by 2012 and system-wide implementation by June 2013

Activity Four: Provide an expedited process to provide data to researchers who need de-identified student-level data, either with or without small cell suppression, depending on the nature and justification of the request. Student identifiers will be replaced with unique research identifiers, to ensure student privacy.

Timeline for completion: June 2011

Responsible parties: Responsible parties for all above activities are NYSED Data Director and staff as well as a P-20 Research Committee that NYSED setup. The Research Committee will be responsible for setting the research agenda, helping define the data and report formats, and analyzing the student and teacher data to drive instructional and policy decisions.

(D) Great Teachers and Leaders (138 total points) (See Appendix D_T for a complete set of timelines)

(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 points)

The extent to which the State has—

- (i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;
- (ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and
- (iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the

criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (D)(1)(i), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents, including information on the elements of the State's alternative routes (as described in the alternative route to certification definition in this notice).

Evidence for (D)(1)(ii), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A list of the alternative certification programs operating in the State under the State's alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice), and for each:
 - The elements of the program (as described in the alternative routes to certification definition in this notice).
 - The number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each program in the previous academic year.
 - The total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous academic year.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

D(1)(i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education.

New York State law empowers the Regents and the Commissioner of Education to establish the examination and certification requirements for teachers (Appendix D_1_i_1 - Education Law §§3001 and 3004). The law gives the Regents broad authority to approve alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals, which includes authority to incorporate and/or authorize providers other than institutions of higher education (IHEs) to prepare teachers and principals (Appendix D_1_i_1 - Education Law §§207, 210, 214, 215, 216, 224, 3004[6]). The Regents have used this authority to endorse the expansion of alternative routes to certification through non-IHE providers. Additionally, at their November 2009 meeting, they approved policy permitting providers, including non-IHEs, to pilot clinically-rich teacher/principal preparation programs (see Section D 4). In effect, New York State

offers routes to certification that run along a continuum from traditional IHE preparation to streamlined preparation for qualified candidates through alternative pathways as described below.

D(1)(ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use.

Existing Alternative Routes for Teachers. New York State has the authority to approve, has created, and welcomes alternative routes to certification. The Regents created alternative routes to certification in 2000 by approving regulations for a fast-track, non-traditional approach to attract qualified, educated individuals into teaching who had not completed teacher education programs, in part to reduce shortages in high-need schools and shortage subject areas. The alternative routes - Transitional B (Trans B) for individuals with baccalaureate degrees; and Transitional C (Trans C) for individuals with graduate degrees - are for career changers or talented recent graduates with liberal arts or content area degrees who seek to teach yet lack needed pedagogical training. Candidates entering these programs who meet high admission standards, may “test out” of content requirements through transcript review, examination, or other means, and must pass New York State Teacher Certification Examinations, including the Content Specialty Test, a rigorous content test, before teaching in the classroom.

Alternative route programs contain embedded school-based experiences before candidates enter the classroom and, once teaching, alternative teachers complete daily mentoring for a specified length of time. Alternative programs lead to the same Initial or Professional certificate as traditional routes. To date, NYSED has approved 9 public and 21 private IHEs to offer 387 Trans B and 23 Trans C programs to prepare teachers (see Appendix D_1_i_2 Tables 1-4 for providers, data, and other information). In 2008-09, the State’s schools employed 2,088 teachers with Trans B and C certificates.

In 2003, NYSED began offering the Transitional A (Trans A) certificate route to attract into teaching experienced individuals with specialized training and skills in a trade or career field and place them into classrooms quickly to teach in the rapidly changing

career and trade fields. A distinguishing factor of the Trans A route is its ability to place individuals with required years of demonstrated work experience and without college background directly into the classroom after passing a New York State examination. Trans A focuses exclusively on the career and technical fields, e.g. welding, etc. Since 2003, 888 teachers have been placed through the Trans A route in hard-to-fill trade and career subjects, to the benefit of students. The number of teachers certified under the three routes in 2008-09 is shown below. (Additional data are found in Appendix D_1_i_2).

Alternative Certification Route	# of Teaching Certificates Issued, 2008-09	# of Programs
Transitional B	2,070	389
Transitional C	10	23
Transitional A	119	N/A

Statewide, in 2008-09, 36,444 teachers and 2,044 school building leaders (including principals) were certified under all existing routes to certification.

As evidenced by partnerships via, for example, the New York City *Teaching Fellows* (in conjunction with The New Teacher Project), Teach For America, Teacher U, etc., New York State has been and continues to be eager to pursue high quality partnerships to create additional pathways to the classroom.

Since its inception in 2000, the New York City *Teaching Fellows* Program (NYC Fellows with TNTP), the nation's largest fellows program and arguably one of its best, has placed over 10,000 teachers in NYC's neediest schools and replaced temporary licensed teachers in 63 percent of schools. In addition, hundreds of teacher candidates from *Teach for America* are employed in New York City schools as Teaching Fellows each year. The Math Immersion Program (MIP) is a specialized NYC Fellows program created to fill a critical shortage of mathematics teachers in NYC by attracting candidates without a math major who have math knowledge (e.g., from engineering, economics, business) by giving them supplemental "immersion" training in math during pre-service and a

customized master's program to address their needs as alternative teachers and non-math majors. Before entering the classroom, these individuals demonstrate math proficiency by passing the Content Specialty Test in that subject.

Since 2002, the MIP has placed 1,983 Math Fellows in NYC schools, 83 percent of all Math Fellows, 38 percent of NYC's new math hires, and about 22 percent of NYC's approximately 5,000 math teachers. The program has been so successful that NYC began a Science Immersion Program in 2006, and Science Immersion Fellows now comprise 16 percent of NYC science teachers.

The Intensive Teacher Institutes in Bilingual Education/Special Education are fully funded, content-rich, specialized 15-credit programs that began in 1990 and have prepared nearly 3,000 bilingual teachers in regular and special education subjects to address a critical statewide shortage of bilingual teachers in the State's neediest LEAs and schools.

In 2007, three of the highest performing urban charter organizations (*Achievement First, KIPP and Uncommon Schools*), the *Hunter College School of Education*, and the *New York City Charter School Center* created a path-breaking partnership to collaboratively design a teacher preparation program leading to teacher certification and a Master's degree in education. The resulting model, ***Teacher U*** was launched in the summer of 2007. This model of teacher training is focused on preparing teachers that are responsive to the needs of students in inner city public schools. The courses and in-school clinical activities cover such areas as: classroom management, curriculum and effective pedagogy for various subject areas, assessment of students learning and working with students with special needs – including English Language Learners. Students are closely monitored and supported through on-site visits by faculty, videotaping of their teaching, and meeting with faculty to analyze these video records. In 2009, *Teacher U* launched a program for teachers in Special Education in partnership with *Teach for America* and the NYC Fellows. Originally launched with a cohort of 40 teachers, that number has more than doubled in its first two years.

In 2009, *New Visions for Public Schools* partnered with Hunter College and the New York City Department of Education to launch

the Urban Teacher Residency Program (UTR). UTR is a 14 month teacher-training program that fully integrates the graduate coursework of the aspiring teacher (Resident) with intensive, hands-on experiences in New York City schools. Within a strong public school, Residents collaborate with expert educators on all aspects of teaching and learning. At the same time, Residents take graduate courses at Hunter College specifically designed by UTR to align with experiences in urban schools. Successful completion of the program results in a Master's Degree in Education and certification to teach in New York City. UTR Graduates are guaranteed the opportunity to be hired by a school within New Visions' network of 76 public schools and are asked to commit to four years of teaching in New Visions schools after their Residencies. For the 2009-10 Residency Year, UTR will prepare 24 residents in English and Science for grades 7-12. In 2010-11 school year that number will double to 48 residents in English, Biology and Mathematics for grades 7-12 and in special education for grades 5-8.

Alternative Routes for Principals

To ensure highly effective principals in high poverty and /or high- minority schools New York has also worked with key partners to build this system capacity.

New Leader for New Schools (NLNS) was begun in 2000 and in 2001 trained a cohort of 13 individuals in New York City and Chicago. By 2008, the total number of New Leaders had grown to over 550 nationally. The Program is structured around a summer foundations training institute and Residency Year. In the summer institute residents focus on developing instructional and organizational leadership skills which prepare them for the residency in urban public schools alongside a mentor principal. In New York City, 63% of New Leaders-led K-8 schools outperformed the district in English Language Arts and Math combined. In addition, the 2008 four year graduation rate is 74% for students in New Leaders-led high schools compared to the district rate of 61%. Currently 99 NLNS members are working in NYC district and charter schools.

Since 2003, the *New York City Leadership Academy* (NYCLA)¹⁸, a non-traditional principal preparation program, has provided a pipeline of newly-trained principals prepared with problem-based, action-learning experiences to transform NYC's neediest schools. In NYC, 258 public school principals (16 percent of all NYC principals) are graduates of NYCLA's Aspiring Principals Program (APP); 89 percent of APP graduates serve in New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) leadership and support positions.

D(1)(iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

In 2005, NYSED implemented a data-driven teacher and principal supply-demand model to identify, evaluate, and monitor the content area subjects and regions of the State with the greatest shortages of newly certified teachers and principals. A database of certificates issued yearly, by type and subject area, is matched to individual teachers, their employment histories, and their teaching assignments. New York's model looks on a regional basis, at the percentage of teachers who are teaching out of their appropriate certification area, the annual teacher turnover and the number of new (inexperienced) teacher hires by school districts in each certification area as compared to the total number of new teachers certified the previous year in that area. This analysis lets us compare the number of new teachers prepared to the actual number of vacancies filled by a first year teacher. When this number is high (e.g., 5 new teachers prepared for each new teacher hired), then we project a surplus in the area. However, if we are only preparing one or two new teachers for each vacancy filled by a new teacher, we project a possible shortage in that area. Each year, these reports identify percentages of teachers certified and ratios of supply to demand for new teachers. They flag areas of shortage

¹⁸New York City Leadership Academy: Elementary and middle schools led by APP graduates **for** three consecutive years achieved almost twice the gains in students' reading proficiency ratings (6.4% vs. 3.7% gains) than comparison schools. High schools led by APP graduates for three consecutive years posted 9.6% higher gains in the percent of students earning 10+ credits over time than comparison schools.

and the results are presented to the Board of Regents and published online. This allows NYSED, LEAs, institutions preparing teachers, and the public to know where and in what areas shortages exist, to better address teacher need. (Appendix D_1_iii_1 includes examples of these reports.) Recommendations were recently proposed to change the certificate structure for teachers of students with disabilities as informed by these reports. Other important uses of the reports include the designation of federal shortage areas required annually by the federal government, disbursement strategies for our Teachers of Tomorrow funding (\$25 million annual State appropriation to attract hard-to-staff teachers to high-need schools), and regular meetings of the Department with IHE Deans of Education to promote needed expansion of programs in the shortage areas. The initiatives presented in this Race to the Top proposal (particularly the Clinically-rich Graduate Preparation Program for teachers for high-need schools (see D4), differential pay incentive for teachers of STEM/ELL/Students with Disabilities to work in high-need schools and the new expedited pathway for individuals with advanced degrees in the STEM areas to teach in high-need schools) were informed and developed in response to the needs identified in these reports.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance *(58 points)*

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

- (i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; *(5 points)*
- (ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; *(15 points)*
- (iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; *(10 points)* and

(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding— (28 points)

- (a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;
- (b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;
- (c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and
- (d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Ten pages

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance

As outlined in Section A, a robust human capital strategy is central to New York State’s RTTT reform plan. The State has a strong history of establishing high expectations for its students and teachers. The Board of Regents’ recently adopted reform agenda, with its relentless emphasis on improving teacher and principal effectiveness based upon performance, is evidence of this continued focus.

Our teacher and principal effectiveness reforms begin with new and more rigorous professional standards for teachers and principals aligned to a redesigned comprehensive performance-based evaluation system. This assessment backbone, encompassing the initial and professional certifications and continuing with annual performance evaluations, will provide information at each stage of the teacher and principal career continua as to whether or not the individual is equipped and can demonstrate an ability to drive increases in student achievement. This information, housed within NY-SIRIS, will be crucial to ensuring that all students have well-prepared, high-quality teachers in their classrooms and effective leaders in their schools. And, as our educators progress along their career continua, from their initial to professional certifications and from pre-service to in-service, we intend to recognize their increasing levels of professionalism with enhanced career options and compensation opportunities, focusing particularly on ensuring our neediest schools have our most effective educators.

The Regents recent policy actions have created a foundation for strengthening the State’s overall educator effectiveness. As part of our RTTT MOU, we are requiring participating LEAs to commit to implementing numerous synchronized reforms endorsed by the Regents that will have far-reaching impacts on the effectiveness of teachers and principals. To promote even deeper reforms, we have created a major initiative – The Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Funds – to incentivize LEAs to participate in good faith collective bargaining with their labor partners to implement programs that will achieve even greater levels of teacher and principal effectiveness.

New York's strategy to improve teacher and principal effectiveness is based upon these main beliefs:

1. **Radical improvements are needed in the quality of teacher and principal preparation programs.** New York seeks a complete redesign of teacher preparation grounded in clinically rich programs that focus on the teaching skills and knowledge that teachers need to move students to higher levels of academic learning. All programs will incorporate performance-based assessments to ensure that we place only effective teachers into our classrooms.
2. **We must fundamentally raise the bar on what it means to be, and remain, a teacher in New York by increasing the rigor, quality, relevance and transparency of the teacher evaluation process across the state.** Certification in New York State carries enormous consequence and represents a fundamental component in the evaluation system. The Board of Regents have authorized NYSED to bolster all critical evaluation points, including:
 - a. Initial certification: NYSED will establish clear performance-based standards to ensure that teachers are truly prepared to enter the profession.
 - b. Professional certification: Must include demonstration of sustained ability to drive student achievement as evidenced by student growth measures. Achieving professional certification is independent of tenure and must be earned within five years of receiving initial certification. As such, professional certification provides a concrete, high-stakes decision point focused on teacher performance within the first five years of an individual teacher's career, with consequence of dismissal for non-performance (after appropriate supports have been provided.)
 - c. Annual Professional Performance Reviews: comprehensive evaluations for all practicing teachers to include multiple measures of effectiveness, spanning both qualitative and quantitative inputs. Student achievement, as measured by

value-added growth models, will represent a significant component to determine effectiveness. It is our intention that once enhancements to the present system are fully developed, effectiveness measures will inform differentiated professional development, tenure, certification, career ladder roles and responsibilities, and dismissal based upon clearly defined performance thresholds.

Student and teacher data linkages are critical to inform the redesign of both the teacher evaluation process and the teacher and principal preparation programs. New York State will create seamless information flows to ensure that lessons from student and teacher data linkages inform further improvements in teacher and principal preparation programs. Teacher and principal evaluations will provide the critical link between establishing high professional standards, measuring teachers' and principals' effectiveness in achieving them, informing strategic resource allocation to ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals and ultimately driving dramatic instructional reform across the system.

NYSED will leverage a range of existing Regents' policies and regulations, commitments from RTTT participating LEAs via their scope of work, and enhanced efforts of LEAs incentivized through a state-level fund for teacher and principal effectiveness reforms, to develop and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that incorporate significant weighting for student growth. NYSED's strategies are outlined briefly in the table below and are explored in more detail later in this section.

Summary of New York's strategy for ensuring effective teachers and leaders

	Teachers	School Leaders
Recent policy changes specific to Effective Teachers and School Leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regents policy for new teacher standards • Regents policy to create performance-based initial and professional certification standards including 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regents policy for initial and professional principal certification standards • Regents policy requiring all LEAs to adopt and implement

*New York State: Race to the Top:
Selection Criteria and Competition Priorities*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Multi-measure performance based evaluation with individual student growth measures 	<p>common NY State Principal Performance Evaluation System (PPES)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regents policy requiring annual evaluations of principals including constructive feedback; data on growth for students, teachers, classes, and schools • Regents policy requiring Individual Principal Development Plans, include analysis of student performance and prior evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All new non-certified principals (as of 2010-11) will have multi-measure performance
RTTT Participating district requirements (Final Scope of Work)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAs will commit to collaborative development of rigorous evaluations for all teachers with a portion of individual effectiveness based upon quantitative individual student growth measure (2010-11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Evaluation will inform single Teacher Effectiveness Score (as of 2011-12) and could be used for differentiated PD and supports, tenure, promotion / career ladder, compensation, and dismissal • Differentiated PD and supports will be linked directly to the evaluations and student growth data described above, to include coaching, mentoring, etc.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Primary focus on lowest performing schools and equitable distribution (“pivot” points) • Universal vision--to extend to all schools & LEAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAs will commit to collaborative development of rigorous evaluations for principals with a portion of individual effectiveness based upon quantitative student growth measures (2010-11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Evaluation will inform single Principal Effectiveness Score (as of 2011-12) which could be used for differentiated PD and supports, tenure, promotion / career ladder, compensation, dismissal • Provide differentiated PD development and supports linked directly to evaluations described above, to include coaching, mentoring, etc.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Primary focus on lowest performing schools and equitable distribution (“pivot” points) • Universal vision--to extend
District RFPs or competitive grants	<p>Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund (voluntary among participating LEAs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAs will create Individual Teacher Development Plans for every teacher that are based, in part, on student growth and achievement data • LEAs will commit to collaborative development of rigorous evaluations for <i>all</i> teachers with at least 30%-40% of 	<p>Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund (voluntary among participating LEAs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAs will create Individual Principal Development Plans for every Principal that are based, in part, on student growth and achievement data • LEAs will commit to use quantitative student growth measures to account for 30%-40% of individual Principal Effectiveness

	<p>individual effectiveness score based upon quantitative individual student growth measure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaining 60%-70% could include rubrics-based (e.g., Charlotte Danielson), in-person and/or video observation by trained (both administrators and peers), stakeholder perceptions (i.e., surveys of students, parents and colleagues) • LEAs will commit to use new evaluations to inform decisions for all teachers associated with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Differentiated PD and supports – Tenure – Promotion and Career Ladder – Compensation – Dismissal (after ample opportunity to improve) 	<p>Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaining 60%-70% of Principal Effectiveness Score could include retention of effective teachers, improving effectiveness of teachers, removing ineffective teachers, rubrics-based New York State Performance Standards (and Principal Performance Evaluation, PPES, under development for completion in spring, 2010) , school quality reviews (e.g., reviews by district administrators, peers, etc.), stakeholder perceptions (i.e., surveys of students, parents, and colleagues) • LEAs will commit to use new evaluations to inform decisions for all teachers associated with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Differentiated PD and supports – Tenure – Promotion and Career Ladder – Compensation • Dismissal (after ample opportunity to improve)
Funded Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) for Teachers • Create a Teacher Career Ladder • Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers in hard to staff subjects • Develop Residency Program for Teachers • Build Model induction programs to prepare all teachers to be teacher leaders • Provide Teacher Professional Development Focused on the Use of Student Performance and Growth Data for Formative Assessment • Incentive Districts Using Teacher Incentive Fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transform Principal Preparation Programs • Revise Performance Evaluation System for Principals • Expand Leadership Academies for School Principals • Create a Principal Career Ladder • Provide Principal Professional Development Focused on the Use of Student Performance and Growth Data for Formative Assessment

D(2)(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth and measure it for each individual student.

Goal 1: Develop clear approaches to measuring student growth by developing value-added growth model rooted in comprehensive

and robust data systems

Activity One: As Described in Section C, NYSED will work with contractors, researchers, policy-makers, representatives from collective bargaining groups, and LEAs to design and implement a growth and value-added model for use in making growth calculations for educator evaluations. NYSED will form a Value-Added Model Advisory Committee—comprised of representatives from NYSED, LEAs, and Institutions of Higher Education—to oversee the selection of an external partner and subsequent development of the State’s model and management of all related communications. While standards and tests will evolve to reflect Common Core Standards and common assessments, New York State currently has strong standards, meaningful tests, and districts, particularly NYC, that have already begun this work, which positions the State well to develop and disseminate a value added model. The Office of District Services will coordinate a pilot of the system and will develop and provide comprehensive training to support implementation of the value-added model. RTTT participating districts would have the option of using this model or of adopting a substantial equivalent. Funding for this project will be provided by the RTTT grant.

Responsible Parties: NYSED RTTT Management team and NYSED Office of District Services, Value-Added Model Advisory Committee, Contractors, representatives from collective bargaining groups, LEAs, Office of District Services

Timeline for completion:

- Develop value-added metrics in currently-tested grades and subjects in 2010-11
- Pilot in small set of LEAs in 2011-12 via the Teacher Growth & Accountability Incentive Fund
- Implemented statewide in 2012-13

D(2)(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this

notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.

Robust and credible data that link students and teachers, and that measure student growth and achievement for each individual student are necessary, but not sufficient in supporting deep instructional reforms to improve student outcomes. Student data must be connected to teacher and principal evaluation processes, which requires structured collaboration with teachers, principals, and superintendents from across the State.

Rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for educators require multiple elements. Clear and high standards for teachers and principals set the foundation for robust quantitative measures of student achievement and growth that are embedded in evaluations with multiple measures of effectiveness and that are developed in collaboration with a range of practitioners at all levels (including teachers, principals, and superintendents). These measures can then be combined into a single effectiveness score for every teacher and principal across the state which are communicated through precise, transparent, and rational annual performance reviews, creating system-wide transparency at the teacher, classroom, school, district, teacher preparation program-level especially with regards to the equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals across high poverty and high minority schools and districts. To promote the capture of robust student performance data, the Regents adjusted the administration of 3-8 ELA & Math assessments to occur in May in order to capture a full year's worth of growth; this will facilitate the use of student growth data for educator evaluations.

A critical component of the State's redesigned evaluation systems will be NY-SIRIS which will link individual student achievement and growth to the teacher responsible for instruction and the principal responsible for supervising instruction. A pilot program to link student and teacher data will be in place in 2010-11, with roll out across the state to full deployment in 2013 [see (C)1 Element 8]. Until the PreK-20 Longitudinal Data System provides rapid time data to feed the APPR, individual districts will use existing student achievement data from State testing and LEA assessments to assess student growth (the change in student achievement for

an individual student between two or more points in time), as follows:

- ✓ For tested grades and subjects, student achievement is defined by: (i) a student's score on the State's 3-8 assessments under the ESEA or on the Regents Exams; and, as appropriate, (ii) other measures of student learning, such as those described in paragraph (3) of this definition, provided they are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
- ✓ For non-tested grades and subjects, student achievement is defined by: to the extent possible, alternative measures of student learning and performance such as student scores on pre-tests and end-of-course tests; student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

Goal 1: Design rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents) that take into account data on student growth as a factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.

Activity One: Redesign the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) for teachers to provide four rating categories that take into account student growth, with teacher and principal involvement.

Under current policy, all teachers are required to have an Annual Professional Performance Review. (Please see APPR – Appendix D_2_i_1: section 100.2(o) of the Commissioner's Regulations.) There are eight mandatory criteria: content knowledge, assessment of student progress through analysis of student performance data, preparation and application of pedagogical practice, instructional delivery, creating a supportive learning environment, knowledge of student development, reflective practice and collaboration (research based: what teachers need to know and do to positively impact student learning).

At their December 2009 meeting, the Regents approved the creation of a ninth category for student growth. Also at their December 2009 meeting, the Regents approved a policy requiring LEAs to implement uniform qualitative rating categories to evaluate teachers (e.g., Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective) (See Appendix D_2_i_2.) In order for a RTTT final scope of work to be approved, LEAs will be required to implement multiple qualitative rating criteria (i.e. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective; or their substantial equivalents). The use of these rating criteria for compensation, promotion, and other personnel actions must be consistent with any applicable collective bargaining requirements. By spring 2010, the Regents plan to revise the APPR regulations for the State that will include the multiple qualitative rating criteria and the requirement to incorporate student achievement data where available.

New York is committed to meaningful collaboration with participating LEAs to revise the current evaluation tool and process for teachers to include student achievement and growth data in a more significant way. To aid in this transition, NYSED will form the Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Advisory Committee (TPEAC) to include representatives from NYSED, LEAs, and Institutions of Higher Education. In addition, NYSED will collaborate with NYSUT's AFT-funded initiative to develop Teaching Standards, Standards for Professional Contacts, and Standards for System Support.

Timeline:

- ✓ Spring 2010: Regents revise their regulations to align the APPR with the newly revised teacher standards, incorporate student growth data, and establish four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents) for school districts and BOCES to use in teacher evaluations
- ✓ Fall 2010: As a result of adoption of new APPR regulations, all LEAs required to incorporate student growth in teacher evaluations and able to opt in to use of the four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective,

Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents)

- ✓ Fall 2010: All RTTT participating LEAs required to use the four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents) in teacher evaluations.

Responsible Parties: Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Advisory Committee, NYSED

Activity Two: Redesign the Principal Performance Evaluation System for principals to use four qualitative rating categories that take into account student growth, with teacher and principal involvement.

With support from a Wallace Foundation grant, NYSED is collaborating with organizations of superintendents, principals, and assistant principals to develop a Principal Performance Evaluation System (PPES) for evaluating *all* principals (numbering 4,600 in 2008-09) and assistant principals (numbering 4,900 in that same year). Principals, district-level leaders, and national experts have identified research-based elements - the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium 2008 standards - to serve as the foundation for PPES. Five rating criteria will be used focusing on the principal's performance as an instructional leader: (1) Performance goals; (2) Student performance; (3) Feedback from multiple sources; (4) Professional growth; and (5) Personalized professional focus.

Principals will develop specific, measurable performance goals that address issues identified through analysis of student achievement and growth data as well as other data and factors that influence the teaching and learning process (e.g., school climate).

At their December 2009 meeting, the Regents approved the use of student growth data in the PPES (see Appendix D_2_i_2)

Timeline for completion:

- ✓ Spring 2010: Regents issue PPES regulations that include the incorporation of student growth data and establish four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial

equivalents) for school districts and BOCES to use in principal evaluations

- ✓ Fall 2010: As a result of adoption of new PPES regulations, all LEAs required to incorporate student growth in principal and assistant principal evaluations and able to opt in to use of the four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents)
- ✓ Fall 2010: All RTTT participating LEAs required to use the four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents) in principal and assistant principal evaluations

Responsible Parties: Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Advisory Committee, NYSED

Activity Three: Drive substantial increases in teacher effectiveness by incentivizing LEAs and their collective bargaining agents to implement more robust, multi-layered teacher evaluations.

As part of our RTTT plans and budget, New York has allocated \$100M to establish the Teacher Growth & Accountability Incentive Fund (see MOU form attached in Appendix D_2_i_3) to incentivize LEAs and their labor partners to:

- ✓ Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers that are designed and developed with teacher involvement.
- ✓ Utilize a single composite teacher effectiveness score, which incorporates multiple measures of effectiveness:
 - ✓ (i) Quantitative (Min. 30%; Max. 40%): Measure of student growth
 - ✓ (ii) Qualitative & Other Quantitative (Min. 60%; Max. 70%): e.g., rubrics-based (e.g., Charlotte Danielson, a national

leader in the design of instruments and procedures for teacher evaluation) in-person and/or video observations by trained observers (both administrators and peers), stakeholder perceptions (i.e., surveys of students, parents, and colleagues)

- ✓ Conduct annual evaluations of teachers (as described above) that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools

Timeline for completion:

- ✓ Spring 2010: RFP issued for Teacher Growth & Accountability Incentive Fund
- ✓ 2010-2011: Design and pilot implementation of new LEA evaluation system

Responsible Parties: NYSED, LEAs

The Chancellor of New York City's public school system, representing approximately one-third of all public school students in the state, has provided a written commitment to engage in this incentive program (see MOU form attached in Appendix D_2_i_3_a).

Activity Four: Drive substantial increases in principal effectiveness by incentivizing LEAs and their collective bargaining agents to implement more robust, multi-layered principal evaluations.

As part of our RTTT plans and budget, New York has allocated \$20M to establish the Principal Growth & Accountability Incentive Fund (see MOU form attached in Appendix D_2_i_4) to incentivize LEAs and their labor partners to:

- ✓ Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for principals that are designed and developed with principals' involvement.

- ✓ Utilize a single composite principal effectiveness score, which incorporates multiple measures of effectiveness:
 - ✓ Student Growth as defined above (Min. 30%; Max. 40%)
 - ✓ Qualitative and Other Quantitative (Min. 60%; Max. 70%): to include multiple measures, possibly including:
 - ✓ Retention of effective teachers
 - ✓ Improving effectiveness of teachers
 - ✓ Removing ineffective teachers
 - ✓ Rubrics-based New York State Performance Standards (and Principal Performance Evaluation, PPES, under development for completion in spring, 2010)
 - ✓ School quality reviews (e.g., reviews by district administrators, peers, etc.),
 - ✓ Stakeholder perceptions (i.e., surveys of students, parents, and colleagues)
- ✓ Conduct annual evaluations of teachers (as described above) that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools

SAANYS and CSA, the two statewide administrators unions, have provided letters of support endorsing this initiative (see Appendix D_2_i_5 for SAANYS' letter and Appendix D_2_i_6 for the letter from the Council of School Supervisors and Administrators).

Timeline for completion:

- ✓ Spring 2010: RFP issued for Principal Growth & Accountability Incentive Fund
- ✓ 2010-2011: Design and pilot implementation of new LEA evaluation system

Responsible Parties: NYSED, LEAs

D(2)(iii) Conducting annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools.

As described previously in D(2)ii, annual reviews are currently required for all teachers in New York. The State intends to enhance the existing Annual Professional Performance Review for all teachers as approved by the Regents in December 2009. By late spring of 2010, the Regents plan to approve amendments to §100.2(o) of the Commissioner's regulations to ensure that each school district's APPR plan includes timely and constructive feedback to the teacher. The Regents also plan to strengthen the requirement that the teacher is provided with student achievement and growth data for his or her students on a timely basis and as part of the annual evaluation.

Goal 1: Build the capacity of participating LEAs to successfully execute annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback and as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools

Activity 1: Participating LEAs will be required to use a State-developed diagnostic tool to assess their current evaluation systems and will be required to submit a plan for: (1) incorporating student growth in the evaluation of teachers through the APPR and of principals through the PPES; and (2) ensuring the teachers and principals receive timely and constructive feedback, including relevant data.

As part of the diagnostic assessment and planning process, LEAs will develop district-wide plans to improve their evaluation processes, and will identify a district-wide pool of individuals who are qualified to conduct evaluations (i.e., principals, other administrators, and peer reviewers) and provide constructive feedback. Over time, the “pool” of potential individuals who are qualified to conduct evaluations will be linked to the State’s teachers and principal career ladders and each individual’s attainment of high effectiveness ratings based on performance (including student growth). In the short-term, potential reviewers will be identified by district leadership, principals, and peer surveys. LEAs will provide their staff with NYSED-supported training opportunities (including on-line training modules that incorporate the use of video of instruction) to ensure consistency across reviewers. LEAs will also create simple tools or dashboards to monitor that every teacher and principal receives a comprehensive in-person review on an annual basis. LEAs will also be required to support frequent “low stakes” formative observations and reflective practice for all teachers and principals, creating a culture of continuous feedback through mentoring and coaching relationships, both formal and informal. As part of the implementation, LEAs will share all summative evaluation data with teachers and principals, including rubrics-based observations and value-added student performance measures for teachers and for principals, and teacher and student surveys.

Longer-term, NY-SIRIS will provide rapid-time data about student growth, which will enable teachers and principals to examine school, classroom, and individual student data to improve outcome. It will also enable the generation of standardized reports using student data and customized reports for individual students or select populations, and help educators to diagnose students’ learning needs, match needs to school and programmatic solutions, set goals for improvement, and measure success. Additionally, it will aid administrators and districts in diagnosing teachers’ learning needs, matching those needs to supports and differentiating professional development based on goals for improvement.

Timeline: Beginning in Fall 2010 with implementation of new evaluation systems

Responsible Parties: NYSED Office of District Services, Contracted External partners, LEAs

Activity Two: Provide support to participating LEAs to conduct annual evaluations per the RTTT Scope of Work that include timely and constructive feedback

Coordinated by the Office of District Services, LEAs will be supported throughout the implementation of the new evaluations through the State’s regional network professional development strategy allowing LEAs to share experiences, including challenges and lessons learned, with peer districts. As they come together in both regional locations and online, LEAs will share emerging “best practices” regarding appropriate evaluation rubrics (that include multiple measures of effectiveness with significant weighting for value-added student growth measures.)

Professional development opportunities will be multi-faceted and will include a detailed overview of the new evaluation tool, methodology for using the new evaluation rubrics, explanation of and rationale for the value-added model, guidance on delivery of constructive feedback to teachers and principals, and the importance of using data to inform instruction. (Note: During the roll-out period, districts that do not have access to NY-SIRIS will be required to use currently existing achievement data from State testing and LEA assessments to measure student growth. Guidance will be provided to districts, based upon the outcomes of the district-level diagnostic, regarding the development of instructional teams at the school and district level (principals, assistant principals, other administrators, department heads, peer reviewers) to develop differentiated focus and supports disproportionately directed at the bottom 5% of lowest performing schools.)

Timeline: Beginning in Fall 2010 with implementation of new evaluation systems

Responsible Parties: NYSED Office of District Services, Contracted External partners, LEAs

Activity Three: Participating LEAs will develop Individual Development Plans for their teachers and principals per the RTTT Final

Scope of Work.

Following the review of each teacher, an individual development plan will be prepared which will include an analysis of student performance data at the class and total student-load level (with a focus on sub-groups to include but not limited to low income, minority, ELLs, and students with disabilities), rubrics-based observations, and results of prior evaluations. Individual Development Plans for principals will include an analysis of student performance data at the class, teacher, grade, subject and school level (with a focus on sub-groups to include but not limited to: low income, minority, ELLs, and students with disabilities), rubrics-based observations, input from surveys of teachers, parents and students, and results of prior evaluations.

Timeline: Beginning in Fall 2010 with implementation of new evaluation systems

Responsible Parties: NYSED Office of District Services, Contracted External partners, LEAs

Goal 2: Drive substantial increases in teacher and principal effectiveness by incentivizing LEAs and their collective bargaining agents to conduct more robust, multi-layered evaluations and to provide teachers and principals with constructive feedback based on those evaluations.

Activity One: Leverage more robust, multi-layered evaluations with the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Funds to produce richer data-driven feedback

Although all RTTT participating districts will conduct teacher and principal annual evaluations that incorporate student growth and utilize four performance categories, by committing to use student data as 30-40% of a single composite education effectiveness score, the LEAs participating in the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive will place student growth at the center of their evaluation system. They will use Incentive Fund dollars, in part, to support training for leaders and teachers on integrating student growth into discussions of classroom practice, and analysis of student work.)

Timeline: Beginning in Fall 2010 with implementation of Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund Initiative

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Incentive Fund LEAs

D(2)(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum to inform decisions regarding:

New York is committed to the development of robust performance-based teacher evaluations for all teachers and principals that will guide all decisions regarding professional development, career ladder, tenure, compensation and dismissal. When used well, the ultimate benefit of evaluations is to: identify areas for improvement, direct resources and supports to build the instructional capacity of the system, and place the most effective teachers in schools and classrooms with high poverty and high minority youth to dramatically increase student outcomes.

(a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development.

Goal 1: Participating LEAs, supported by NYSED, will use the enhanced APPR and PPES results, as described above (in D2), to design and implement differentiated and embedded professional development (PD) for teachers and principals based upon effectiveness measures.

Activity One: Per New York's final scope of work, all RTTT participating districts will implement a revised APPR and PPES beginning in 2010-11 (which will include measures of student growth) and four categories of teacher effectiveness. The APPR and PPES will be used for providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or differentiated professional development.

Timeline:

- ✓ Spring 2010: Regents revise their regulations to align the APPR and PPES with the newly revised standards, incorporate student growth data, and establish four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents) for school districts and BOCES to use in evaluations
- ✓ Fall 2010: As a result of adoption of new APPR and PPES regulations, all LEAs required to incorporate student growth in teacher/principal evaluations and able to opt in to use of the four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents)
- ✓ Fall 2010: All RTTT participating LEAs required to use the four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents) in teacher/principal evaluations and to provide relevant coaching, induction support, and/or differentiated professional development

Responsible Parties: Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Advisory Committee, NYSED

Activity Two: Build the capacity of LEAs to use annual evaluations (as described above) to provide relevant coaching, induction support, and/or differentiated professional development for teachers and principals

New York has implemented many initiatives to strengthen professional development for teachers, including the requirement to implement professional development plans for each LEA, mandating 175 hours of professional development every five years as a condition of professional certification, and mandating mentoring for *all* first year teachers. Per Regents' policy, NYSED will make investments in sustained professional development initiatives (described in Section B) that can be differentiated and evaluated via student growth data as well as investments in district-level diagnostic professional development and technical assistance.

Timeline:

- ✓ Fall 2010: All RTTT participating LEAs required to use the four designated qualitative rating levels (e.g. Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective, or their substantial equivalents) in teacher and principal evaluations and to provide relevant coaching, induction support, and/or differentiated professional development

Responsible Parties: NYSED Office of District Services, Contracted External partners, LEAs

Goal 2: Drive substantial increases in teacher and principal effectiveness by incentivizing LEAs and their collective bargaining agents to conduct more robust, multi-layered evaluations and to provide teachers and principals with relevant coaching, induction support, and/or differentiated professional development based on those evaluations.

Activity One: Leverage the more robust, multi-layered evaluations as part of the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Funds to produce more fine-grained coaching, induction support, and/or differentiated professional development

Although all participating districts will conduct annual teacher and principal evaluations that incorporate student growth and utilize four performance categories, by committing to use student data as 30-40% of a single composite education effectiveness score the LEAs participating in the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive will place student growth at the center of their evaluation system. They will use incentive fund dollars, in part, to support differentiated professional development closely linked to student growth data, identify coaches and mentors using effectiveness ratings closely tied to student growth data, and build data-driven feedback loops between professional development, coaching/mentoring activities, and teacher effectiveness.

Timeline: Beginning in Fall 2010 with implementation of Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund Initiative

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Incentive Fund LEAs

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities

Goal 1: Establish a Teacher Career Development Continuum and a Principal Career Development Continuum based on demonstrated effectiveness (See December 2009 Regents item in Appendix D_2_i_2)

Activity 1: Establish a Teacher Career Development Continuum (TCDC) within the New York State certification system utilizing performance-based assessments that incorporate student growth.

Historically, teacher career advancement – both in terms of certification and compensation – in New York State has been linked solely to higher education degrees and credits (baccalaureate for Initial certification, master’s degree for Professional certification, additional compensation for additional credits and/or degrees) At their December 2009 meeting, the Regents approved a new approach to teacher career advancement focused on effectiveness (see December 2009 Regents item in Appendix D_2_i_2).

Teachers will progress along a State Teacher Career Development Continuum from Novice Teacher to Master Teacher. Each step will require a deeper level of demonstrated proficiency in practice demonstrated in a significant part through student growth and achievement, in order to unlock opportunities for increased responsibility and potential earnings.

New York State Career Ladder

Role	Number of Years Teaching and Description	Criteria to Demonstrate Effectiveness	Sample Increased Roles and Responsibilities
Novice Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 – 4 years • Non-tenured with initial certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance-based assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receives formal mentorship and significant professional support from Master Teachers and Peer Reviewers
Lead Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – 5 years • Newly tenured with professional certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance-based assessment: consistent min. score of 3 of 4 • Demonstrates student growth via Value-Added Score 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to the standard role of an NY classroom teacher today
Peer Reviewer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 years + • Tenured with record of effective instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance-based assessment: consistent min. score of 3.5 of 4 • Demonstrates significant student growth via Value-Added Score 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluates teachers while continuing to teach on a part-time basis or full-time basis with additional compensation • Mentors novice teachers
Master Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 years + • Tenured with exceptional record of effective instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance-based assessment: consistent score of 4 of 4 • Demonstrates exceptional student growth via Value-Added Score 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluates teachers while continuing to teach (similar to Peer Reviewer role) • Mentors novice teachers • Assumes additional roles that extend reach to higher-need students (e.g. teaching larger regular class sizes, team teaching with novice teachers)



Compensation (Potential Uses)

- Incremental to salary schedule
- Bonuses based on individual performance evaluation, lowering the achievement gap and teaching in high-needs schools and/or subjects

146 of 255 January 19, 2010

Close collaboration with stakeholders will be critical to design career ladders. Given the dynamic and evolving nature of this work, both the State and our stakeholders will learn over time and work together to adjust the models appropriately. Target implementation would begin with a pilot in 2012-13.

<p>Performance Measures Notes: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in this application package in Section II. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii).</p>						
		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
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
(D)(2)(i)	Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).	TBD (N/A)	50	100	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	TBD (N/A)	33	55	77	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	TBD (N/A)	25	50	75	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.	TBD (0)				
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Compensating teachers and principals.	TBD (0)				
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Promoting teachers and principals.	TBD (0)				
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	• Retaining effective teachers and principals.	TBD (0)				
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	• Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.	TBD (0)				
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	• Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.	TBD (0)				
Assumes 33% of LEAs “early” adopt the APPR before it is required in the 2011-12 academic year. Assumes 25% of LEAs participate in the pilot year of the PPES.						
General data to be provided at time of application:						
Total number of participating LEAs.		551				
Total number of principals in participating LEAs.		~3,400				
Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.		~174,800				
Criterion	Data to be requested of grantees in the future:					
(D)(2)(ii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.					
(D)(2)(iii) ¹⁹	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.					

¹⁹ Note that for 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.

(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.	

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

- (i) Ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher

rates than other students; (15 points) and

(ii) Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA. (10 points)

Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (D)(3)(i): Definition of high-minority and low-minority schools as defined by the State for purposes of the State's Teacher Equity Plan:

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

D(3)(i)

Goal 1: Ensure equitable distribution of the most effective teachers and principals across the State of New York.

To date, NYSED's work on the equity in education quality has focused on: 1) the share of uncertified teachers in shortage areas in high-need LEAs; and 2) the distribution of teachers who meet the US E.D. highly qualified definition across high and low-need LEAs. In response to troubling trends in those areas, the New York State Board of Regents in 2003 effectively abolished emergency certification, which was disproportionately used in large urban districts. As a result, NYSED has made significant

progress in reducing the share of uncertified teachers in the shortage areas (13%-24% decline) in the largest high-need LEAs between 2000-01 and 2007-08. In addition, thanks to the alternative certification routes that the Regents created in 2000, the NYC Department of Education was able to establish the Teaching Fellows Program in 2001. Since 2001, Teaching Fellows grew to 11% of all New York City teachers, while temporarily licensed teachers fell from 53 percent of new hires to 3 percent.” Thus, New York’s direct policy interventions changed the qualifications of teachers of high-poverty, minority youth.²⁰

However, New York State recognizes that closing the achievement gap requires an intense focus on educator effectiveness. NYSED will ensure equitable distribution of the most effective principals and teachers to high-poverty and high- minority school through: (1) State activities aligned with Board of Regents policies; (2) LEA activities required of participating LEAs by the Race to the Top final scope of work; and (3) LEA activities required of LEAs awarded the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund.

Activity One: Strengthen existing processes for monitoring the equitable distribution of teachers and principals.

In the short term, NY State will continue to analyze the currently available data on certified teachers and principals who meet the U.S. ED highly qualified definition. As the P-20 Longitudinal System (described in Section C) is phased in, New York State’s Office of Accountability will collect and “District Average Teacher Value Added Scores,” overall and by subgroup (high poverty, minority, English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities), from all RTTT Participating Districts, and will incorporate those scores into district report cards.

²⁰ **The Narrowing Gap in New York City Teacher Qualifications and its Implications for Student Achievement in High-Poverty Schools,* Don Boyd, Hamp Lankford, Susanna Loeb, Jonah Rockoff, and Jim Wyckoff www.teacherpolicyresearch.org.**

The State will establish “Educator Value-Add Equity Indices” across LEAs. LEAs that are RTTT Participating Districts will have to submit “Educator Value-Add Equity Plans” to resolve within-district inequity challenges, for review by the State. The Office of District Services will develop the capacity to provide technical assistance to LEAs as they design and implement these plans. The Office of Accountability will also conduct surveys of the LEAs that have an equitable distribution of teachers to identify emerging promising practices and strategies to measure and address equitable distribution. Through the Office of District Services, NYSED will encourage cross-LEA collaboration between the high and low performers on the “equity index.” District Services will document emerging promising practice and disseminate that information across the State.

Timeline: 2010-11 (existing measures), 2011-12 (new measures) and 2012-13 (new measures refined), ongoing

Responsibility: Office of Accountability, Office of District Services, LEAs

Activity Two: Develop the capacity of LEAs to use the newly developed APPR and PPES (which will include student growth and differentiate effectiveness using four rating categories—i.e. ineffective, developing, effective, and highly effective, or their substantial equivalents) to intervene to improve teacher and principal effectiveness

Evaluations on the basis of effectiveness (including student growth) are necessary but not sufficient to yield an equitable distribution of effective and highly effective educators. Instructional leaders – whether they are superintendents supporting principals or principals supporting teachers – must have the knowledge and skills to help their supervisees improve. The investments NYSED is making in the development of Pre-K-12 curriculum frameworks (see Section B), aligned professional development (see Section B), formative and interim assessments (see Section B), redesigned summative assessments (see Section B), a robust instructional reporting system (see Section C), new induction programs (see Section D), a formative assessment professional development initiative (see Section D), and principal leadership academies to support new and experienced principals (see Section D) will

provide tools that those instructional leaders can use to improve the effectiveness of their teachers and principals. Central to the diagnostic process for participating LEAs around their evaluation practices and use of evaluations will be: (1) an analysis of the LEAs' ability to enhance educator effectiveness, particularly in high-poverty and high-minority schools; and (2) development of a plan to expand supports for ineffective and developing educators.

Timeline:

- 2010-2011: Diagnostic review of the evaluation processes and use of evaluations by participating LEAs
- 2010-2011: Implementation of new APPR and PPES
- 2010-2011: Implementation of participating LEA intervention plan for educators identified as ineffective or developing

Responsibility: Office of District Services, LEAs

Activity Three: Invest in differentiated professional developments and supports with a focus on teachers and principals who are in high-needs schools and shortage subject areas.

As outlined in A, D(2) and D(5), New York will target professional development and supports for teachers and principals based upon student performance data. All of New York's professional development activities will be coordinated by the Office of District Services. NYSED will focus on developing robust supports, especially with regard to teachers of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. Priority will be given to teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools, especially those with the largest gaps in equitable distribution of effective teachers and in hard-to-staff and specialty subject areas. As well, priority will be given to principals in high-poverty and high-minority schools.

To assist districts in building their capacity, New York will have state-certified Education Diagnostic Teams modeled on the school

inspection practice of the State's charter school authorizers and school quality reviews, but focused at the district level, particularly on high needs districts. For more information on these teams, please see Section D(5) Goal 1.

Timeline: Various

Responsible Parties: Office of District Services, LEAs

Goal 2: Dramatically improve the equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals by incentivizing LEAs and their collective bargaining units to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals

Although all RTTT participating districts will be able to opt into using effectiveness ratings for initiatives around the equitable distribution of teachers and leaders, the LEAs participating in the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive will commit to:

- ✓ Implementing an evaluation system for teachers and principals that relies on student growth as 30-40% of a single composite education effectiveness score to differentiate effectiveness using four rating categories with explicit scoring ranges for each category
- ✓ Using those evaluations beginning in 2011-12 to:
 - (1) Assist developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or differentiated professional development.
 - (2) Provide additional compensation to highly effective teachers and principals (as determined by the annual evaluations

described above) to transfer to high-poverty and/or high minority schools.

(3) Include the equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (as determined by the annual evaluations described above) as an explicit factor in decisions about teacher assignments.

Timeline: Beginning in Fall 2010) as part of the implementation of the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund Initiative

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Incentive Fund LEAs

D(3)(ii)

Goal 1: Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; and teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA)

New York State is making progress in ensuring that all students are taught by highly qualified teachers, as required by No Child Left Behind. In 2004-05, in high poverty schools, 18.3% of classes in elementary schools and 19.7% of classes in middle/high schools were taught by teachers that were not highly qualified. By 2007-08, New York experienced significant gains in the distribution of highly qualified teachers. For example, in 2007-08 in high poverty schools, 5.2% of classes in elementary schools and 12.1% of classes in middle/high schools were taught by teachers that were not highly qualified (13.1% and 7.6% respective reductions from 2004-05).

Also, the data indicate that New York has made progress in the percentage of FTE teaching assignments held by teachers without appropriate certification, For example, statewide in 2004-05, 7.9% of FTE teaching assignments were held by teachers without

appropriate certification and by 2007-08, this was reduced to 4.7% (for the same time period NYC experienced a reduction of FTE teaching assignments held by teachers out of their certification area from 18.7% to 10.4%; and for the rest of the state, the change was from 2.7% to 2.1%).

However, while progress has been made, there are still certain subjects and geographic locations where the percentage is significantly higher. For example, in New York City, there are a large number of out-of-certification teachers in Bilingual Education (26 percent), Career and Technical Education (24 percent), Special Education middle/secondary (19 percent), the Sciences (18 percent), Languages other than English (14 percent), and English as a Second Language (12 percent). Many high-need districts also have percentages of teachers out of certification that exceed the statewide average. Also, while the statewide 2006-07 to 2007-08 teacher turnover rate was five percent, many regions and certificate areas exceeded that rate.

Although New York produces more teachers than ever before (25,660 new teachers in 2007-08), they are not always in the subject areas where shortages exist and in those regions of the State where they are most needed. For example, in 2007-08 the State produced only an estimated 72 percent of the certified Career and Technical Education teachers and 60 percent of the Special Education middle and secondary teachers needed to plug the holes in those subjects. Just 17 percent of the Career and Technical Education teachers and an estimated 29 percent of the Special Education middle and secondary teachers New York City needed to fill its shortages (assuming it hired all teachers certified in the subject that year) came from the City. These shortages persist from year to year.

Activity One: Strengthen existing processes for monitoring the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas.

The challenges in tracking effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas mirror those of the equitable distribution as described above. New York Accountability Office and District Services will collect similar information for hard-to-

staff subjects and specialty areas and employ for uses similar to details above.

Timeline for Completion: 2010-11 (existing measures), 2011-12 (new measures) and 2012-13 (new measures refined), ongoing

Responsibility: Office of Accountability, Office of District Services, LEAs

Activity Two: Redesign teacher and principal preparation programs to ensure that graduates possess the skills to be effective.

In order to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and school leaders in New York's high-need schools over the long term, Sections D(4) and D(5) of this application identify the following activities related to fundamental redesign of teacher and principal preparation programs. New York State will prioritize development of the following programs with a focus on high-need populations and shortage or specialty areas:

- Initiating newly designed, clinically rich undergraduate program for teacher preparation for schools serving high-need populations and shortage or specialty areas (English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities) [see D 4 ii 1a];
- Piloting a clinically rich graduate teacher preparation program for high-need schools and shortage or specialty areas (English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities) that both IHEs and non-collegiate institutions can implement (See Section D(4)(ii)1 b);
- Piloting a clinically rich approach to prepare school principals to directly strengthen teaching and learning for high-need schools and shortage or specialty areas (English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities) that both IHEs and non-collegiate institutions can implement (see D 4 ii 2); and
- Developing an expedited pathway for teachers in the STEM discipline, or in specialty areas including English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. In the summer of 2010, NYSED will request a new Regents policy for the

development of a new and expedited certification route for persons with Doctoral degrees in STEM disciplines to teach in high-need middle and high schools (grades 7-12). In addition, a teaching certificate will be available to persons with Master's or Doctoral degrees in STEM disciplines who have taught in IHEs. To qualify, faculty must have college level teaching experience and demonstrate classroom effectiveness.

These investments in capacity are critical to the long-term assault on New York's lowest-performing schools as the State can only overhaul the failing schools and districts when we have adequately prepared and supported talented teachers and principals to do so. They will establish strong foundation for New York's long-term success.

Timeline for Completion: Various

Responsibility: Higher Education

Activity Three: Invest in differentiated professional developments and supports with a focus on teachers and principals who are in high-needs schools and shortage subject areas.

This activity is described in Section D(3)(i), above.

Activity Four: In addition to in-service professional development supports as described above, New York seeks to pilot new induction programs. Approximately 2,000 new teachers from high-need schools and shortage or specialty areas (English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities) will undergo rigorous training to help create teacher leaders (See Section D(5) (ii)].

To assist in the transition to teaching for program participants, in 2010-11, IHEs and non-degree entities with strong track records of working with teachers to raise the achievement of high needs students will develop more accessible, high-quality pedagogical programs, including on-line offerings to assist these new teachers. Induction programs often offer only short-term support to help new STEM teachers be effective in their first year (Feiman-Nemser, 2003). While these programs are helpful, they are not effective

in retaining teachers (Kelley, 2004). Candidates with these certificates will get strong, long-term mentoring support while teaching.

Timeline: Spring 2010 RFP

Responsibility: Office of Higher Education

Activity Five: New York State will provide financial rewards to motivate the most effective teachers to remain in schools and classrooms serving high-poverty and high-minority youth across the State, especially in STEM areas.

New York will develop a differential pay incentive for high-need, highly effective teachers. Because highly qualified, certified, and effective teachers are central to improving student achievement and closing performance gaps, this strategy will target teachers who support the learning needs of students in STEM disciplines in high-need middle and high schools. Teachers must be certified in a STEM discipline or to teach ELL or Students with Disabilities (to help all students in high-need schools benefit from the STEM disciplines), with at least three years of outstanding experience demonstrated by a variety of measures, including student outcomes.

Beginning in summer 2010, eligible teachers will receive \$30,000 in total bonuses over five years to support the learning needs of students in STEM disciplines and other designated subjects in the State's high-need middle and high schools. NYSED will award bonuses progressively; for example, eligible teachers will receive an additional \$4,000 in year one, an additional \$5,000 in year two, up to an additional \$8,000 in the fifth and final year. This initiative can reach 1,000 teachers annually in approximately 300 high-need schools. Once the first cohort successfully reaches the fifth year, the annual direct cost for a maximum annual cohort of 1,000 teachers will remain constant at \$30 million. To sustain the initiative and retain effective teachers, beginning in fall 2011, New York will utilize Title II, Part A funds.

Timeline for Completion: Spring 2010 RFP

Responsibility: Office of Higher Education

Activity Six: Dramatically increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas by offering LEAs and their collective bargaining units the opportunity to provide those teachers with additional compensation

Although all RTTT participating districts will be able to opt in to using effectiveness ratings for initiatives around placing effective teachers in hard-to-staff subjects, the LEAs participating in the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive will commit to:

- ✓ Implementing an evaluation system for teachers that relies on student growth as 30-40% of a single composite education effectiveness score to differentiate effectiveness using four rating categories with explicit scoring ranges for each category
- ✓ Using those evaluations, beginning in 2011-12, to provide additional compensation to effective teachers (as determined by the annual evaluations described in (B) above) in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas with a potential focus on high-poverty and/or high minority schools.

Timeline: Beginning in Fall 2010) as part of the implementation of the Teacher and Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund Initiative

Responsible Parties: NYSED, Incentive Fund LEAs

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

- (i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and
- (ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

- (i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and**

Goal 1: Link student achievement data and student growth data to the students’ teachers and principals

Activity One: NYSED will aggregate information on teacher and principal effectiveness from evaluations as outlined in Section D2, and any additional measures that are developed over time.

Timeline for completion: June 2011 and ongoing

Responsibility: NYSED, Contractors, Regional Data Centers, LEAs, Higher Education

Activity Two: Link above data to the in-State programs where those teachers were prepared for credentialing. As detailed in Section C, NYSED's P-20 Longitudinal Data System will make it possible to track SUNY, CUNY, and participating private IHE and non-collegiate preparation program graduates and connect their students' P-12 growth and achievement to the programs from which the teachers and principals graduated.

Timeline for completion: December 2012 (SUNY and CUNY), begin July 2012 (CICU)

Responsibility: NYSED, Contractors, Regional Data Centers, LEAs, Higher Education

Activity Three: Publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the state.

New York will develop institutional performance profiles for each credentialing program in the State. New York has 4,836 programs to prepare candidates for teacher certification and 123 programs to prepare candidates for school building leader certification (principals).

In addition to the educational accountability measures already in place, by December 2010, the Regents will approve a teacher and principal preparation program performance accountability system. Beginning in 2011-12, it will publicly report the data from existing accountability measures, and those identified here as planned for development, for each teacher and principal preparation program, holding the programs accountable for the:

- Performance of their graduates on the respective certification examinations,
- Percent of graduates certified in/employed in shortage subjects,
- Percent of graduates employed in high-need schools, and
- Performance of their graduates in positively affecting student achievement and growth (including with sub-groups).

The goal is to inform the public, the institutions, and NYSED about the effectiveness of each preparatory program, raising the level of their accountability. The reports will help institutions and their school and community partners to analyze strengths and weaknesses and make decisions for program improvement and will also permit NYSED to design and implement accountability measures for the institutions.

Timeline for Completion: 2011-12 and ongoing

Responsibility: Contractors, Regional Data Centers, LEAs, Higher Education

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

Research shows that teacher and principal preparation programs that have demonstrated ability to drive student learning share common standards and areas of focus. As such, New York State is committed to a complete redesign of existing teacher and principal preparation standards, and the corresponding certification requirements, as described in detail below.

Given the extensive research regarding programmatic elements that lead to effective teacher and principal preparation programs, New York State will embark on the institutional transformation starting immediately, as approved with Board of Regents policy in December, 2009. However, as NYSED is able to collect and analyze statewide data on linkages between students, teachers, preparation programs, and student growth and achievement, it will closely monitor new lessons learned and incorporate in ongoing

programmatic design and refinement.

Goal 1: Improve the effectiveness of the State’s teaching and school leader workforce by strengthening its performance-based approach to certifying all teachers and leaders.

Activity One: New York will require performance-based assessment, to include student growth measures, for initial certification in teaching. Beginning in spring 2013, all candidates for an Initial certificate will complete a performance-based assessment, grounded in statewide teaching standards currently being developed and intended to demonstrate the knowledge and skills that research has shown to be linked to classroom effectiveness, in order to complete their teacher preparation programs. In collaboration with State and national education leaders, in July 2010, NYSED will begin to develop this performance based assessment to evaluate teacher candidates’ content knowledge and teaching skills, ability to disaggregate data, ability to analyze data, development of differentiated instructional plans based on data (for ELLs and Students with Disabilities), delivery of instruction (through a video tape presentations), and knowledge and skills in curriculum development and instructional planning. This NYSED-developed performance assessment will be available for use by teacher preparation programs. Through Regent’s Regulations, all accredited teacher preparation programs will be required to use this assessment, or an alternative that is Regent’s approved as being substantially equivalent.

Timeline for Completion: Spring 2013

Responsible Parties: NYSED, LEAs, Higher Education Institutions

Activity Two: New York will require a performance-based assessment, including student growth, for Professional certification in teaching. Once a new teacher earns an Initial certificate and completes at least two years of teaching, NYSED will require the teacher to complete an assessment focused on the effectiveness of teaching skills based on teaching experience and impact on

student achievement and growth. This will include a portfolio of the teacher's work comprising elements of the performance-based assessment for Initial certification in teaching plus a student academic growth component that is based on student performance data, including data from the PreK-20 Longitudinal Data System. This more rigorous Professional certification process will be required of all teachers in their first year, which annually represents approximately 5% of the teaching force in New York. The State's authority over Professional certification decisions will ensure that Professional certification candidates who have not raised student achievement over multiple years will not receive Professional Certification and will, therefore, no longer be eligible to teach in New York State.

Timeline for Completion: Spring 2013

Responsibility: NYSED, LEAs, Higher Education Institutions

Activity Three: New York will require performance-based assessment for certification for Principals. During spring 2010, NYSED and its partners will begin to develop a comprehensive, performance-based assessment to be administered by preparation institutions to ensure that candidates have experienced, via a Clinical Services model, authentic, problem-based experiences requiring real world leadership responsibilities focused on school improvement measuring student achievement. Candidates will become active members of school improvement teams focused on specific initiatives (e.g. leading data inquiry teams) to raise achievement, providing leadership and support for initiatives focused on positively impacting student growth and achievement.

Clinical experiences will occur throughout the program. Three performance evaluations, at strategic transition points in the program, will determine candidate eligibility to progress to the next phase. Faculty from the preparation institution, school leaders, teachers, and other stakeholders (such as parents) will participate in the evaluation. The State's authority over Principal certification decisions will ensure that Principal certification candidates who have not raised student achievement over multiple years will not receive Principal Certification and will, therefore, no longer be eligible to be a Principal in New York State.

Timeline for Completion: Spring 2013

Responsibility: NYSED, LEAs, Higher Education Institutions

Activity Four: New York will enhance the rigor of Content Specialty Tests (CSTs.) Research shows that a teacher's strong content knowledge positively affects student growth and achievement. To assure that candidates have the knowledge and skills to help students meet the expectations of the New York State Learning Standards, by Fall 2011, New York will redesign its CSTs to more rigorously assess program candidates' mastery of the relevant content area to be required beginning in spring 2012 (See Appendix D 4 1). The more rigorous CSTs will include a subtest for the candidate to demonstrate literacy and writing competence that must be passed independently of the overall test in order to satisfy the test requirement. In addition, the early childhood, childhood, and middle childhood education CSTs will include separate Literacy/English Language Arts and mathematics subtests. Candidates will be required to pass each of these subtests to satisfy the CST requirement.

Timeline for Completion: Spring 2013

Responsibility: NYSED, LEAs, Higher Education Institutions

Goal 2: Reform teacher and principal preparation to improve the effectiveness of its teaching and school leader workforce by developing a clinically rich approach to preparing teachers and leaders for high-need schools, where effective educators are needed the most.

Activity One: New York will create Residency Programs for teachers. To address the reality that an estimated 50 percent of new teachers in high need schools leave within the first five years, we will ensure that teachers demonstrate effective performance before certification, and increase the supply of highly effective teachers in high-need subjects in high-need schools that will positively affect student growth and achievement, NYSED will select providers, through an RFP process in June 2010, to develop and pilot

clinically rich teacher certification programs. The transformed programs will include intensive residency components, grounded in the teaching standards currently being developed, and centered on practicing the real-world skills that make a difference in the classroom. These programs will prepare teachers to be effective in high need schools with a focus on students in the performance gap - ELL, SWD, and Black and Hispanic males. During their residencies, teachers will be expected to spend a portion of their time in effective classroom settings serving high-need students in order to model effective practices. Research shows that preparation grounded in a strong clinical approach produces teachers who are more effective in raising student achievement (Boyd et al., 2009a).

NYSED seeks RTTT funding to encourage strong partnerships between preparation programs and high-need LEAs across the State that will provide support and preparation to place up to 400 effective teachers, focused on the above targeted populations, schools serving high-need populations – more than any other such program in the nation. Funding will be used to provide a \$30,000 annual stipend to graduate candidates or tuition reimbursement for undergraduates and the evaluation of the residency programs to assess their efficacy. Data and lessons learned will help frame recommendations for continuation of programs, possible future expansion, and bringing effective models to scale.

a. Undergraduate Model. In collaboration with IHE partners, New York will develop a clinically rich undergraduate program that will recruit candidates through a highly selective screening process, place them in year-long residencies in their fourth year of teacher preparation, and provide tuition reimbursement during the program. Over time, participating LEAs can enhance this more clinically rich component by employing the best candidates in teaching assistant/paraprofessional positions during their residencies. To promote high quality preparation, resident placement priority will be in effective classrooms serving high-needs students (based upon demonstrated growth among high need students and / or dramatic gains).

Preparing teachers through an intensive clinical component by directly supporting the application of theory into practice enables resident teachers to understand first-hand the diversity of the student population, the culture of the learning environment in high-need schools, and the strategies appropriate to raising academic performance for all students. Trained mentors and/or supervising teachers will supervise and mentor the teaching placements; they will receive the time and resources to make the mentoring an integral component of their professional work.

Candidates will commit to teach in schools serving high-need populations for three years after finishing the clinical component, ensuring that highly effective teachers, properly prepared for the demands of high-need schools and with one year of experience, will be available to teach in schools in need of improvement. After completing their clinical components, candidates hired as teachers of record will continue to be supported by faculty in their preparation program, and P-12 partners, in their first years of teaching. Participating IHEs will be expected to show how the work of their faculty with the new programs will be valued for tenure and promotion.

b. Graduate Model. New York will pilot graduate-level teacher clinical residency programs in IHEs and non-collegiate institutions. Financial resources will be provided to pilot programs to design and implement two types of rigorous clinically based programs to prepare teachers to be effective in high-need schools (Models A and B). Candidates will hold baccalaureate degrees, will commit to teaching for 3 years in a high-need school, and will be eligible for Trans B certification on entry into the programs. After successfully completing the program and all required teacher certification examinations, candidates will be awarded Professional certificates. The certification examination will comprise the demanding performance-based assessment.

Model A will place the resident teacher in a classroom with a mentor teacher in a closely supervised environment. A mentor or

teacher must be highly effective in serving high needs students and will supervise the year-long residency. The residents will be evaluated on a continuing basis using developed performance assessments. During the clinical component, the Resident will continue to work toward certification by completing program requirements. Model B is similar to Trans B alternative preparation programs, where the resident is the Teacher of Record. LEAs and program providers will show how, collaboratively, they will mentor and supervise the resident to assure a clinically rich environment. To ensure equitable treatment in non-IHE programs and those in traditional programs, the Regents will confer master's degrees on graduate level students who successful complete registered clinically based programs offered by non-degree institutions (e.g., cultural institutions, research centers, and other non-profit organizations), which is consistent with Education Law §208 that grants the Regents authority to award earned degrees (Appendix D_4_2).

Timeline for Completion: Spring 2013

Responsibility: NYSED, LEAs, Higher Education Institutions

Goal Three: Expand and scale those preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals

Activity One: New York will expand programs that successfully prepare principals for service in high-need schools. We will invite additional leadership preparation programs, and non-collegiate providers with appropriate expertise, to apply for funds to transform their programs during 2010-11, tailoring them exclusively to prepare principals to serve in high-need schools. The State will issue an RFP to fund ten programs that partner leadership preparation providers with schools serving high-need students and establish research-based program elements to be demonstrated through performance assessment. The first cohort of students will begin the

pilot programs in September 2011. Clinical services will be substantive in scope, full-time, and include participation in leadership responsibilities in schools effectively serving high-need students (as demonstrated by student growth data). The goal is to create a long term pipeline for new school leaders for high-need schools. ESEA funding will sustain and expand this work after RTTT funding ends.

Timeline for Completion: September 2011

Responsibility: NYSED, LEAs, Higher Education Institutions

Activity Two: New York will fund the expansion of programs with track records of preparing and supporting teachers that have significantly raised the achievement of high needs students through several other initiatives outlined in Sections B and D including: an RFP for clinical training programs, an RFP for new teacher induction, and an RFP for professional development services for our new formative assessments. The RFP process will ensure a track record of success, a quality expansion plan, and capacity to implement that plan.

Timeline for Completion: September 2011 (draft RFPs), 2012 (disburse funds), ongoing

Responsibility: NYSED, Contractors, Regional Data Centers, LEAs, Higher Education

Activity Three: New York will incorporate emerging best practices into teacher and principal preparation program redesign. New York will conduct survey of preparation programs identified as most effective based upon the institutional profiles. The State will publish emerging best practices, aligned to research, and incorporate into program redesign on an ongoing basis, as relevant.

Timeline for Completion: September 2011 and ongoing

Responsibility: NYSED, Contractors, Regional Data Centers, LEAs, Higher Education

*New York State: Race to the Top:
Selection Criteria and Competition Priorities*

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
General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0	0	38	47	55
Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0	0	41	44	48
General data to be provided at time of application:					
Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the State.	4,836				
Total number of principal credentialing programs in the State.	123				
Total number of teachers in the State.	226,000				
Total number of principals in the State.	4,540				

Data to be requested of grantees in the future:	
Number of teacher credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of principal credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of principals prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.	
Number of teachers in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State’s credentialing programs.	
Number of principals in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State’s credentialing programs.	

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals (20 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to—

(i) Provide effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to

teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high-need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes; and

(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages

Goal 1: Provide comprehensive and action-oriented district-wide diagnostics, to assist LEAs in prioritizing reform strategies, differentiating professional development for all teachers and principals based upon student performance and growth, and building LEA capacity for data analysis to inform instructional practice.

Through the implementation of the P-20 data system, districts will have access to rich data for use by districts, principals, and teachers to inform differentiated professional development needs that are strategically targeted to improve instructional practice and ultimately student outcomes.

As outlined in sections A and D, New York will develop differentiated professional development and supports for teachers and principals based upon student growth and achievement. All of New York's professional development activities will be coordinated

by the Office of District Services. NYSED will focus on developing robust supports, especially with regard to English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. Priority will be given to teachers in schools serving high-poverty and high-minority populations, especially those with the largest gaps in equitable distribution of effective teachers and in hard to staff and specialty subject areas. As well, priority will be given to principals in schools serving high-poverty and high-minority populations.

To assist districts in building their capacity, New York will have state-certified Education Diagnostic Teams modeled on the school inspection practice of the State's charter school authorizers and school quality reviews, but focused at the district level. The teams will be anchored by experienced educators with relevant experience and demonstrated track record of dramatically increasing student achievement in schools and districts serving high-poverty and high-minority populations. In addition, the intervention teams will have robust analytic capacity through experienced practitioners in education or fields outside of education to ensure rigor and consistency in all diagnostics. The intervention teams will support reflective diagnostics for district, school, principal, and teacher performance (based upon evaluations from D(2)(b) above). These reviews will provide a clear mapping of a district's areas of strength and opportunities for development, specific to improving instructional practice, in a timely way. As part of the review process, intervention teams will include data-based inquiry to support on-site training regarding effective use of data to inform improved instructional practice. Overall, the spirit of the intervention teams will be one of observation and dialogue to identify concrete action plans. Similar to the experience of Uncommon Schools in NYC, the inspection teams will create a culture of support with clusters of schools and school leaders engaged in professional communities of practice.

New York will focus the diagnostic teams on districts with the lowest-performing schools, largest gaps in the equitable distribution of teachers, and the greatest needs in terms of shortage and specialty areas. The primary objective will be to support LEAs in developing priorities based on data (including the equitable distribution of the most effective teachers and principals and gaps in shortage and specialty areas), articulating needs for differentiated supports and professional development based upon the

performance data, and identification of potential partner organizations to help build district capacity.

As described in detail in Section A and B, New York will partner with external organizations in order to build a robust network of partners to help translate the above district, school, and classroom data diagnostics into differentiated supports for districts, principals, and teachers. New York is fortunate to have a rich statewide network of potential support organizations. Representative organizations include, but are not limited to: BOCES, Institutions of Higher Education, networks of high-performing schools, charter management networks, cultural institutions, and museums..

New York will help shape the demand for meaningful professional development offerings across the State by setting clear expectations of potential partners. Professional development partner responsibilities will include: codification of content and emerging/best practices in the field/area, preparation of training materials, and delivery of training.. Partners will embed data-based inquiry into all of their sessions. Furthermore, partners will be expected to provide self-assessments so that teachers and principals can easily identify their own development needs within a given area (use of data to drive instruction, translating rigorous standards into instruction, developing and using formative assessments.) Finally, partners will integrate the latest technologies into their offerings, to include online learning modules and the use of video to demonstrate best practice.) Ultimately, LEAs will make the ultimate decision to select the best PD partners given their strategic needs as outlined in their district diagnostic.

Based upon New York's deep experience in school intervention, curricular supports and differentiated professional development across content areas and pedagogy are both critical. While the State expects that the NY-SIRIS data system will be a powerful tool for our educators, New York must also develop a network of partners with demonstrated track records of delivering results in high-poverty and high-minority school settings. These partners will have complementary data tools to diagnose student needs and help teachers respond to those needs.

Timeline for Completion: Beginning Fall 2010 and continuing throughout implementation of RTTT projects

Responsibility: Office of District Services, LEAs

Goal 2: Establish clear expectations for high quality professional development providers, and support development of statewide, regional, and local capacity, with a specific focus on assisting educators in high-need schools.

Activity One: As described in detail in Section B, New York will build a robust network of partners to help translate the above district, school, and classroom data diagnostics into differentiated supports for districts, principals, and teachers. New York is fortunate to have a rich statewide network of potential support organizations. Representative organizations include, but are not limited to: BOCES, Institutions of Higher Education, networks of high-performing schools, charter management networks, and cultural institutions and museums.

The Office of District Services, in coordination with the Race to the Top Management team and Teacher and Leader implementation teams, will help to shape the demand for meaningful professional development offerings across the State by setting clear expectations of potential partners. Professional development partner responsibilities will include: codification of content and emerging / best practices in the field/area, preparation of training materials, and delivery of training.) Partners will embed data-based inquiry into all of their sessions. Furthermore, partners will be expected to provide self-assessments so that teachers and principals can easily identify their own development needs within a given area (use of data to drive instruction, translating rigorous standards into instruction, and developing and using formative assessments). Finally, partners will integrate the latest technologies into their offerings, to include online learning modules and the use of video to demonstrate best practice). Ultimately, LEAs will make the ultimate decision to select the best PD partners given their strategic needs.

The State will align resources across the Four Assurances to bolster a comprehensive professional development strategy, prioritizing districts with low-performing schools. In addition, the New York will reallocate targeted resources such as the Wallace Foundation Leadership Grant, in support of the reforms. New York will build upon its Wallace Foundation grant, which focuses on differentiated professional development for school leaders based upon student growth and achievement, to inform opportunities for differentiated professional development for teachers.

All professional development strategies and investments will be linked to student achievement.

Timeline: Beginning Summer 2010 and continuing throughout the implementation of RTTT projects

Responsible Parties: Office of District Services, BOCES, IHE, external service providers

Activity Two: Continue to support national network of school leadership training and development organizations to extend access to high-quality leadership for LEAs.

Strong leadership, with capacity to lead inquiry teams across grades and sub-groups is a core predictor of the capacity for schools to drive data-driven strategies for teacher support, induction and development and ultimately student achievement. New York State has been a leader in supporting entrepreneurial partners like The New York City Leadership Academy, New Leaders for New Schools, and others to assist districts in developing robust pipelines of high quality school leaders. These partners, in addition to The New Teacher Project and Teacher U, focus on serving districts that serve high-need populations and are leaders in the national conversations seeking greater alignment between teacher and principal professional development and data on student achievement.

NYSED is using a 2008 Wallace grant to develop regional Leadership Academies to give school leaders professional development based on research, best practice, and regional-needs based on student performance data. The academies currently offer problem-based learning using the authentic, job-embedded challenges principals face in their schools informed by real time data from their

schools. Their focus is to assist and support principals as instructional leaders and to positively affect their ability to improve student learning. Every academy includes a research-based coaching component, supporting principals and ensuring application of learned skills and improvement strategies.

NYSED is working with a range of national experts to develop an evaluation model to assess the Academies' successes in improving student achievement. New York is partnering with ten other states in the Leading Change Learning Community consortium to share research and effective turnaround intervention strategies. The consortium selected New York as a case study for sustainability for such academies.

The first academy serves school leaders in the Rochester City School District (RCSD). NYSED and representatives of RCSD and St. John Fisher College collaborated to build a data-informed, customized curriculum responsive to the day-to-day demands of school leaders and designed to give graduates the skills and dispositions needed to implement RCSD's turnaround reform agenda. All 66 RCSD principals are participating in the Academy. A second academy, serving 42 LEAs north of New York City, recently began operation.

Funding from the Wallace grant is limited; thus New York will use \$8 million in RTTT monies to replicate the successful Leadership Academies in Rochester and New York City that were established with seed money from the Wallace Foundation. Eleven more RTTT Management Team-coordinated academies are planned, so that all regions of the state--including the remaining three large city districts--will eventually be served. The State will provide an additional \$10 million of Section 1003(g) funds annually to sustain the Leadership Academies and ensure that they are grounded in research and best practices from such organizations as the New York City Leadership Academy and New Leaders for New Schools in order to reach and develop highly effective educational leaders in the State's high-need schools. Beginning in fall 2011, over three years the Academies will serve

more than 700 principals (about 15 percent of all the State’s principals). When all academies are fully operational, all school leaders will have access to research-based professional development.

Timeline: Beginning Fall of 2011, ongoing

Responsibility: RTTT Management Team, Office of District Services, LEAs, Partners

Activity Three: New York will create rigorous professional development opportunities based upon research-based best practices that focus on formative assessment to drive continuous improvement in instructional strategies and ultimately student achievement.

Research on teacher enhancement and instructional improvement shows that a change in teaching practice is evident in organizations that establish a supportive professional development culture, provide professional development grounded in a combination of content and pedagogy, and build institutional capacity and individual knowledge that is sustainable over time (BaniLower, Boyd, Pasley, Weiss, 2005; Harlan, 2004; Ingersoll, 2001; Loukes Horsley, Love, Stiles, Mundry, Hewson, 2003; Supovitz & Turner, 2000).

In 2007, NYSED partnered with the Syracuse City School District (SCSD) in a professional development initiative to transform instruction. SCSD implemented a system-wide professional development model based on the work of Margaret Heritage, a national expert on formative assessment and data use. Ten elementary school principals and teachers engaged in embedded professional development opportunities that transformed instructional practices. Data indicate that improvements in teacher content knowledge and pedagogy have been and continue to be documented, yielding increased student achievement.

Based on this experience, NYSED seeks to build LEA-level leadership capacity to transform instruction and dramatically improve student outcomes by focusing professional development on “formative assessment.” CCSSO defines formative instruction as “a process used by teachers and students during instruction that provides feedback to adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve

students' achievement of intended instructional outcomes" (CCSSO, 2006).

Using research and data from the SCSD model and other successful formative assessment projects from across the nation, the RTTT Management team will issue an RFP in October 2010, to fund approximately 10 projects in high-need LEAs, targeting 2,000 K-12 teachers across all content areas, to provide formative assessment-based professional development. The objective is to effect a systemic change in the interaction between the teacher, the content, and the learner. Beginning in summer 2011, participating teachers will learn to analyze data (including data from the PreK-20 Longitudinal Data System) and use them to improve instructional practice, create a culture of data-driven decision-making, and design and differentiate instruction to address the needs of all students, particularly those in the performance gap. LEAs will be required to provide the needed time and structures as part of the school day to support collaboration among teachers, administrators, and staff and to commit to supporting ongoing professional development for all stakeholders.

Projects will include professional development activities using evidence-based modalities shown to result in effective transfer of knowledge. The key models will include learning communities of teachers, student achievement data analysis focused on strengthening teacher practice, technical assistance from national experts, and self-reflection on practice.

Initial funding will be available to support LEA-level programs and an independent evaluator to track successful data-driven practices to strengthen teaching and learning. NYSED will codify lesson learned to inform broader statewide implementation. To scale up successes, the RTTT Management Team will coordinate existing USNY resources, promote use of technology in the delivery of professional development, and share these effective professional development strategies with ETACIT. NYSED will realign federal and State funding resources to support and sustain this PD priority [see also D 2 iv a].

Timeline until Completion: Fall of 2011, ongoing

Responsibility: RTTT Management Team, Office of District Services, LEAs, Partners

Activity Three: New York will create a New Teacher Induction Program designed to create Teacher Leaders.

In 2008-09, New York had 503 high-need, low-performing schools (See Section D 3 ii). School improvement is most effective in environments where teachers are encouraged to become teacher leaders as teacher leaders are fundamental to implementing instructional change, cultivating cultures of excellence, and supporting and mentoring the next generation of new teachers.

Data on teacher attrition show that approximately ten percent of beginning teachers leave before the end of their first year, 30 percent leave in the first three years, and between 40 and 50 percent leave within five years. High poverty schools experience higher rates of teacher turnover than low-poverty schools. Quality, evidence-based induction programs are very effective ways to give teachers the supports needed for success and to improve retention. Research shows 80 to 90 percent of teachers in such induction programs stay in the field for five years or more (Sack, 2005).

NYSED will create induction programs to assist more than 4,000 new teachers to become teacher leaders who are skilled at school improvement (2000 of these teachers will be from high-need schools). By fall 2010, NYSED's RTTT Management Team will issue an RFP to support models that will:

- Provide effective support to help new teachers progress along the teaching skills continuum, provide differentiated PD support, link PD to teacher effectiveness early in their teaching careers,
- Retain and motivate new teachers,
- Grow teacher leaders, and
- Help transform schools into true teaching and learning communities.

These funded induction programs, which will begin in fall 2011, will give new teachers mentoring and support to help them

become instructional leaders and improve teaching and learning. In addition to helping new teachers achieve expertise in curriculum planning, assessment, and using data and reflections on practice to inform instruction, especially for high-need students, induction programs will help to develop their skills for creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions, aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes, and energizing and engaging partners in turnaround initiatives. A detailed evaluation plan, including both qualitative and quantitative measures, will measure the program's outcomes. To sustain the initiative, NYSED will take the most successful practices learned from these models and amend the existing certification requirements for new teachers to include an enhanced induction program designed to prepare *all* teachers to be teacher leaders. As part of the sustainability plan, the participating LEAs and teacher education programs will agree to provide training to personnel in other LEAs, IHEs, the State Teacher Centers and ATLAS.

Timeline until Completion: Fall of 2010 (RFP), Fall of 2011 (Induction Programs begin and are ongoing)

Responsibility: RTTT Management Team, Office of District Services, LEAs, Partners

D(5)(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice).

A statewide evaluation of funded projects will occur annually. Projects will be required to have a local evaluation component documenting frequency of delivery and participation in the professional development, effect on teacher content knowledge, transfer of knowledge and skills to classroom practice, and measures of effect on student growth on achievement and perceptions. NYSED will use the results of these evaluations to determine which projects merit further investment and dissemination across the State. NYSED will establish a baseline of data and will use it to set performance targets for districts. These targets will be used on an annual basis (if not more frequently), to create a process of continual quality of improvement in instruction tied to student outcomes.

This data will be analyzed to used for effective knowledge management and support to districts on effective strategies tied to student outcomes including all subgroups. Through the work of RTTT management team and TACIT (see section E) Low Performing Schools will be able to prioritize strategies that produce the greatest results in student achievement.

Timeline until Completion: Fall of 2011, ongoing

Responsibility: RTTT Management Team, Office of Accountability, Office of District Services

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
Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.					
(Enter measures here, if any.)					

(E) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (50 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 points)

The extent to which the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(1):

- A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

State Education Law §§210, 211-b and 211-c and Commissioner's regulations §100.2(p) highlight the State's legal authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools and LEAs in improvement or corrective action. The following are examples of such authority:

Schools Under Registration Review

Under Education Law §210, the Regents have the authority to register New York State institutions. Pursuant to §100.2(p) of the Commissioner's regulations, registered public and nonpublic high schools may issue diplomas and administer Regents Examinations. Any public school of a school district that is identified as being among those that are farthest from meeting the benchmarks established by the Commissioner or as being a poor learning environment may be identified as a School Under

Registration Review (SURR) (See Appendix E_1_1, 8 NYCRR §100.2[p][9]). The methodology for identifying SURR schools is based upon the performance of the “all students” group on English language arts and mathematics assessments and bears significant similarities to the process by which schools are identified as persistently lowest-achieving under Race To the Top guidelines (See Appendix E_1_1, 8 NYCRR §100.2[p][14][ix]).

A SURR undergoes a resource, planning and program audit and is required to develop and implement a restructuring plan (Appendix E_1_1, 8 NYCRR §100.2[p][10][i]). If a SURR fails to demonstrate adequate improvement within a specified timeframe, usually two full school years, its registration may be revoked by the Board of Regents. (Appendix E_1_1, 8 NYCRR §100.2[p][10][iii]). Thus, Regents have the authority to close any public school of a school district in the State that, after being identified as a SURR, is determined to be an unsound educational environment. Following revocation of a school’s registration, the Commissioner has the authority to develop a plan to ensure that the educational welfare of affected students is protected. (Appendix E_1_1, 8 NYCRR §100.2[p][10][iii]).

District Improvement Plan and Distinguished Educator Program

Pursuant to Education Law §211-b[3], school districts that have been identified as requiring academic progress or schools that are in improvement, corrective action, restructuring or SURR status face a series of interventions focused on improving student achievement (See Appendix E_1_1). One of these interventions is the creation of a District Improvement Plan to address chronic failure within an LEA (See Appendix E_1_1, Education Law §211-b[3]; 8 NYCRR §100.2[p][7]). This plan, which is subject to the approval of the Commissioner, requires school districts to consider redirecting resources towards such strategies as increased time on task; teacher and principal quality initiatives; middle school and high school restructuring; services to English language learners or pre-kindergarten programs (See Appendix E_1_1, Education Law §§211-b[3], 211-d[3][a]; 8 NYCRR §100.2[p][7]).

In addition, whenever a school or district has failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for four or more years, the Commissioner may appoint a distinguished educator to become an ex-officio non-voting member of the school district's board of education (See Appendix E_1_1, Education Law §211-c). The distinguished educator reviews any school or district improvement plans and either endorses such plan without change or recommends modifications (See Appendix E_1_1, Education Law §211-c[5]). The school district must either modify its plans as directed by the distinguished educator or seek permission from the Commissioner not to do so (See Appendix E_1_1, Education Law §211-c[5]).

Differentiated Accountability

In January 2009, US E.D. approved New York's proposal to participate in its Differentiated Accountability (DA) pilot. While New York's DA plan provides LEAs with flexibility to work with schools that require less intervention, the plan also provides NYSED with the authority to directly intervene in schools in restructuring status, which must develop plans subject to the Commissioner's approval and must include fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the staff, governance, or organization and may include a plan to close or phase out the school (See Appendix E_1_1, 8 NYCRR §100.2[p][6]). Moreover, pursuant to Education Law §§211-b and 211-c and §100.2(p)(6) of the Commissioner's regulations, the Commissioner has the authority to appoint school quality review teams, joint school intervention teams and distinguished educators to schools and school districts that are at various stages in the DA continuum. Schools in corrective action may be required to participate in such activities as a curriculum audit, and schools in DA restructuring status may also be assigned to work with distinguished educator assigned by the Commissioner (See Appendix E_1_1, Education Law §211-c [4]; 8 NYCRR §100.2[p][6]).

Direct Intervention in a Chronically Low-Performing District

In addition to New York's general authority to intervene directly in low-performing districts, New York has in the past been able to implement intensive interventions in a chronically low-performing school district – the Roosevelt Union Free School District. This

was accomplished by the enactment of special legislation which authorized removal of the board of education and heightened State intervention and oversight over the school district.

Reform Plan Criteria

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools (40 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

- (i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and (5 points)
- (ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). (35 points)

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(2) (please fill in table below):

- The State's historic performance on school turnaround, as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) that States or LEAs attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and lessons learned to date.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

(E)(2)(i) The State's historic approach to turning around low-performing schools is the School Under Registration Review (SURR) process, which actively identifies low-performing schools and then uses elements of the transformation, turnaround, and closure strategies to improve academic performance. The program has demonstrated significant success as evidenced by the fact that since the inception of SURR in 1989, 312 schools in New York have been identified for registration review, of which 228 have been removed from review because they improved their performance. Another 66 schools that did not improve their performance sufficiently have been phased out or closed and in most cases replaced by new schools. Between 2004-2005 and 2008-2009, 66 schools have been identified as SURR. Of those, 42 have made sufficient progress to be removed from SURR and eight schools have been closed or in the process of phasing out and being replaced by new schools (see Tables E2-1 and E2-2 for the results of this process).

While the SURR process has been an effective mechanism for identifying low-performing schools, our SURR intervention strategies have not resulted in break-through increases in student achievement. With this knowledge, our RTTT application specifically addresses important challenges and lessons learned, ensuring that our future interventions in persistently low-performing schools yield the high increases in achievement that our students deserve. In particular, we found that it was often difficult to identify appropriate Distinguished Educators (DEs) to assist with interventions. As such, our RTTT plans rely less on expert individuals and instead facilitate a robust marketplace of service providers. Secondly, in many of our SURR interventions, schools lacked a coherent curriculum and high quality, aligned professional development. These schools also lacked effective use of formative, interim, and summative assessments as mechanism for driving instructional improvements. To address this, as outlined in Section B, we will provide all of the State's schools with curriculum frameworks and aligned professional development

and formative, interim, and summative assessments. Additionally, many of our interventions relied primarily on a new principal and we learned that changing the culture of a failing school requires not only an effective principal, but also a team of dedicated individuals whether it is a school leadership team, an external intermediary organization, or some other partner organization to infuse needed capacity. Finally, our efforts to intervene in schools generally focused on the school itself, leaving out a crucial partner – the district - whose role must be to build the capacity of all its schools. We have taken steps to ensure that our plans address this and will infuse capacity at both the district and school-level.

RTTT now presents an opportunity to strengthen and broaden our efforts to intervene in low-performing schools. With the expanded definition of lowest-performing schools and additional resources, New York will be able to increase the number of schools reached and build our capacity at both the district and state-levels to support turnaround initiatives. We will build upon our existing SURR structures and processes as we marshal the resources of RTTT with new management structures and strong oversight and accountability practices.

New York State has developed a methodology to identify the persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools and also any Non-Title I eligible schools that would also be considered persistently lowest-achieving. Described in the table below, our methodology uses 2008-2009 school year data. Based on this approach, the Commissioner has identified 57 persistently lowest-achieving schools and informed their LEA's that they have schools identified on this list for participation in the four intervention strategies. (Please see Appendix_E_2_i_2 for the list of identified schools). Each of the seven districts in which these schools are located (Albany, Buffalo, New York City, Rochester, Roosevelt, Syracuse and Yonkers) has signed a RTTT Memorandum of Understanding with NYSED committing to take the actions required to turn the schools around.

Explanation of New York State's methodology for Identification of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Race to the Top Requirement	How NY Meets the Requirement
Identify any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater.	There are in the 2009-2010 school year 433 Title I schools in improvement, corrective action or restructuring. NY has identified 22 Title I schools in restructuring as persistently lowest-achieving based on the performance of the all students group in ELA and mathematics and lack of progress on these assessments.
Identify any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater.	There are in the 2009-2010 school year fewer than 100 secondary schools that are eligible for but do not receive Title I funds that are identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring under NY's differentiated accountability plan. Therefore, NY has identified five Non-Title I schools in restructuring as persistently lowest-achieving based on the performance of the all students group in ELA and mathematics and lack of progress on these assessments.
Identify high schools that have had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.	In addition to the 27 Title I and Non-Title I schools identified for ELA and mathematics performance, New York has identified an additional 30 Title I schools in improvement, corrective action and restructuring, and Title I eligible secondary schools because these schools had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent for the past three years.
Take into account the academic achievement of the "all students" group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.	New York took into account the proficiency of the all students group in ELA and mathematics combined by averaging a school's Performance Indices for the all students group on all 2008-2009 ELA and mathematics accountability measures for which a school was accountable and then placing each potential lowest-achieving schools in rank order based on this average.
Take into account a school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group.	New York took into account lack of progress in ELA and mathematics by defining lack of progress as any school that that had reached the restructuring phase under NY's integrated accountability system for Title I and Non-Title I schools and had less than a 25 point gain on an ELA or mathematics

accountability measure between 2005-2006 and 2008-2009.

In order to capture those chronically lowest-achieving schools in which reform efforts have not been successful over time, as described in RTTT, New York's identification of persistently lowest-achieving schools does not include the following: (1) those schools that are in the process of phasing-out and/or closing during the 2009-2010 school year; (2) on a case by case basis, as permitted by US E.D. guidance, transfer alternative high schools (where students who had formerly dropped out or are overage and under-credited for their grade may choose to transfer in order to engage in an accelerated school program with additional supports; students often enter these schools at the age of an 11th grader but with 9th grade credits). New York maintains an integrated accountability system by which all schools, both Title I and Non-Title I, move along the same accountability continuum. This means that if a school has failed to demonstrate progress by not making AYP for five years on an accountability measure, the school is placed in the restructuring phase regardless of whether the school received Title I funds in all, some, or none of these years. Therefore, New York does not include schools in improvement and corrective action in identifying lowest-achieving schools because they have not yet been subject to multiple earlier school improvement and turnaround efforts and therefore are not considered to be failing to show progress. It is important to note, however, that those schools in improvement and corrective action with graduation rates below sixty percent for three years *are* designated as persistently lowest-achieving. With clarification from US E.D. that the above rationale was consistent with the intent of RTTT, the NYSED Office of School Improvement and Accountability created New York's list of persistently low-achieving schools.

In February 2010, in accordance with State law and regulations, the Commissioner will identify schools to be added and removed from the State's registration review list. The methodologies for identification of schools for registration review and for persistently lowest-achieving status as defined by RTTT are similar, but not identical. To begin the process of aligning these two programs, schools identified for registration review this coming year will be a subset of those schools identified as persistently lowest-

achieving. Thus schools on the State's SURR list, but not on the persistently lowest-achieving list will simply continue to implement their SURR corrective action plans or, in some cases, their plans to close or phase out the school. Later this year, the Board of Regents will be asked to adopt amendments that ensure full alignment between the SURR and persistently lowest-achieving designations.

NYSED has set achievable yet aggressive goals for dramatic improvement in these schools and expects that after one year of model implementation, 25 percent of the schools will no longer be identified as persistently lowest-achieving. After two years of model implementation, 50 percent of the schools will no longer be identified as persistently lowest-achieving and, at the end of the third year of model implementation, 67 percent of the schools will no longer be identified as persistently lowest-achieving, while 80 percent will attain the accountability status of *In Good Standing*. We expect that districts who choose a transformation model for a low-performing school will continue to monitor supports and achievement closely following the change to *In Good Standing*. The Office of School Improvement and Accountability, in coordination with the RTTT Management Team, will implement metrics to provide ongoing tracking for those schools for up to five years.

(E)(2)(ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). (35 points)

From its long experience in school turnaround, NYSED has learned a number of valuable lessons regarding the characteristics of persistently lowest-achieving schools, the areas in which they struggle, the types of interventions necessary to turn them around, and the challenges of sustaining improvement over time. Through our SURR process, school districts with persistently low-achieving schools receive an integrated system of supports that includes targeted technical assistance, research, and professional

development; information management and data systems support; and community engagement services to strengthen local efforts advocating for change. The strength of our current support system is one reason New York has consistently received an “A” rating in terms of standards, assessments, and accountability from *Education Week’s* annual Quality Counts. New York intends to build on this foundation to create a comprehensive, coherent system of support for LEAs as they implement their intervention plans.

Goal I: New York State will provide a comprehensive system of support to LEAs as they implement one of the four intervention models

New York’s plan to support LEAs addresses not just their needs related to school intervention, but intends to build the capacity of LEAs to better support student achievement in all their schools. While ETACIT will provide technical assistance and other supports for school interventions, our new Office of District Services will coordinate our efforts to build LEA capacity as we make robust investments in professional development for LEAs aligned to higher standards; provide detailed curriculum frameworks, and formative, interim, and summative assessments; build a comprehensive data system and; support our LEAs in building coherent early childhood plans. Our Office of Accountability will also be a coordinated partner, ensuring that all LEAs and schools are held accountable for driving gains in student achievement.

Our low-performing school intervention plan begins with a clear process for annually identifying our persistently lowest-achieving schools. It then provides a one-stop-shop that will offer LEAs turnkey diagnostic tools and roadmaps to aid in the selection of one of the four RTTT school intervention models. It will also house a repository of external partners able to provide adaptable innovative schools models, implementation expertise, and hands-on technical assistance services. Our support system also provides a simple gate-keeping process so that only those plans that are high quality are approved for implementation. Finally, the annual process concludes with the evaluation of efforts to turnaround our lowest-performing schools. To effectuate this plan, NYSED is launching two new offices focused solely on helping districts turn around their low-performing schools with innovative new school

models.

Activity One: Implement key organizational structures and management functions that will support LEAs in implementing the school intervention models.

To more strategically align our resources, ensure coherence, and access innovative practices, we intend to redesign our low-performing schools support structure. Four offices, led by Senior Deputy John King and in coordination with the RTTT management team, will work closely together to implement supports to LEAs as they address their low-performing schools: the Office of District Services; the Office of Accountability; the Office of Innovative School Models (OISM); and the External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround (ETACIT).

Office of District Services

To ensure LEAs have the capacity to support achievement in all their schools, the Office of District Services will coordinate NYSED's provision of services to LEAs across all functions and divisions and also move the SEA to a more service-oriented relationship with the State's LEAs. Led by Ken Slentz, a former school teacher and superintendent, who has been a recognized leader in the technological, financial and day-to-day operations of school districts. One of his most noted strengths is his ability to build the capacity of his professional staff, a skill that will be critical in building the capacity of LEAs.

Office of Innovative School Models (OISM)

The Office of Innovative School Models (OISM) will open in February of 2010 and focus on supporting the creation of new school models to serve as successors to low-achieving schools that will be phased out, closed, or restarted. It will also oversee the State's charter school authorizations. Led by an Executive Director with deep experience in both education administration and charter authorizing, OISM will work to create optimal state-level policy and operating conditions for dramatic school intervention and

ensure that LEAs have the flexibility to adapt innovative practices in the areas of school enrollment and placement, school time and schedule, and teacher scheduling, including reviewing requests from restarted, turned around, transformed or newly created schools for variances from Commissioner's Regulations . (See Appendix E_2_ii_1). The office will also administer our state-level Innovative Secondary Schools Model Incentive fund program and will manage the RFPs to develop ETACIT, described below, and for virtual and blended schools. Additionally, since ETACIT will be developed and managed by an external partner, OISM will initially provide direct support to LEAs until ETACIT is fully up and running in December 2010.

External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround (ETACIT)

The External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround (ETACIT) will serve as a statewide clearinghouse of information and support for LEAs intervening in their low-performing schools. Working with Joint Intervention Teams and Distinguished Educators as appropriate, ETACIT will provide direct technical assistance to districts with identified low-performing schools, guiding them through every step of the process from conducting a district-level diagnostic assessment that will inform their choice of an intervention model to evaluating potential lead partners and selecting the one that best meets the needs of the LEA and school community. Those school districts selecting school closure will also be assisted throughout the phase out of the school. ETACIT will also assume long-term responsibility for creating and supporting a dynamic repository of lead partners with proven track records of raising the achievement of high needs students. To ensure we tap national expertise in school turn around and district reform, ETACIT will be developed and run by an external partner. Throughout our intervention efforts, ETACIT will coordinate closely with Regional Special Education Technical Assistance Support Centers (RSE-TASC) which serve as NYSED's primary comprehensive and coordinated system of special education technical assistance and school improvement resources.

(Note: Joint Intervention Teams (JITs) are appointed by the Commissioner and make recommendations for schools in the Restructuring phase of Differentiated Accountability. They include a representative of the school district, an SED staff member,

and an education expert. As part of their determination, the JIT conducts an assessment of a school's educational program and establishes the root causes for the school's failure to make progress. As we align our SURR process with the identification of RTTT low-performing schools, the JITs will support both processes. If a school is in restructuring, but not persistently lowest-achieving, then the JIT will help the school district determine whether the school should continue to implement its current restructuring plan, modify the plan, or abandon the plan and implement one of the four RTTT intervention models. The role of the JIT will vary depending on whether the school is persistently lowest-achieving or not. If the school is persistently lowest-achieving then the JIT is primarily gathering baseline data that ETACIT will use to support the district in selecting an intervention model; however if the school is not yet persistently lowest-achieving, the JIT will make an assessment of whether the school is likely to be able to make AYP by doing something less than one of the four intervention models, or whether the district should voluntarily implement one of the four models, at which point ETACIT would provide assistance.

Office of Accountability

Currently, NYSED's Accountability and School Improvement functions are embedded in two separate divisions. We will streamline this structure into one office, the Office of Accountability. The purpose of this office is to not only "raise the floor" of student achievement, but also to "raise the ceiling." As noted by Sir Michael Barber, the highly regarded former Senior Education Advisor to British Prime Minister Tony Blair, a system of strong external accountability, correctly designed, can make a decisive contribution to the attainment of that widely shared moral purpose of almost every educator to improve outcomes for all students and simultaneously promote equity. Formally, the Office of Accountability will oversee school accountability and compliance for all schools and LEAs in the State focusing particularly on the achievement of subgroups of students; identify low-performing schools on an annual basis; coordinate grant programs and the provision of technical assistance by School Quality Review Teams, Joint Intervention Teams and Distinguished Educators to enhance the capacity of LEAs to support schools that are in improvement, corrective action or restructuring that are not yet identified as persistently lowest-achieving to implement turnaround

strategies; and conduct an annual evaluation of the intervention efforts of participating LEAs with low-performing schools.

Activity Two: Develop a coherent, efficient process for LEAs to select an intervention model, choose a lead partner if preferred, and have their implementation plan approved by the Commissioner

To aid LEAs in their selection of an intervention model, ETACIT, working with Joint Intervention Teams (JIT) and Distinguished Educators, will assist LEAs in conducting a district-level diagnostic assessment that includes an analysis of the overall student population with focus on the needs of ELL students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students; district-wide performance; LEA capacity to manage school interventions; and the LEAs current allocation of strategic resources. All of these elements will inform the selection of an intervention model and lead partner, and subsequent implementation planning.

New York's LEAs have the option of implementing one of the four intervention models for each persistently low-performing school. A summary of those models, as characterized under current New York State law follows:

Restart – A restart model may include either conversion of a school to a charter school or the replacement of a public school by a new charter school that will serve the students who would have attended the public school. Under certain circumstances districts may also enter into contracts with SUNY, or in New York City, with CUNY, for them to manage public schools. A former student who wishes to attend the new restart school may enroll within the grades served.

Turnaround Model - In New York, there are two versions of the turnaround model: 1) a school is phased out and replaced by a new school over time or; 2) the school remains open, but the school is completely redesigned with the following elements: a new principal is designate and given enhanced operational flexibility; at least 50% of the staff are replaced; incentives are implemented (both financial and career-related) to promote recruitment and retention of high quality staff; high quality professional development

is provided to all staff; a new school governance structure is adopted and student performance data is used to inform and differentiate instruction; learning time is increased and; appropriate social-emotional supports and community-oriented services are provided to students. LEAs choosing the turnaround model will be encouraged to partner with an external intermediary or “lead partner” to assist them with planning and implementation.

Transformation Model - A school that undertakes a transformation model does not close, but rather remains identified as persistently low-achieving until it demonstrates improved academic results. In New York City, no more than 50% of schools may undertake the transformation model. This model calls for replacement of the principal plus adoption of a rigorous and equitable evaluation system for teachers and principals that rewards school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates while identifying and removing those who, after ample professional development, have not increased student achievement. LEAs choosing the transformation model will also be encouraged to partner with an external intermediary or “lead partner” to assist them with planning and implementation.

School Closure - The school is closed and students are enrolled in higher achieving schools within the LEA which can include charter schools.

Following selection of an intervention model, LEAs will be supported through the implementation planning process. Those LEAs selecting the transformation and turnaround models will be guided by ETACIT to select a lead partner. LEAs selecting the restart option will be provided with appropriate support to restart the school as a charter or under the management of SUNY or CUNY. Those LEAs choosing to close their school will be provided with roadmaps and templates for efficient school closure that ensures a smooth transition for the enrolled students, their families, and the local community.

All LEAs will be supported throughout the development of their implementation plans with a clear timeline and process for

approval. Plans will include a description of the LEA's governance structure that will oversee the district's intervention efforts (such as an internal LEA office, Partnership Zone (described further in next section under Goal 2, Activity 2), or an external lead partner.) Plans will also include a description of proposed instructional programming and school culture, staffing, faculty incentives and rewards, student enrollment practices, and parent and community engagement. Plans will also be required to address the needs of ELL students and students with disabilities as well as at-risk students and drop-out prevention efforts.

The Commissioner will appoint a panel consisting of members of the Joint Intervention Team (JIT) and Distinguished Educators to review the implementation plans. One of three recommendations will be made by the panel to the Commissioner: 1) accept the LEA's plan and approve for opening 2) accept the LEA's intervention plan on the condition that suggested revisions are made or; 3) return the LEA's plan and require the LEA to submit a new plan. Plans will be reviewed and approved in March in preparation for school opening in September of the same calendar year.

Activity Three: Provide those LEAs with identified low-performing schools with a comprehensive information reporting and instructional system.

As discussed in Section C(3), those districts with identified low-performing schools will be prioritized as the State implements its instructional data system. The system will help districts conduct a diagnostic assessment and select the appropriate school intervention model; aid in the identification of improvement strategies for instruction within turn around schools; and inform recruitment, training and retention of teachers within these schools. The capacity of educators within low-performing schools to effectively use data will be supported through professional development as outlined in Section C and also in our educator preparation programs, outlined in Section D.

Activity Four: Annually evaluate the effectiveness of school intervention efforts

With the help of an external partner, NYSED will measure the progress and performance of identified persistently low-achieving schools in order to raise awareness, identify and assess best practices at the core of improvement efforts in these schools, and position NYSED to both further support the transformation of participating schools and include additional schools in future funding opportunities. All schools implementing the transformation, turnaround, or restart model as well as those participating in our State-level Innovative Secondary School Model Incentive fund will partake in a longitudinal study as part of a statewide evaluation. Qualitative and quantitative data will be collected and analyzed to measure the progress and performance of each school and its associated model and identify those characteristics and factors that contribute to the challenges and successes that cross schools statewide.

Timeline: Issue RFP in June 2010 and conduct annual evaluations

Goal 2: Build state and local capacity to intervene in low-performing schools and sustain reform efforts by catalyzing the marketplace for innovative partners

We recognize that our LEAs have differentiated capacities to implement and support the four intervention models. Some of our large urban districts have dedicated staff and processes in place such as Offices of Portfolio Management and Charter Schools, while in most others, these functions are absent. In some districts, elements of effective new school designs that address the needs of at-risk students are exemplary, while in others there is no evidence of a strategic plan to meet the specific needs of these students. Recognizing this variation in capacity and readiness, New York is committed to providing districts with the option to select and benefit from the assistance of contracted external partners that will provide differentiated supports for the turnaround, restart, and transformation models. Potential partners will include nationally renowned new small school developers, leading charter management organizations, universities, virtual and blended school providers, autonomous internal district offices, and individual BOCES. Additionally, partners will be selected to manage statewide support services through ETACIT, further building

the State's capacity to support LEA intervention efforts.

Activity One: Issue RFPs for lead partners to support the turnaround, restart, and transformation models.

Beginning in May 2010, New York will issue a state-level RFP for “intermediary” partners that will assist districts in their planning and implementation efforts to intervene in low-performing schools. Partners will be “pre-selected” by the State before being made available to school districts based on demonstrated ability to support the districts in implementing a successful new school model and their willingness to sign a performance contract based on predicted gains in student achievement. LEAs will also have the option to procure their own partners, subject to the approval of the Commissioner. Recognizing that novel approaches to knowledge management and dissemination will be needed to scale proven practices and models across the State, potential partners will be asked to propose plans to share information on proven national and international practices.

Drawing on our significant experience in school intervention, we recognize that strong curricular supports and professional development are critical elements. In the case of the transformation and turnaround models, we will seek intermediary partners to provide schools with curriculum materials consistent with the State's new curricular frameworks and with aligned professional development for both teachers and principals. While we anticipate that the State's NY-SIRIS data system will be a powerful tool for our educators, we will also seek partners who have complementary data tools to diagnose student needs and help teachers respond to those needs.

As a basis for developing our RFP requirements, we will take lessons learned from exemplary school partnerships including those forged by New Visions for Public Schools and College Board Schools, two organizations that provide partner schools with many of the same instructional services and supports historically provided to schools by their local districts. Building on the strength of these models, the NYC Department of Education has taken the partnership archetype to scale by having all 1400+ schools choose a

support package from a collection of intermediary-like partners comprised of for-profit and not-for-profit organizations as well as internal service organizations that provide differentiated advisory and support services.

Timeline: We anticipate that lead partners will be “pre-selected” by the State by November 2010, allowing LEAs to evaluate and choose a partner and then have adequate collaborative planning time in preparation for school opening in 2011-2012. We plan to structure the state RFP to be reopened over subsequent years to accommodate the expected increase in supply of qualified partners as national school reform efforts evolve and new partners enter the marketplace.

Activity Two: Implement the Mass Insight Partnership Zone model

To provide more options for school districts selecting the transformation and turnaround models, New York will collaborate with Mass Insight to create Partnership Zones, a hybrid model that combines the benefits of a district with additional operating flexibility. “Zone schools,” which are developed in clusters, remain inside the district and can continue to tap into the scale efficiencies of many central office services. However, Zone schools also afford principals and lead partners the freedom from district policies and procedures to make staffing, scheduling, curriculum and salary decisions (within the constraints of the district collective bargaining agreement) in return for being held accountable for dramatic student achievement gains within two years.

These flexible conditions have been proven to empower educators to be more innovative, dynamic, and responsive to the needs of their students. As part of the final scope of work, districts will be required to engage in good faith negotiations with their collective bargaining partners to gain the additional flexibility necessary to implement the four intervention models.

The Partnership Zone model leverages the power of a network to build capacity at both the school and district levels. An important lesson from our intervention work in New York City has come from the practices of successful charter management organizations, including Achievement First, KIPP, and Uncommon Schools, which have demonstrated the power of cross-school collaboration and sharing of data. Schools within and between these networks come together at the teacher and principal-level to discuss

instructional intervention strategies, share case studies, plan professional development, and analyze data.

Mass Insight is partnering with six states - Colorado, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New York, and Texas in this three-year, \$70-million public-private partnership which is designed to create scalable and sustainable strategies for turning around clusters of their lowest-performing schools, starting with a selected group of one or two proof point districts in each state. A two-year extension is expected to follow the three-year initial effort. Mass Insight will launch the initiative by helping NYSED and participating LEAs conduct an analysis of the statutory and regulatory conditions affecting operating flexibility. They will then work with NYSED staff and school districts to develop the state and local-level strategies needed to increase flexibility for lead partners.

Timeline: Beginning in early 2011 following pre-selection of lead partners by the State

Activity Three: Issue an RFP for the development and management of ETACIT

In order to ensure our school intervention work is superbly supported and informed by cutting-edge thinking and practices, the State will select an external partner to develop and lead ETACIT which will provide advisory services to LEAs and manage the State's repository of lead partners. Potential vendors will be evaluated based on their ability to effect state-level change and demonstrated knowledge of the complexity associated with school turnarounds. ETACIT will work closely with the Office of Innovative School Models and Charter Schools and will be tasked with functioning as a clearinghouse of information for both LEAs and NYSED staff.

Timeline: We anticipate the procurement process will begin in May 2010 and the center officially launch in December 2010.

Activity four: Launch a \$20 Million Innovative Secondary Schools Model Incentive fund

NYSED will support the turnaround of 25 additional low-achieving schools by creating a competitive Innovative Secondary Schools Model Incentive fund. This fund will serve as an incentive for eligible school districts with schools *In Need of*

Improvement, Corrective Action or Restructuring status (but which have not yet been identified as persistently low-achieving per the RTTT definition) to implement innovative new models in partnership with institutes of higher education, local leaders in business and industry, full service school partners, and other profit/nonprofit organizations. In order to support, stimulate, reengage, and sustain customized pathways to high school completion the fund will focus on creating new models centered on themes including STEM, virtual high schools, transfer schools serving over-age and under-credited students, schools for the arts, career and technical schools, museum schools, and language acquisition schools.

Selected participating LEA's with Tier III schools, as defined pursuant to Section 1003(g) of ESEA, may apply to open an innovative model school or program under the Incentive Fund. Upon approval of the application by the Commissioner and the commitment of the LEA to use a portion of its participating RTTT LEA allocation to support implementation of a model, NYSED will provide a matching grant of up to \$500,000 of Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Timeline: Launch in July 2010

Activity five: Issue an RFP for the development of Virtual Schools and Blended Schools

To provide opportunities to make up courses and also acquire initial credits, New York will engender foundational change in digital content, digital use, digital capacity and access, leadership, accountability, and funding by: 1) issuing an RFP and approving robust models of online "virtual" high schools and "blended schools," hybrid virtual and "brick and mortar" schools and by; 2) implementing the twelve actions steps of the Statewide Learning Technology Plan.

These schools will provide innovative options not only for over-aged and under-credited students and other students disconnected from traditional schools, but also for all learners who want access to participate in school "anytime, anywhere." This approach grants alternative pathways to completing graduation requirements and advanced courses of study. Students across the state will

have the option to take online public school courses at no cost. Statewide virtual schools will expose, empower, and support nontraditional students in alternative approaches to teaching and learning.

Timeline: Issue RFP

Activity Six: NYSED will establish a standard process to review, recommend, and approve online courses for use by local school districts, beginning first in the four core content areas (English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and expanding over time to include all content areas. NYSED will identify an entity to review and recommend identified resources, such as online courses for students and professional development for teachers that can be disseminated through the University of the State of New York (USNY) system. Recommendations will have final approval by the Commissioner of Education. A list of approved courses will be developed and maintained by the identified entity. This framework will enable students to access alternative pathways to make up course credit and earn initial course credit. This undertaking will result in providing a plethora of acceptable online resources accessible for all learners in New York State.

Timeline: Launch RFP in May 2010

Rationale: Many of the concepts embedded in our plan are referenced in Mass Insight’s 2007 Report, *The Turnaround Challenge*. This report, which U.S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan recently called “the bible of school turnaround,” provides an ambitious framework for approaching intervention in persistently lowest-achieving schools. New York’s plan is further built upon the following research base and these principles will be embedded throughout implementation:

Context is critical: “If there is anything close to a law in the turnaround literature, it is that context is critical,” states Murphy (2008, p. 349). Brady (2003) in Murphy & Myers (p. 320) argues, “The specific intervention strategy is not important. What’s important is having the right mix of people, energy, timing, and other elements – particularly school leadership – that together

contribute to school success.” (See also Brinson & Rhim, 2009.)

Introduce an external partner: In no other sector do many organizations have the internal capacity to do turnarounds. It’s often considered highly specialized work. (See Murphy & Myers, 2008; Brinson & Rhim, 2009; Hess, 2008.) The district should be required to engage an external partner to assist with the turnaround. The extent to which the partner takes control of the school should depend on the context and the capacity of the district and be subject to approval of the State. The external partner should have an in-building, embedded relationship with the school. Its efforts cannot be occasional or light-touch; they must involve intensive face-to-face, school-embedded support.

Conduct a rapid, high-quality needs assessment: For each school designated for turnaround, conducting a comprehensive assessment that illuminates the school’s strengths, identifies areas of concern, and provides information about causes for strength and weakness and context is essential. Murphy (2008, p. 337) states “that according to nearly every analyst in the turnaround game,” after the decision is made to undertake a turnaround, “the next step is to have an accurate diagnosis of the organization.” (Goodman, 1982, p. 50)

Maintain district involvement and responsibility: “The research indicates that school districts are central players in effective and sustainable school reform; consequently, efforts to improve schools should incorporate school districts (Archer, 2006a; Dwyer et al., 205; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2003; O’Day & Bitter, 2003; Spillane, 1996, 1997, 1998 as quoted from Rhim, Hassel, & Redding, 2008).” In every example of the successful turnaround schools chronicled by the Center on Innovation and Improvement, district involvement was intensive. In several instances districts stated that what they learned from their efforts was being used to prevent other schools from falling into the same category. (See Brinson & Rhim, 2009)

Concentrate resources on a few, high-leverage strategies to yield the largest effects (Kowal, Hassel, Hassel, & Rhim, 2007): A

targeted focus on the instructional core is a high leverage strategy to improve school performance and the only strategy that can ultimately abet high performance (Elmore, n.d.) Research can guide decisions about what actions inside the instructional core will have the most leverage.

Overall Timeline of Activities with Responsible Parties:

NYSED has set forth a comprehensive, high-quality plan for intervening in the lowest-achieving schools using the four models. Given the complexity of this endeavor and the required support and governance structures, we are providing a detailed timeline outlining our plans below as well as a summary table of related statutory and regulatory conditions, scope of work requirements, and LEA incentives or RFPs. Please note that in the first year of our plan (through December 2010), we will use internal staff and structures to begin supporting LEAs; long term this work will be done by external partners following the completion of state-level RFPs.

- January 2010: NYSED informs LEA that it has schools identified on the Low-performing School List.
- February – March 2010: The newly created Office of Innovative School Models (OISM) begins developing technical assistance for LEAs to prepare them to select one of the four intervention models
- April 2010: State awarded RTTT grant
- April – June 2010: OISM assists districts in completing a diagnostic district-level review
- April 2010: OISM initiates an RFP for lead partners for the turnaround, restart and transformation models; partners selected for pre-approved list in December 2010

- April 2010: OISM initiates the procurement of an external partner to develop and run ETACIT which will provide longer term support to LEAs in implementing intervention models; targeting December 2010 launch
- May –October 2010: OISM assists LEA’s in selecting one of the intervention models and developing an implementation plan for each of their identified schools. Plans will include a proposed timeline for phase-in; district governance structure to oversee implementation, such as an internal turnaround office, a Partnership Zone, or an external lead partner; also includes policies and structures to support intervention in the areas of parent engagement, school scheduling, staffing, faculty incentives and rewards, student enrollment practices, and instructional programs.
- June 2010 – The Office of Accountability, in collaboration with OISM, finalizes metrics and processes to measure implementation progress; will base its annual evaluation of LEA progress, in part, on these metrics
- November 2010: ETACIT partner selected; ETACIT launches
- December 2010: External lead partners selected and pre-approved; ETACIT immediately begins helping school districts select partners for the turnaround, restart, and transformation models
- January 2011 and ongoing: ETACIT, now fully operational, provides technical assistance to districts in collaboration with lead partners on their intervention plans; develops network support for LEA’s implementing school interventions
- February 2011: OISM launches RFP for virtual and blended schools
- February 2011- March 2011: Partnership Zone model launches; districts identified and first cohort of schools selected

- February 2011: After review by OISM and with support from Distinguished Educators and RTTT management Team, LEA plans reviewed and approved by Commissioner for school opening Sept 2011; upon approval implementation begins by LEA with support from lead partners and ETACIT
- March 2011: OISM begins administering the Innovative Secondary School Model Fund to incentivize LEAs to turn around low-performing schools before they are identified by the State for intervention
- April 2011: ETACIT, in coordination with the RTTT management team, facilitates professional development offerings for LEA's in the use of data, results driven school intervention practices, human capital and finance strategies
- April 2011- ongoing annually: Next cohort of LEA low-performing schools identified (for September 2012 re-opening), ETACIT provides assistance in LEA diagnostic and development of comprehensive plan; implement plan with partners and provide professional development as needed. Measure results. Share results and innovative practices.
- April 2011 – system fully operational: Develop plan for reopening RFP for external providers to ensure ongoing innovation and new designs are available and implemented
- April 2011 – September 2011: Launch new Partnership Zone initiative with support from *Mass Insight*
- June 2011 - ongoing annually: the Office of Accountability annually reviews the progress of each LEA and lowest-achieving school, reporting directly to the Commissioner; a persistently lowest-achieving school that fails to make dramatic improvement over the plan period will have its registration revoked and the Commissioner will develop a plan to protect the educational welfare of the children who attended the school and require the LEA to implement it.

NOTE: Currently, New York has several school districts that are planning to replace schools that have been identified on our persistently lowest-performing schools list by opening new small schools in the 2010-11 school year. Since these schools have already been identified through the State’s School Under Registration Review process, we intend to facilitate a process for these districts to move ahead on their current timelines to replace these schools. These school districts have demonstrated they have the necessary local conditions and partner agreements to successfully intervene in the school. As such, the Commissioner will support these LEAs with proven track records that are currently in the planning process to approve their plans in the Spring of 2010 for opening in September 2010.

Strategy Summary Table: Turning around low-performing schools

Recent Regents policy changes specific to Turning Around Lowest-performing Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board of Regents Proposed Methodology for Identification of Persistently Lowest-achieving Schools (December 2009) • Board of Regents Update on School Turnaround/Restart/Closure/Transformation Strategies (December 2009) • Board of Regents Virtual High School Initiative (November 2009)
Participating district requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In schools that have been identified as persistently lowest-achieving, implement one of the four turnaround models outlined in the State Plan and approved by the Commissioner
Funded projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of four intervention models for Low-performing Schools • Development of full-service schools • Development of External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround • Establishment of Office of Innovative School Models • Engagement of external partners to support LEAs in developing and implementing turnaround and transformation models • Development of Mass Insight Lead Partner Model • Development of Virtual Schools and Blended Schools

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of digital learning courses for LEAs • Statewide annual evaluation of innovative school models and school interventions
District RFPs or competitive grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovative Secondary Schools Model Incentive fund

Evidence for (E)(2)

Since 2002, The New York City Department of Education, with the support of NYSED, has been involved in a major reform initiative that incorporates many of the elements of the four school intervention models outlined in Race to the Top. The State's accountability system made NYC's school portfolio management model possible by providing a process by which low-performing schools are identified for improvement and replaced if they do not make gains in achievement. While these improvements have resulted in an overall 10% increase in the graduation rate, no one is satisfied with New York City's results to date and New York City continues to reform its organizational structure to support high-performing schools, intervene in schools at-risk of chronic underperformance, and replace low-performing schools in order to consistently work towards closing the achievement gap for all students.

Significant lessons learned from New York City's experience include: (1) the importance of a thoughtful enrollment plan to ensure that school replacement strategies do not result in extraordinary concentrations of very high needs students in struggling neighboring schools; (2) the critical role intermediary capacity and school leader effectiveness play in the success of replacement schools; and (3) the need for strategies to manage the costs and disruption created by significant staff displacement. A critical role of ETACIT will be to help LEAs thoughtfully anticipate and address these challenges through comprehensive enrollment

strategies, processes to select high-quality intermediaries and to provide turnaround, restart, and transformation school leaders with intensive support (including leveraging the leadership academies described in Section D), and human capital strategies that rely on annual evaluations (that incorporate student growth) to provide differentiated professional development and mentoring. Thus, lessons learned from both NYSED’s and the NYC Department of Education’s efforts have informed New York's RTTT application

Approach Used	# of Schools Since 2004-05	Results and Lessons Learned
<p>New York State Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) Process. (See Appendix_E_2_ii_1)</p> <p>The SURR Process contains many elements of the turnaround, transformation, and closure models. (See Appendix_E_2_ii_1)</p>	66	<p>Out of the 66 schools identified between 2004-05 and 2008-09 (See Appendix_E_2_ii_1, Results of the SURR Process, Table 1, for a annual analysis):</p> <p>28 schools have been removed for an increase in academic improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 schools have been scheduled for removal based on an increase in academic improvement • 8 of the schools have been closed or are phasing out • 16 schools remain on the list. However, 5 of the schools were just identified in 2008-09, and must spend a minimum of 2 years in the SURR process. <p>See Appendix_E_2_ii_1, Table 2, for an analysis of the change in Performance Index in ELA and Math for schools identified for registration review between 2004-2005 and 2008-2009</p> <p>From New York’s experience with the Registration Review process, NYSED has learned that:</p> <p>1) Schools are most often identified as persistently lowest-achieving because the</p>

		<p>schools serve high percentages of high needs students in the district; the schools are under resourced in terms of human capital; and the resources that are available to the school are not utilized optimally; therefore, turnaround strategy must encompass not only individual schools, but also the whole district</p> <p>2) To improve student achievement, persistently lowest-achieving schools must typically address most, if not all, of the following: low academic standards, inadequate instructional leadership, curriculum deficiencies, ineffective instructional methods, many inexperienced teachers, lack of alignment between professional development and staff needs, assessment data not used to plan instruction, inefficient use of time, lack of parent and community involvement, ineffective classroom management practices, lack of strategic social supports and effective college goal setting with students.</p> <p>3) There is no single intervention strategy that works in all situations. Schools and districts vary in their ability to devise effective turnaround strategies and their willingness to implement them. While in some situations intensive technical assistance and support is sufficient, in other cases both the school and the district lack the capacity to develop an effective turnaround strategy. A key decision point, therefore, for the SEA is determining whether its role should be primarily supportive or prescriptive. (See Murphy (2008, p. 349). Brady (2003) in Murphy & Myers (p. 320) who argue, “The specific intervention strategy is not important. What’s important is having the right mix of people, energy, timing, and other elements – particularly school leadership – that together contribute to school success.” (See also Brinson & Rhim, 2009.)</p> <p>4) Building the capacity of districts to support their persistently lowest-achieving schools is a key ingredient to success. (See Fullan, M. (2003). London: Routledge Falmer District must have broad strategy, not just school by school approach. Schools most typically succeed in large part because of effective district support. In some cases, support external to the district may need to be leveraged to assist a school.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>5) It is critical that the school have assistance in coordinating the many and different resources available to them, in the form of a turnaround partner. In no other sector do many organizations have the internal capacity to do turnarounds. It's often considered highly specialized work. (See Murphy & Myers, 2008; Brinson & Rhim, 2009; Hess, 2008).</p> <p>6) It is easy to close schools but much harder to open successor schools that are truly fundamentally better and different than the schools they replace. Merely changing the administration and a significant percentage of a school's staff will not, in itself, typically engender dramatic school improvement.</p> <p>7) The gains that schools that are transformed make are often fragile. It takes continued sustained support to ensure that changes in the school's culture become institutionalized. (See Hess, 1999); and, after schools improve performance, it's critical that they have viable transition plans to avoid relapse into performance patterns that initially led to intervention.</p> <p>8) When a school must close and be replaced, phasing out the school and replacing it with a school that phases in over time has several advantages over either abruptly closing the school or turning the management of the school over to an external entity. The phase-in, phase out model engenders less community opposition, permits the new school to grow slowly and organically, and allows for a better and more rational allocation of resources.</p> <p>9) Districts must consider all policies that impact on school choice, enrollment and student transfers, and, as mentioned above, must therefore consider both school and district-wide strategy for turning around low-performing schools</p> <p>NYSED will use what it has learned from the SURR process, especially as it relates to the replacement of schools to assist in implementing the RTTT requirements.</p>

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
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models will be initiated each year.	39 SURR schools	15	35	7	

New York has identified 57 persistently-lowest-achieving schools. Serving as our baseline year are the 39 schools currently under registration review. These schools are not included in our list of persistently low-achieving schools but are engaging in a process similar to the transformation, turnaround and closure models as described in Appendix_E_2_ii_1.

We anticipate that the majority of the 57 schools identified as low-performing will use 2010-2011 as a planning year to engage in diagnostic work to develop an overall approach to their portfolio of schools before opening redesigned schools in September of 2011. However, we have estimated that as many as 15 schools may be ready to open in September 2010. Additionally, a few districts may not have the capacity to start all the schools by 2011 and as such, we anticipate that a small number of schools, up to 7, may not be fully redesigned and ready for opening until Sept 2012.

As noted earlier, the methodologies for identification of schools for registration review and for persistently lowest-achieving status as defined by RTTT are similar, but not identical. To begin the process of aligning these two programs, schools identified for registration review this coming year will be a subset of those schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving. Thus schools on

the State's SURR list, but not on the persistently lowest-achieving list will simply continue to implement their SURR corrective action plans or, in some cases, their plans to close or phase out the school. Additionally, NYSED will continue its responsibility of identifying new schools each year for SIG purposes. In the coming months, the Board of Regents will be asked to adopt amendments that ensure full alignment between the SURR and persistently lowest - achieving designations.

(F) General (55 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(F)(1) Making education funding a priority (10 points)

The extent to which—

- (i) The percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008; and
- (ii) The State's policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(1)(i):

- Financial data to show whether and to what extent expenditures, as a percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice), increased, decreased, or remained the same.

Evidence for (F)(1)(ii):

- Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

(F)(1)(i) Financial data to show whether and to what extent expenditures, as a percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice), increased, decreased, or remained the same.

Data Sources:

Figures in \$ Millions	All Funds Receipts			Cash Disbursements by Function, State Funds								MOE Percent
	Taxes	Misc. Receipts	Total	School Aid	School Aid - Medicaid Assistance	STAR Property Tax Relief	Special Education Categorical Programs	City University of New York	State University of New York	State University Construction Fund	Total	
2007-08 Adjusted	60,871	19,643	80,514	18,903	80	4,657	1,017	1,105	5,938	15	31,715	39.4%
2008-09 Actual	60,337	20,064	80,401	20,603	106	4,435	1,041	1,071	6,278	16	33,550	41.7%

New York State Mid-Year Financial Plan Update 2008-09 through 2011-12, October 28, 2008, pp. T-23, T-219

New York State Mid-Year Financial Plan Update 2009-10 through 2012-13, October 30, 2009, pp. T-23, 140

F(1)(ii) a)

New York State adopted a new approach to funding education, referred to as Foundation Aid, in 2007-08. Once fully phased in, Foundation Aid will result in equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other school districts. The goal is to reallocate State funds in a way that contributes most effectively to improved educational results in school districts serving the highest concentrations of students in need of extra time and help.

The determination of high-need school districts in New York State is complementary, but different, from the federal definition of high need LEA. The *Need Resource Capacity* of a school district is the measure of the district’s relative need, based on free and reduced price lunch data and census poverty data, in relation to the resource capacity that exists within a district. In other words, this approach assesses pupil need in relation to a district’s ability to raise revenues locally to address those needs.

There were 204 districts in New York State identified as high-need school districts as of November 2009. These include New York City; the “Big 4” cities of Buffalo, Rochester, Yonkers and Syracuse; 45 High-Need Urban-Suburban districts, and 154 High-Need Rural districts. The following table, using 2008-09 data, displays the number of districts and schools, including charter schools, in each *Need Resource Capacity* category; the student enrollment and percent of total enrollment in each category; and the percent share of total aid. It shows that high-need school districts and charter schools enroll 54.5 percent of students and receive 66.6 percent of aid.

Need Resource Capacity Category	Number of Districts	Number of Schools, including Charters	Enrollment	% of Total Enrollment	% Share of Aid
1. High Need: New York City	1	1,547	983,759	36.6	39.2
2. High Need: Big 4 cities (Buffalo, Rochester, Yonkers, Syracuse)	4	216	114,823	4.3	7.3
3. High Need Urban/Suburban	45	349	205,335	7.6	10.9
4. High Need Rural	154	406	160,831	6.0	9.2

5. Average Need	356	1,481	826,299	30.7	27.2
6. Low Need	134	616	400,397	14.8	6.2
Total	694	4,615	2,691,444	100	100

The Foundation Aid formula consolidated approximately 30 existing aid programs. It is based on the cost of educating students in successful school districts, while adjusting for district-specific pupil need and regional cost differences.

$$\text{State Aid} = [\text{Cost of adequate education} \times \text{pupil need} \times \text{regional cost}] - \text{expected local contribution}$$

This approach defines aid irrespective of decisions by districts on how much to spend and aligns funding to the cost of educating children.

The underlying principles of Foundation Aid are:

1. Adequacy— A foundation amount assesses the cost of an adequate education and effectively distributes funds across school districts to ensure adequate resources provide all students with the opportunity for acceptable achievement. Adequacy is defined as the resources needed to provide all students with the opportunity to meet a given level of achievement, which in New York State is assessed by the Board of Regents learning standards for elementary and secondary education.
2. Equity—Funding equalizes differences in the fiscal capacity between high-need school districts and average to low-need school districts and incorporates the level of student need and regional cost differences in assessing required levels of local effort. An *expected local contribution*—calculated based on each district’s actual property value per pupil, and adjusted by income per pupil—represents the fair local share from each district, based on its ability to pay. The *regional cost index* measures relative purchasing power of different regions around the State. The *pupil needs index* reflects the amount of cumulative pupil need in each district—including the number of students in poverty, English language learners and a measure of school district geographic sparseness—to ensure that districts have the resources to educate students who require

extra time and help to succeed. Funds to support students with disabilities are calculated separately.

3. Accountability—NYSED gives greater flexibility to districts with acceptable student achievement and works most closely with districts not yet meeting State standards. This approach ensures the most efficient and effective use of State resources.

b) State policies lead to equitable funding within LEAs, between high-poverty schools and other schools

In 2007, the same year that the foundation formula commenced, New York allocated an historic increase in funding for education making a commitment to a multi-year phase-in of full funding. High need LEAs benefited from C4E and under the phase-in will continue to benefit from additional increases.

To ensure that the funding increase went hand in hand with increased accountability, the Spitzer/Paterson administration implemented the Contracts for Excellence initiative (C4E). Under Education Law section 211-d, those school districts which received a significant increase in Foundation Aid in 2007-2008 – a ten percent increase or a total of \$15 million or more, whichever is less, or received a substantial aid increase through a supplemental educational improvement plan grant and that also had one or more schools in accountability status (schools in need of improvement, corrective action, restructuring, or the state law equivalent) were required to enter into a contract with NYSED to improve student achievement by implementing research-based programs. Performance targets were set based on the results that were expected due to the increased funding. There were 56 C4E districts in the first year, including the Big 5 cities and several mostly high need districts. School districts were required to allocate a pro rata share of State funds to those schools in improvement status which served students with the greatest needs, as defined by poverty, low achievement, English Language Learner status and disabilities. In other words, high poverty schools within districts received a need-weighted allocation based on student need. The pro rata share by school could only be waived by NYSED staff if data demonstrated that student achievement levels were acceptable or significant funds from other sources were already targeted to the

school.

Due to the economic crisis within the State, the phase-in of the Foundation Aid formula has been delayed. The Governor is committed to continuing the C4E program in order to ensure that low-performing districts, which received considerable resources in 2007 and 2008, target those additional resources predominately to students in schools with the greatest educational needs.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools *(40 points)*

The extent to which—

- (i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;
- (ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;
- (iii) The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;
- (iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than

those applied to traditional public schools; and

(v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(2)(i):

- A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- The number of charter schools allowed under State law and the percentage this represents of the total number of schools in the State.
- The number and types of charter schools currently operating in the State.

Evidence for (F)(2)(ii):

- A description of the State's approach to charter school accountability and authorization, and a description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- For each of the last five years:
 - The number of charter school applications made in the State.
 - The number of charter school applications approved.
 - The number of charter school applications denied and reasons for the denials (academic, financial, low enrollment, other).
 - The number of charter schools closed (including charter schools that were not reauthorized to operate).

Evidence for (F)(2)(iii):

- A description of the State's applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- A description of the State's approach to charter school funding, the amount of funding passed through to charter schools per student, and how those amounts compare with traditional public school per-student funding allocations.

Evidence for (F)(2)(iv):

- A description of the State’s applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- A description of the statewide facilities supports provided to charter schools, if any.

Evidence for (F)(2)(v):

- A description of how the State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages

F(2)(i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State

Article 56 of New York’s Education Law does include a cap on the number of charter schools that may be formed, other than charter schools formed by conversion of an existing public school, but such cap does not prohibit or effectively limit the number of high-performing charter schools in the state. Education Law §2852(9) limits the number of charters, other than conversions of public schools, that may be issued by the various charter entities. The current limit is 200, with 100 allocated to SUNY and 100 to the Board of Regents and local boards of education. In addition to the 200 charter schools, any public school in the State, with the approval of the parents of a majority of students then enrolled, may be converted to a charter school pursuant to Education Law §2851(3), and any conversion of an existing charter school is specifically excluded from the cap by Education Law §2852(9).

As of the 2009-10 school year-to-date, New York has 140 charter schools currently operating (with an additional 14 charter schools approved to begin operating in 2010-2011 or later). Of that number, 6 are conversions of existing public schools. In 2009-2010, there are 4,540 public schools other than charter schools. New York law does not differentiate between charter schools by type, except that a charter school that converts from an existing public school, under Education Law § 2854(3)(b), has employees remain in the negotiating unit of the school district upon conversion. Pursuant to Education Law §2852(9), therefore, the total number of

charter schools that currently may form in New York are 4,540 conversion charter schools plus 200 non-conversion charter schools, or 4,740. This represents approximately 104 percent of the total schools in the state that are allowed to be charter schools.

Article 56 of the Education Law does not otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools in grades kindergarten through 12. New York's funding mechanism provides for a per-student charter school basic tuition, which does not limit the number of charter schools by limiting the share of State or local funds that can go to charter schools. Under Education Law §2854(2) (b), any student who is qualified by law to attend a public school is qualified to attend a charter school. New York's charter school law does not contain any restrictions on the number, percent or demographics of students who may be enrolled in charter schools. Charter schools are not restricted to operating in specific geographic areas, though Education Law §2852(9) reserved a portion of the increase in the cap made in 2007 to charter schools in New York City.

.See Appendix F_2_i_1 for New York's Charter School Law in relevant part (Education Law Article 56).

(F)(2)(ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools

New York has a rigorous approval, monitoring, and reauthorization process. The strength of New York's process was recognized in the Charter Schools Monitoring Report prepared by WestEd in June 2009 on behalf of US E.D. WestEd found that New York's "consistent focused attention on its grant and charter school objectives guides its program implementation and helps drive the creation of high-quality charter schools in the State." They also reported that "monitoring and performance is another strong point in New York's Charter Schools Program. Oversight of charter schools for both program compliance and performance is exceptionally comprehensive, rigorous, and persistent."

In a January 2010 report, the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools ranked New York second in the nation for its charter quality control policies, including its provisions for performance-based charter contracts; comprehensive charter school monitoring and data collection processes; and clear processes for renewal, non-renewal, and revocation decisions. The report also cited New York as a leader in providing charter autonomy. In 2006, the same organization noted that "SUNY has been a particularly effective authorizer. It has taken its authorizing duties seriously—both in approving and in overseeing charters—and has not been afraid to close charters that haven't lived up to their promises."

Education Law §2851(2) establishes detailed application requirements, including a required description of student achievement goals and the methods of evaluating whether students have achieved such goals. Under Education Law §2852(2), a charter entity may only approve an application upon certain specified findings, which include whether the charter school is in compliance with law, whether the applicant can demonstrate the ability to operate the school in an educationally and fiscally sound manner and whether granting the application is likely to improve student learning and achievement. Appendix F_2_ii_1 shows, for each of the past 5 years, the number of charter school applications made, approved and denied.

Upon approval by a charter entity, a charter agreement is entered into, and for a charter entity other than the Board of Regents, the proposed charter must be submitted to the Board of Regents for review (Education Law §2852(5), (5-a) and (5-b)). If the Board of Regents approves the charter, or the charter is deemed approved by operation of law, the new charter school is formed for a term of up to 5 years (see Education Law 2853(1)(a)). A charter may be renewed for a period of up to 5 years (Education Law §2851(4)), provided the charter entity makes the same findings required for a new charter school. Upon renewal, the applicant is required (Education Law §2851(4)) to submit additional information, including a report of the progress of the charter school in meeting its educational objectives, including its record of student achievement.

There are numerous provisions in Article 56 relating to accountability. The Board of Regents and any other charter entity that approved the charter are required by Education Law §2853(2) to exercise oversight sufficient to ensure the charter school is in compliance with law and its charter, and both the Regents and the other charter entities are given authority to visit, examine and inspect each charter school. Education Law §2853(2-a) affords the school district in which the charter school is located the power to visit, examine and inspect the charter school.

Charter schools are required by Education Law §2857(2) to submit an Annual Report to the charter entity and the Board of Regents. Part of the required Annual Report is a Charter School Report Card, which must include measures of the academic and fiscal performance of the school, including graduation rates, dropout rates, student performance on standardized tests and college entry rates. Finally, charter schools are required by Education Law §2851(2)(f) to have annual programmatic and fiscal audits comparable to those required of other public schools, and the annual fiscal audit must be submitted with the Annual Report.

Education Law §2855(1) authorizes the charter entity or the Board of Regents to revoke or terminate the charter on certain specified grounds including: (i) when the charter school's outcomes on student assessments fall below the level that would allow the Commissioner to revoke the registration of another public school and student achievement has not improved over the preceding 3 years; (ii) serious violations of law, and (iii) material and substantial violation of the charter, including fiscal mismanagement. In addition, Education Law §2855(3) gives the charter entity or the Board of Regents authority to place a charter school in probationary status to allow implementation of a remedial action plan (corrective action), and provides that failure of the charter school to comply with that remedial action plan may result in summary revocation of the charter. Appendix F_2_ii_1 contains a chart showing the NYS charter schools that were closed and the reasons therefore. A number of charter schools have either been placed on corrective action or probation, or have been given renewals shorter than 5 years in response to deficiencies.

Thus, educational soundness and student achievement are required factors to be considered upon formation or renewal of the charter of a charter school, and poor academic performance is one of the grounds upon which a charter may be revoked.

Article 56 includes provisions that encourage the formation of charter schools that serve student populations similar to those of the local school district, including high-need students. Education Law §2854(2)(a) specifically requires charter schools to demonstrate good faith efforts to attract and retain a greater enrollment of SWDs and ELLs than the school district in which it is located. Education Law §2854(2)(a) authorizes the formation of charter schools designed to provide expanded learning opportunities to students at-risk of academic failure, and thus the establishment of admissions criteria encouraging admission of at-risk students. Education Law §2852(2) encourages charter entities to give preferences to applications that demonstrate the capability to provide comprehensive learning experiences to students at-risk of academic failure. As a result, New York charter schools do serve high-need students. In the case of students living in poverty, for example, a total of 23,072 students eligible for a Free or Reduced Lunch were reported, representing 75% of all students attending a State charter school in 2007-08. This compared to 45% of students statewide eligible for Free or Reduced lunch.

The strength of New York's charter school authorizing process is evidenced by our robust charter school outcomes, particularly in New York City. As mentioned previously, a study by Stanford University economist Caroline Hoxby showed that charter school students are more likely to be proficient in math and reading than students in the nearest comparable public school. Overall, charter students have proficiency rates that are 5.2 percent higher than their public school counterparts in reading and 3.2 percent higher in math. Further, Hoxby's study shows that charter school students' gains in academic achievement, relative to their public-school peers, tend to increase as the charter schools mature. Subsequently, a report issued by the Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO), also at Stanford University, found that charter schools in New York City are demonstrating significantly better results for their students in reading and in math than their traditional public school counterparts. These trends were consistent

for students overall, as well as for several key groups, including Blacks and Hispanics in both subjects, for students who had not previously done well in traditional public schools, for students in poverty in reading, for students enrolled for at least two years or more in reading, and for all students in math regardless of how long they were enrolled.²¹

The success of New York State's charter school initiative is also reflected in the State's success in attracting some of the highest performing charter operators in the country, including KIPP (in both New York City and Albany), Achievement First (in New York City), and Uncommon Schools (in New York City, Rochester, and Troy), and some of the most innovative charter models in the country, such as the Harlem Children's Zone schools.

(F)(2)(iii)-- The State's charter schools receive equitable funding as compared to traditional public schools.

New York's primary funding mechanism for charter schools is through mandated tuition payments by school districts. Education Law §2856(1) requires that public school districts with resident students attending charter schools pay a per pupil tuition amount (the "charter school basic tuition") to the charter school for each of these students. That per-pupil amount is based on a computation designed to ensure that the district provides charter school pupils with an amount equivalent to the school district's per-pupil operating expenditures on instructionally-related activities (see Appendix F_2_iii_1).

The charter school tuition formula is based upon the school district's operating expenditures rather than the revenue source, and reflects expenditures supported by both State aid and local taxes for public school students. The key definition in computing charter school basic tuition is that of approved operating expense (AOE). AOE includes instructional expenditures, but excludes, among other things, transportation and capital expenses, cafeteria and school lunch expenses and most expenditures supported by Federal funds. AOE includes many types of expenditures that charter schools are not required to make; such as costs of providing special

²¹ PR Newswire, Stanford: NYC Charter Schools Providing Significantly Better Results in Reading, Math

education services, textbooks and other services and materials to students attending nonpublic schools, and costs of school health services. As described in Appendix F_2_iii_1 school districts are required to provide a range of services to charter schools in addition to payment of charter school tuition. Beyond the charter school basic tuition, New York's charter schools are eligible to receive Charter School Stimulus Funds from the State (see (F)(2)(iv) below).

In addition, charter schools are considered local educational agencies (LEAs) as defined in 20 U.S.C. §7801(26), and thus may apply as LEAs for awards under the ESEA or other Federal funding sources that use the ESEA definition and for the school lunch and school breakfast programs. Also, Federal IDEA Part B funding attributable to a student with disability (SWD) must be paid by the school district to a charter school that opts to provide special education to such students. Since 1999, New York has been awarded \$56,161,991 from the Federal Charter Schools Program for grants to charter schools. Thus, New York charter schools are eligible to receive a commensurate share of Federal funds.

By linking charter school basic tuition to operating expenditures and requiring that a variety of services be provided to charter school students at school district expense, New York's funding scheme provides equitable funding as compared to traditional public schools.

(F)(2)(iv)-- The State provides funding for facilities, assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities and other supports

New York supports charter schools in obtaining facilities in a variety of ways, though funding dedicated solely to facilities costs is not currently available. The charter school basic tuition may be used to pay lease expenses and other facilities costs. In addition, the New York State Charter Schools Stimulus Fund (described in more detail in Appendix F_2_iv_1) provides grants for the development, implementation and operation of charter schools, including start-up costs and costs associated with the acquisition,

renovation or construction of charter school facilities.

Education Law §2853(3)(a) provides that charter schools may be located in part of an existing public school building, in space provided on a private work site, in a public building or in any other suitable location. Education Law §2853(4)(c) provides that charter schools may contract with a school district or the governing body of a public college or university for the use of a school building and grounds. Any such contract must provide such services or facilities at cost. There are currently 65 charter schools located in space leased from public schools or public universities. The New York City School District, in which approximately 64% of the State's charter schools are located (99 of 154 charter schools), actively assists charter schools with obtaining facilities as described in Appendix F_2_iv_1)

The NYS Office of General Services annually publishes a list of vacant and unused state buildings and portions of state buildings which may be suitable for the operation of a charter school (see Education Law §2853(3)(c)). Upon request, a school district is required to make available a similar list of vacant and unused school buildings within the district, including private school buildings, which may be suitable for a charter school. Charter schools are also eligible to participate in energy improvement programs funded by the NYS Energy Research and Development Authority, such as the Not-For-Profit Energy Incentive Program pursuant to 9 N.Y.C.R.R. §§7920.1-7920.11.

Pursuant to Education Law §2853(1)(d), charter schools have authority to issue corporate bonds, which are tax exempt. As LEAs, they are eligible to apply to participate in Federal school bond programs, including Qualified Zone Academy Bonds and Qualified School Construction Bonds. These programs provide interest free borrowing to LEAs and result in a higher proportion of overall project funding to be devoted to actual brick and mortar construction instead of incidental costs. New York applicants are ranked based on their student eligibility for the federal free and reduced price lunch program. Charter schools often serve low wealth, high

poverty populations and therefore should rank highly among applicants providing a greater opportunity to access interest free bonding programs.

As described more fully in Appendix F_2_iv_1, there also are situations in which a charter school may indirectly benefit from school district bonding for school construction. In addition, the Regents have supported and continue to support legislation to afford charter schools access to financing of school construction through bonds issued by the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York, a state public authority with expertise in financing construction for school districts, BOCES and other educational institutions.

Pursuant to Education Law §2853(3)(a), for purposes of local zoning and building code compliance, a charter school is treated as a nonpublic school. Since they apply to private facilities, the requirements are generally less restrictive than those for traditional public school facilities. Education Law §2854(1)(b) also requires charter schools to comply with the same health and safety requirements as public schools.

Pursuant to Education Law §2853(1)(d), charter schools have authority to issue corporate bonds, which are tax exempt. As LEAs, they are eligible to apply to participate in Federal school bond programs, including Qualified Zone Academy Bonds and Qualified School Construction Bonds. These programs provide interest free borrowing to LEAs and result in a higher proportion of overall project funding to be devoted to actual brick and mortar construction instead of incidental costs. New York applicants are ranked based on their student eligibility for the federal free and reduced price lunch program. Charter schools often serve low wealth, high poverty populations and therefore should rank highly among applicants providing a greater opportunity to access interest free bonding programs.

As described more fully in Appendix F_2_iv_1, there also are situations in which a charter school may indirectly benefit from school district bonding for school construction. In addition, the Regents have supported and continue to support legislation to afford

charter schools access to financing of school construction through bonds issued by the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York, a state public authority with expertise in financing construction for school districts, BOCES and other educational institutions.

Pursuant to Education Law §2853(3)(a), for purposes of local zoning and building code compliance, a charter school is treated as a nonpublic school. Since they apply to private facilities, the requirements are generally less restrictive than those for traditional public school facilities. Education Law §2854(1)(b) also requires charter schools to comply with the same health and safety requirements as public schools.

In addition, New York State is committed to exploring public/private partnerships to provide highly leveraged uses of capital to support its aggressive reform agenda. NY endeavors to drive innovation to create high quality and results-oriented education opportunities for all youth.

As noted in Sections A and E, New York has strong network of school reform partners. They have demonstrated results across the state and want to expand. NYSED seeks to provide credit enhancement to support high quality charter schools and innovative school models across NY State, to be matched by other funders. If a match could be successfully negotiated, proportionate reductions in other RTTT investments would be used to fund the State's portion of the match up to \$10 million (Please see appendix F_2_iv_2: Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Letter Re: Charter Facilities Financing).

Specifically, New York State may leverage opportunities to develop a charter school facilities credit enhancement program, similar to what was established by Texas Governor Perry and Education Commissioner Scott established in May of 2009.

NYSED would identify public sources of funds as potential reserves to support credit enhancement for high quality charter school facilities and innovative school models across the state. In the short term, this credit enhancement program could enable high-

performing charter operators in NY to reduce interest payments on facilities debt, provide students in those schools with adequate facilities, and enable the strongest networks to expand to more sites. In the long term, this program could create a public mechanism for financing other types of next-generation models.

(F)(2)(v)-- The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools

The board of education of each school district has authority to prescribe the course of study, employ teachers and other staff, exercise budgetary control and otherwise exercise the superintendence, management and control of the school district (e.g., Education Law §§1709(3), (16) and (33); 1718(1); 1720(1); 2022(1) and (4)). Some board decisions are non-delegable, but New York law generally leaves it to the discretion of the board of education to determine how much autonomy to grant to a school within the school district in exercising its authority under Education Law §1709(33) to manage and control the school district.

A leading example of an innovative approach to public education is the Tech Valley Regional Technology Institute, a joint program of two BOCES that was authorized by special State legislation (see Appendix F_2_v_1) and provides a grades 9-12 high school course of instruction dedicated to providing expanded learning opportunities in technology and the core academic subjects required for issuance of a high school diploma. The Institute's mission is to engage students in rigorous and enriching educational experiences focused on emerging technologies, project-based learning and collaboration and to provide such experiences through linkages with high-tech businesses that will foster a direct connection between student learning and real world experience in advanced technical facilities. The Institute is established as a corporate entity separate from the two BOCES, though its governing board is appointed by the two BOCES. The Institute's governing board is given authority to employ its own joint officers and employees, determine the curriculum, determine the school calendar and daily schedule and adopt its budget, subject to approval of the BOCES. The Institute is given flexibility to contract with private and for-profit and not-for-profit entities to carry out its supplemental innovative technological activities. Students receive their high school diplomas through their school districts of

residence. The Institute is financed through a combination of State aid and funding from school districts of residence, in the same manner as other BOCES programs.

Another example of a school district allowing the formation of innovative, autonomous open enrollment public schools is the New York City Department of Education's *Children First* initiative (See Appendix F_2_v_1 for a fuller description), which affords school principals flexibility in allocating resources, selecting staff, and implementing instructional strategies. This initiative is supported by Article 52-A of the Education Law (See Appendix F_2_v_1). Additionally, CUNY has the authority to run up to five high schools. Although SUNY does not currently run any schools directly, it has the authority to do so and is a candidate for managing schools identified in Section E.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions (5 points)

The extent to which the State, in addition to information provided under other State Reform Conditions Criteria, has created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(3):

- A description of the State's other applicable key education laws, statutes, regulations, or relevant legal documents.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

New York State's educational system provides the most complete, interconnected network of educational services in the United

States all under the guidance and direction of the Board of Regents, who under Education Law §§ 101 and 102 serve as the governing board of the University of the State of New (USNY), and the Commissioner of Education, who is also appointed as the President of the University of the State of New York (USNY) in accordance with 8 NYCRR §§ 3.5 and 3.6. Pursuant to Education Law §214, USNY encompasses all secondary and higher education institutions incorporated in the State and all libraries, museums, schools, cultural education institutions and other education institutions which are incorporated by the Board of Regents or admitted to USNY. Under Education Law §216 the Regents incorporate or charter museums, libraries, colleges and universities and other educational institutions, and no such institutions can be incorporated under other laws without the consent of the Regents or the Commissioner. As a result, USNY provides a unique, indeed extraordinary, opportunity to employ a large number of institutions to solve problems of education reform and innovation in order to increase student achievement and graduation rates, narrow achievement gaps, or pursue other important outcomes. As such, USNY is uniquely situated to enact conditions favorable to education reform. A broad based panel of leaders from across USNY, recently convened to broaden the range of opportunities for collaboration, recommended, “more cooperation, better cooperation and funding cooperation.”

One example of successful partnerships among USNY entities involves the New York State Museum after school program in Albany. The New York State Museum has two innovative after-school programs for Albany City youth that have transformed the lives of nearly 7,000 urban students since its inception. Housed in the unique environment of a natural history museum, the Museum Club offers academic support, mentoring, and hands-on enrichment activities to students. Participating students’ grades improve an average of 10-15% during their first year of participation, and the longer children are in the program, the more their grades improve. The success of the Museum Club inspired students to want to remain in the program beyond middle school (when the program initially ended) and the Discovery Squad teen program was created. This work-based mentoring program is designed for underserved urban teens and offers an extended network of tutoring, academic help, college visits and support services. Teens

receive a stipend for working in the various departments of the museum and mentor younger students. Grades and school attendance are monitored. The Discovery Squad participants have a 100 percent high school graduation rate, as compared to about 60 percent in the district, and 93 percent of these graduates attend college.

Another example of partnerships among USNY entities is the collaboration of the Buffalo City School District and The University of Buffalo. As explained in section F(1)(ii), Chapter 57 of the New York State Laws of 2007 reformed the State's method of allocating resources to school districts. In addition to providing most school districts with a significant infusion of State aid, Chapter 57 also requires selected school districts to develop Contracts for Excellence (C4E), a comprehensive approach to targeting fiscal resources towards specific programs proven to raise the achievement of students with the greatest educational need. The Buffalo City School District collaborated with the University of Buffalo to evaluate gains in student achievement attributed to one of the programs funded through C4E, an extended learning program requiring summer school attendance for struggling students. In the first year of the program, 2007-08, there were 56 participating districts. Since the beginning of the program 21 districts have made sufficient academic progress to leave the program by achieving good standing for all district schools for at least two consecutive years. Based on current law another seven C4E districts will soon make sufficient academic progress to have all their schools in good standing. The University of Buffalo evaluation has demonstrated the benefits of these C4E programs, helping to create advocacy for their continuation and expansion.

Funding secured through *Race to the Top* will help to focus the tremendous opportunities within USNY and engage its members in additional transformational approaches to address major education reform areas for improving student achievement, reducing the achievement gap and raising graduation rates. Three examples of the opportunities that USNY presents are:

Providing universal access to libraries, museums, archives and other cultural institutions is an important strategy for minimizing the gaps in educational opportunities and experiential learning. The Office of Cultural Education (OCE) is

comprised of New York State Research Library, Museum, Archives and Public Broadcasting. In addition to its collection stewardship and public programs, OCE administers chartering, technical assistance, program coordination and grant and aid programs serving 7,000 public and academic libraries and 73 library systems; museums, historical societies, zoos, aquaria, botanical gardens, science centers, and other similar organizations; 26 public radio and television stations; 3,000 historical records repositories and 4,500 local government units. The OCE also operates the Talking Book and Braille Library (TBBL), which provides reading material (books in Braille and recorded media) to over 54,000 eligible readers, who are visually impaired, physically disabled or learning disabled.

IHEs provide extensive support to schools and students, especially through opportunities for middle and high school students to interact with colleges and take courses that carry college credit as well as high school credit. This is one of New York's strongest and most successful reform efforts. New York has a 35-year history of encouraging cooperation between LEAs and IHEs. The oldest early college high school in the State has been in operation since 1974. This year, NYSED received a \$6 million grant from the Gates Foundation to support the development of 11 early college high schools, statewide serving more than 2,700 students, operated by LEAs in cooperation with IHEs. Existing early college high schools are operated by CUNY colleges and by private IHEs (e.g., Bard College). In 2007, more than 60,000 high school students benefited from cooperation between LEAs and IHEs: CUNY's College Now program served more than 30,000 students in 230 New York City public high schools; Another 30,000 high school students, statewide, took college credit courses from SUNY campuses that year. Programs such as the 23-year old NYSED-administered Science and Technology Entry Program's (collaborations between IHEs and LEAs) and the NYSED-administered Liberty Partnerships Program (55 IHEs collaborate with LEAs to provide comprehensive pre-college drop-out prevention services to at-risk middle and high school students) effectively raise graduation rates and college enrollment rates of participants above statewide averages.

Transforming Teaching and Learning and School Leadership. Within NYSED the Office of Higher Education (OHE) recommends and implements higher education policies, provides oversight, monitors the quality of the State's higher education system, and promotes access to higher education for all New York State citizens. The State's Higher Education system encompasses 270 colleges and universities and 246 non-degree proprietary schools. OHE manages the licensing and certification of teachers; coordinates the State's efforts to ensure standards for academic excellence and performance in higher education; implements the statutory requirements that protect the educational and financial interest of students attending New York State institutions; and administers a variety of grant programs that provide access to higher education for those individuals who are underrepresented and under-served. Collaborations between higher education and elementary and secondary education, with assistance from museums, libraries and public broadcasting stations will be critical in transforming the teaching, learning and school leadership necessary to close student achievement gaps and promote excellence in learning.

COMPETITION PRIORITIES

Priority 1: Absolute Priority -- Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

To meet this priority, the State's application must comprehensively and coherently address all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that the State and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The State must demonstrate in its application sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans; and it must describe how the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It is assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority.

Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority -- Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). (15 points, all or nothing)

To meet this priority, the State's application must have a high-quality plan to address the need to (i) offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering; (ii) cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other STEM-capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students; and (iii) prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

The competitive preference priority will be evaluated in the context of the State's entire application. Therefore, a State that is responding to this priority should address it throughout the application, as appropriate, and provide a summary of its approach to

addressing the priority in the text box below. The reviewers will assess the priority as part of their review of a State's application and determine whether it has been met.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: One page

The New York State Department of Education has embedded a strong commitment to the development of STEM strategies throughout our proposal. The Board of Regents and Commissioner have committed to an expanded and deepened statewide approach to STEM which will be led by the Senior Deputy Commissioner and the RTTT Management Office. Our STEM strategy incorporates current school programs and strategies with recommendations from the following regional and national initiatives: The Opportunity Equation - Transforming Mathematics and Science Education for Citizenship and the Global Economy; Report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York-Institute for Advanced Study Commission on Mathematics and Science Education (2009) and; Recommended actions for Governors and States and The Empire State STEM Education Progressive Dialogue, led by Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI), which resulted in the input of over 500 stakeholders across all regions of New York State including over 40 Businesses.

Based on these goals our plan incorporates the following STEM strategies into the four assurance sections:

- Enhanced Standards and Assessments
 - Implement the new Common Core math standards
 - Revise New York's science standards and assessments (join consortium once establish)
 - Establish new standards and assessments in technology
 - Provide aligned curriculum frameworks for STEM
- Great Teachers and School Leaders
 - Develop new innovative human capital strategies that will strengthen all supports for the recruitment, pre-service,

induction and promotion of STEM teachers and leaders

- Provide financial incentives for STEM teachers in high needs schools
- Strengthen partnerships with science-rich institutions; use those partnerships to open new learning opportunities for educators
- Promote professional learning that engages teachers in data analysis, identification of students' differentiated learning needs, and assessment of school-level interventions as well as hold school leaders accountable for this progress
- Invest in sophisticated online professional development systems that facilitate learning communities and cyber learning by teachers, along with research to enable the improvement of those systems
- Data Systems
 - Develop a robust P-20 data system that will link teacher assessment to student learning, allow students and families to track progress to college and beyond, facilitate research and development opportunities and knowledge management for the enhancement of STEM strategies and alignment to college achievement
- Low Performing Schools
 - Support innovation and development in STEM school models and school operational and structural design.
 - Strengthen partnerships with science-rich institutions; use those partnerships to establish the New York State Virtual Schools
 - Set targets and goals to increase achievement, particularly for historically underperforming groups in Science and Mathematics and aggressively address the turnaround of low performing schools

New York State Education Department has proven its commitment both to a broad community engagement strategy and the central role that STEM plays in our reform efforts by embedding these strategies in all areas of this proposal. In addition, the State has

already engaged in multiple program innovations, human capital investments and broad based partnership work that furthers this agenda

Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes *(not scored)*

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications that include practices, strategies, or programs to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (prekindergarten through third grade) by enhancing the quality of preschool programs. Of particular interest are proposals that support practices that (i) improve school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive); and (ii) improve the transition between preschool and kindergarten.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

The success of students in high school in large part rests with the strength of the educational component in a student's early learning years. The first steps of P-12 education, prekindergarten and kindergarten, must be a required and accessible segment of the P-12 data system. Early childhood standards and corresponding curriculum must be appropriate and rigorous and built for our children's future. Assessment protocols and data systems must be developed so that instruction in early childhood settings can be of high quality and ensure a child's readiness for school. The service delivery system for early learning is diverse and extremely varied in New York. A system of technical assistance, embedded professional development, and accountability will be developed to address the same. New York State will build school readiness and seamless transitions between preschool and kindergarten by building on current initiative and policies.

- New York State will take a leadership role in establishing world-class internationally benchmarked early learning standards for

prekindergarten

- Build upon current draft of prekindergarten standards by benchmarking to international standards and by using expert specialists in content areas
- Link prekindergarten standards with revised ELA/ELL kindergarten – 12 standards
- Ensure that 21st century skills (e.g. social/emotional, technology, second languages) are embedded in prekindergarten standards
- Use prekindergarten standards to align our on-going work with state agencies responsible for other child care settings and incorporate into the Quality Rating System and birth to age 3 standards
- Develop a comprehensive assessment protocol and data system based on prekindergarten – kindergarten standards
 - Develop an assessment system consisting of screening, on-going progress monitoring (formative) and outcome assessment for prekindergarten and kindergarten across all settings
 - Develop a data system for prekindergarten, linked to the kindergarten – 12 data system which would incorporate community based organizations, Head Start, and all other eligible providers of prekindergarten
- Develop a comprehensive system of early childhood technical assistance, professional development, and accountability
 - Develop a multi-dimensional early childhood course to be embedded in the current on-line academy developed under Reading First
 - Develop a self-monitoring tool for districts to assess the effectiveness of their prekindergarten to kindergarten transitions.
Components of the self-monitoring tool would include:
 - Consistency and quality of instruction across all settings
 - Analysis of shared professional development

- Analysis of building level leadership
 - Analysis of use of data to improve instruction for each student
 - Develop a tool for principals to support evaluation of effective prekindergarten – kindergarten classrooms
 - Develop an early childhood component to be added to the current publicly reported district report card
 - Develop a tool for parents to use in identifying high quality settings
- Establish common monitoring tools for all early learning programs regardless of regulatory agency.
 - Establish an early childhood component in regional centers to work with teachers and administrators utilizing institutions of higher education, and the expertise of regional coaches, and mentors.

Expand New York State’s diverse early childhood delivery system by developing legislation to allow charter schools to provide prekindergarten programs

Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems *(not scored)*

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State plans to expand statewide longitudinal data systems to include or integrate data from special education programs, English language learner programs, early childhood programs, at-risk and dropout prevention programs, and school climate and culture programs, as well as information on student mobility, human resources (*i.e.*, information on teachers, principals, and other staff), school finance, student health, postsecondary education, and other relevant areas, with the purpose of connecting and coordinating all parts of the system to allow important questions related to policy, practice, or overall effectiveness to be asked, answered, and incorporated into effective continuous improvement practices.

The Secretary is also particularly interested in applications in which States propose working together to adapt one State’s statewide longitudinal data system so that it may be used, in whole or in part, by one or more other States, rather than having each State build or continue building such systems independently.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments

included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

New York State is in the midst of making significant enhancements to its existing data system to expand it into a next generation system. The state has already developed a detailed plan and is in the process of implementing the enhancements that will not only include all data elements required by the America Competes Act but will also provide for an instructional improvement system and a teacher evaluation system. These enhancements include all of following components:

- **The linking of teachers and other professionals to their students.** This linking will result in a system that enables all of the following:
 - Analysis of the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and teacher certification processes.
 - The creation of a teacher evaluation system by linking teachers to their students' assessment results. Like all other data in the P-20 system, this data will be made public.
- **Expansion of data on English Language Learners (ELLs).** New York State is expanding the data elements collected on ELLs to over 25 data elements. This expansion will enable all of the following:
 - A detailed profile of the English Language Learner that will inform policy on instructional practices.
 - A full analysis of the phenomenon of the Students with Interrupted Formal Education. This should provide policy makers with profiles for identification of such students, strategies for preventing this occurrence, and instructional strategies for dealing with the outcome of this experience.
- **Inclusion of systematic survey results on the school environment.** Surveys of school climate, with school ratings based in part on results, have been shown to be effective in Cleveland, Chicago, and New York City.

- **Creation of a system to track student progress throughout P-20 with an accompanying “Early Warning System.”** This overall reporting system will identify patterns of performance and behavior that are predictive of failure and the likelihood of a student becoming a dropout.
- **Creation of a full P-20 system.** New York State is in the process of creating comprehensive data warehouses for its two public university systems, SUNY and CUNY as well as a subset of the large private colleges. These warehouses will be linked to the existing P-12 LDS to form a full P-16 LDS. In a parallel effort, the State Education Department is working with the State Department of Labor, Office of Children and Family Services, Department of Health, Department of Mental Health, and Office of Criminal Justice Services. The combined CIOs of these agencies are deciding how to link student information, first through matching and then through a common identification number that will follow individuals throughout their lives. Once this is completed, the State agencies will begin linking the data systems.
- **The creation of a version of the P-20 longitudinal data system designed specifically to support research and policy analysis.** This database will:
 - Comply with FERPA requirements and all other applicable privacy and confidentiality requirement by stripping all personally identifiable information from the database.
 - Be available to all state policy makers and researchers for specific targeted goals.
 - Be made available and accessible to the public and any interested parties for research and analysis through a series of pre-formed and pre-aggregated data sets.

Priority 5: Invitational Priority -- P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment *(not scored)*

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State plans to address how early childhood programs, K-12 schools, postsecondary institutions, workforce development organizations, and other State agencies and community partners (*e.g.*, child welfare, juvenile justice, and criminal justice agencies) will coordinate to improve all parts of the education system and create a more seamless preschool-through-graduate school (P-20) route for students. Vertical alignment across P-20 is particularly critical at each point where a transition occurs (*e.g.*, between early childhood and K-12, or between K-12 and postsecondary/careers) to ensure that students exiting one level are prepared for success, without remediation, in the next. Horizontal alignment, that is, coordination of services across schools, State agencies, and community partners, is also important in ensuring that high-need students (as defined in this notice) have access to the broad array of opportunities and services they need and that are beyond the capacity of a school itself to provide.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

New York State is working to coordinate all parts of education – from early childhood through graduate school – with social service agencies, workforce development organizations, health agencies, criminal justice agencies, and community organizations. The goal is to create a P-20 system that will follow individuals from birth through adulthood in order to provide the support needed to improve education and other outcomes.

The greatest problem in doing this is the current lack of shared knowledge among all the agencies and stakeholders who deal with children and adults statewide. Therefore, the essential basis of this P-20 coordination must be the following: (1) the seamless sharing of information through a multi-institutional database, and (2) follow-up actions developed through an analysis of that information. Our major tool: a continuously updated electronic transcript that will follow an individual from early childhood

through all aspects of education and into the workforce. This electronic transcript will include an “Early Warning System” of data indicators that will help enable each agency or organization within the system to intervene early, as soon as the individual appears to need help.

To carry out this work, New York State has formed three diverse workgroups that consist of State agencies and institutions and community and advocacy groups. It is important to note that each State agency has close ties with and oversight of comparable local agencies (e.g., the State Department of Health and local Departments of Health):

- **The Early Childhood Council** consists of the State agencies in child health and welfare and education, as well as representatives of cultural institutions, Head Start and day care, community groups, and advocacy groups. In 2006, the Board of Regents, which oversees all aspects of education in New York State, adopted a comprehensive policy on early education. More recently, the Governor created a Children’s Cabinet to promote children’s health and welfare. The Early Childhood Advocacy Council is one outgrowth of both of these decisions. Within this overall umbrella, NYSED has worked with the State Office of Children and Family Services to create a Quality Rating System for early child care and education settings. NYSED has also created draft prekindergarten standards and, with its partners, is now creating new birth to age 3 early learning standards. The Council is also working on means to share important data on children as they progress from birth to age 4, when they join the prekindergarten system; at that point, the data would be uploaded into every school’s database and ultimately become part of the statewide NYSED database.
- **The State Agency Workgroup on Information Sharing.** All major NYS agencies are involved in this work, including education, taxation and finance, labor, corrections, juvenile justice, health, and social services. The Chief Information Officers of each agency are working to create a system to share and match data and transmit it horizontally and vertically

throughout the system.

- **Executive Committee for a Statewide P-16 Data System.** More than a year ago, the Board of Regents joined with the State University of New York (SUNY), the City University of New York (CUNY), the New York City Department of Education, and other school districts to work toward a P-16 data system. Thus far, this effort has been financed in part by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and a grant from the Institute of Education Sciences. NYSED, SUNY, and CUNY are developing common student identifiers, course code designations, and other means to match and integrate data from P-12 through college and graduate school.

The electronic transcript that will be produced from the data integration described above will help ensure vertical alignment – especially the transfer of knowledge at all key points where a transition occurs – between earliest childhood agencies (e.g., Head Start, day care, health) and prekindergarten, between elementary school and middle school, between middle school and high school and between high school and college or careers. The electronic transcript will enable agencies or schools at each transition point to get critically needed information about each student and help them to intervene as needed. This will be enhanced because, at each level of the system, there will be a dashboard of critical indicators that will form an Early Warning System. The dashboard will consist of specific indicators tailored to each stage of development. For example, for early childhood, health will be a major factor, as will achievement of basic learning standards (e.g., knowledge of the alphabet). Attendance will be an increasingly important indicator as the child grows older. Different types of assessment will be included and monitored.

Similarly, the system will be horizontally aligned because of the involvement of health, welfare, correctional, labor and other agencies and community partners. Agencies across the spectrum will have access to and supply data to the continuous electronic transcript. As described above, the dashboard of indicators will be available as an Early Warning System to trigger intervention and

support.

Priority 6: Invitational Priority -- School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning *(not scored)*

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State’s participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) seek to create the conditions for reform and innovation as well as the conditions for learning by providing schools with flexibility and autonomy in such areas as—

- (i) Selecting staff;
- (ii) Implementing new structures and formats for the school day or year that result in increased learning time (as defined in this notice);
- (iii) Controlling the school’s budget;
- (iv) Awarding credit to students based on student performance instead of instructional time;
- (v) Providing comprehensive services to high-need students (as defined in this notice) (e.g., by mentors and other caring adults; through local partnerships with community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other providers);
- (vi) Creating school climates and cultures that remove obstacles to, and actively support, student engagement and achievement; and
- (vii) Implementing strategies to effectively engage families and communities in supporting the academic success of their students.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

Supporting and Creating Conditions for Reform, Innovation and Learning:

The New York State Board of Regents has a history of supporting innovation and invention in the areas of local autonomy and comprehensive student support. Districts across the State have taken advantage of the opportunities created by these conditions, most notably New York City, and we intend to facilitate these principles of school autonomy through our school intervention and

professional development activities. The NYC Department of Education's reform strategy has been based on the notion of school autonomy and principal empowerment. Resources and decision-making power are put directly into the hands of principals, who decide with their teams which strategies and supports will best serve their students. New York City has demonstrated that the principle of school autonomy can be taken to scale and is a valuable tool in further building principal and LEA capacity since educators are empowered to choose their own supports based on supported self-assessments. Districts throughout the state have developed school models with school based schedules, resource allocation and staff. As discussed in Section E, Tech Valley High School, which was developed through a unique collaboration with BOCES, Districts and the intermediary Knowledgeworks Foundation NewTech model, has unique scheduling and budgets from resources provided through multiple partners. In Yonkers, the College Board School is an exemplar of college ready innovation. Through our interventions in low performing schools, specifically by seeking partners with experience in supporting autonomous schools, we will encourage LEAs across the State to adapt strategies like these while providing the appropriate supports so that LEAs and principals have the capacity needed to most effectively use their expanded autonomy to drive gains in student achievement.

As described in detail in Section A and throughout this application NYSED has described a State Education Department that is transforming from a compliance-oriented agency to a service oriented agency focusing on providing technical assistance to districts. In this structure, innovation and the dissemination of best practice is a central component and key responsibility of lead staff. Innovation is encouraged through conditions at the state level, district level, school level and in new school or turnaround /restart school principle elements of design. These practices include flexibility in the use of school time and structure of the school, principal autonomies, innovation of school design including expanded pathways for high school completion, blended virtual and placed-based school models and driving data for continuous improvement of results. With the implementation of the OISM, ETACIT and the Office of District Services (described in detail in Section A) lead staff will now be accountable for this work.

Innovations that show results can be disseminated to districts across the state through this design and key innovative strategies will have a voice at a senior level in the NYSED offices to continue to review and propose revisions to support conditions for innovation.

The Board of Regents have supported changes to policy in order to specifically support innovation in school turnaround and district portfolio development (EMSC Committee. 12/09/09 Update on School Turnaround). The Board of Regents approved the following actions for NYSED:

- Establish the Office of Innovative School Models, ETACIT and District Services
- Allow newly created schools to seek operational waivers at the time of registration
- Expand the means by which students can earn high school credit based on completion of competencies including the achievement of credit through virtual/on-line competencies. (Credit based on student performance instead of instructional time). New York State currently has several ways that students can earn credits through exam.
- Create the Innovative Secondary School Model Incentive Fund through Race to the Top. New York will use Race to the Top funds to create new School Development Grant program to increase the supply of high- performing secondary models tied to twenty-first century competencies. These incentive grants will encourage districts to address achievement in high need high schools and middle school before they are identified as Low Performing schools. These funds will support the creation of new STEM schools; new models that incorporate virtual platforms and extended learning; models that will enhance the opportunity for strong supports to embed youth development competencies into the instructional core; Career Technical Education and “Second Chance” high schools that reengage over-age and under-credited youth and dropouts.

New York State overall has a strong state driven system of supports for children and families through Foster Care Preventive Services Programs, After School and Out of School Time Programs, Violence Prevention Programs and Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention Programs. All of these programs have essential design elements that require strong collaboration with schools and Community Based Organizations. NYSED supports cross agency collaboration to expand the collocation and partnerships of strong community based programs in our schools. In addition, the state has encouraged and supported the work of national strategies such as Gear UP, Liberty Partnership Programs and City Year. New York State and cities have support nationally recognized and replicated models of Full Service Schools. These models include: The Harlem Children’s Zone Model currently in replication as Promise Neighborhoods nationally; The Community School Model of the Children’s Aid Society; The Beacon School Model / Beacon Foster Care Prevention model operating in New York City and the “Say Yes to Education” Model of Syracuse to name a few. NYSED is committed to providing children and families with comprehensive services and has included a funding request in our RTTT application so that we may increase the number of full service schools currently in operation in the State in our Low Performing Districts. These models include essential elements: they are led by a community based organization that develops a partnership with the school or district; they are located in a public school, and they create wrap – around youth development activities and summer programs. Many of the models include primary health and mental health services and supportive counseling centers, mentoring programs as well as employment services. Some include Adult Education and College and Career Programs. At their best, these Full Service schools support many of the developmental needs of children, adolescents and their families in a school based setting with the goal of increasing student achievement and creating strong pathways for youth development through K-12 and onto College and Careers. In many of our schools these models are key points of engagement to support school leaders, teachers, families, students and communities mitigate the stressors and impact of poverty on children in our communities.

Through RTTT funds the New York State Education Department would implement a new funding priority to procure an expansion of Full Service School models for schools/districts implementing a Low Performing School Intervention under RTTT funds. This RFP would be open to community-based organizations who work in the neighborhoods where these schools are located. In addition to direct activities funded under the grant the CBO can assist the principal in coordinating and accessing new partnerships to meet the needs of their school community. Full Service Schools will support youth leadership activities and creating conditions in schools to foster a strong school wide positive culture that enhances learning. Parent and community engagement strategies are often the hallmark of strong CBO work; NYSED will fund and encourage the expansion of this work to complement the reform strategies of the four assurances.

In addition to the Full Service School models NYSED has supported explicit strategies to engage and support families who have children with disabilities.

Services for Parent of Students with Disabilities

NYSED currently has two regionally-based support structures - Special Education Parent Centers and Early Childhood Direction Centers – that assist and inform families with students with disabilities. As part of NYSED’s overall redesign plans, we intend to ensure these functions are fully aligned with our school intervention efforts and are coordinated by our new Office of District Services. NYSED’s thirteen Special Education Parent Centers across the State provide parents of children with disabilities with information, resources, and strategies to promote their meaningful involvement in their children’s education programs, including information regarding the special education process (referrals, individual evaluations and individualized education program (IEP) development and transition planning); assist in understanding their children’s disabilities; promote the early resolution of disputes between parents and school districts; and enhance parents’ skills and levels of confidence to communicate effectively and work

collaboratively with other schools and other stakeholders to advocate and actively participate in their children's education program.

NYSED also funds 15 Early Childhood Direction Centers (ECDC) to assist parents in the referral of their children for special education. The Centers provide training and parent education on the special education process. They provide important assistance to ensure the timely evaluation and provision of services to preschool children with disabilities, including providing assistance to school districts in identifying approved evaluators for children with limited English proficiency. ECDCs also link families, including those who are homeless or who care for foster children, to community supports such as respite, child care, Medicaid and other social services. They have a strategic role in addressing a number of activities to support the implementation of preschool special education in New York and are engaged in activities that including the transition of children from early intervention.

BUDGET PART I: BUDGET SUMMARY TABLE

The following table summarizes New York State’s total request for Race to the Top funding.

Budget Part II: Project Budget Table (in \$MM)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel	\$2.7	\$3.9	\$3.9	\$4.5	\$15.0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$1.1	\$1.6	\$1.7	\$1.9	\$6.4
3. Travel	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.8
4. Equipment	\$4.0	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$4.3
5. Supplies	\$8.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$8.2
6. Contractual	\$51.7	\$52.0	\$53.7	\$44.1	\$201.5
7. Training Stipends	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
8. Other	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.1
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$67.9	\$57.9	\$59.8	\$51.0	\$236.5
10. Indirect Costs	\$0.4	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$0.7	\$2.2
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$0.2	\$0.4	\$0.8	\$0.7	\$2.1
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$42.1	\$47.3	\$43.6	\$41.6	\$174.6
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$110.6	\$106.1	\$104.7	\$93.9	\$415.3
14. Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (50% of Total Grant)	\$119.7	\$133.7	\$83.9	\$78.0	\$415.3
15. Total Budget (lines 13-14)	\$230.3	\$239.8	\$188.6	\$171.9	\$830.7

BUDGET PART I: BUDGET SUMMARY NARRATIVE

New York State requests \$831MM of Race to the Top funding to support 30 projects over the four grant years.

New York envisions the Race to the Top projects as advancing progress of a reform agenda that overarches the State's diverse but limited resources. The State has identified a diversity of additional sources of funding to align to support this work, increasing the impact of each dollar of Race to the Top. The complete portfolio of projects planned to move New York forward toward its ambitious goals will require an overall incremental investment over the next four years of \$1,054MM.

The total Race to the Top benefit granted to LEAs is \$592MM, planned as follows:

- \$415MM, awarded in subgrants to participating LEAs, distributed based on participating LEAs' shares of Title I, Part A funds, comprise 50% of the budget. 54%, or \$223.7MM, of this total is tied to project-level budgets. The balance, \$191.7MM, of subgrants will be awarded to LEAs in excess of their project-based needs (needs specified in the following project-level budget narratives) to enable local execution of local priorities in the spirit of the Race to the Top reform agenda. New York State will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that participating LEAs spend these funds in accordance with the State's plan and the scope of work described in the agreement between the State and the participating LEA.
- An additional \$175MM of the State's 50% share is budgeted for supplemental funding of participating LEAs, largely to provide for successful implementation in participant districts whose Title-I-related allocations are not sufficient to do the work as defined in the Scope of Work. These LEAs number 262 and most of this money is required to make possible the turnaround efforts, especially those planned in Rochester, Buffalo and Syracuse City School Districts.
- An incremental \$2.1MM (of the State's share) will be allocated to involved LEAs to support *statewide* projects. These LEAs number 291.

Projects drawing money from the remainder of the State's share (direct and indirect state-level costs) total \$239MM. The largest projects are those directly affecting all LEAs and those that build new, foundational systems, including: Curriculum frameworks, Adopting standards and K-12 formative assessment; Instructional improvement system construction & rollout, and integration of higher education and non-education systems; and, External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround and the competitively awarded Full-Service School Model Fund.

Of the grant dollars planned for spending in the fourth year of the Race to the Top grant, \$51.6MM will be funding operations at the State level. Of that money, the State expects approximately \$12.8MM will be carried forward in some part into the year(s) to follow (\$5.3MM of which will support ongoing contractors, and the remaining \$7.5MM associated with personnel). The State has identified multiple potential resources of ongoing funding that can absorb the increased demand of sustaining the projects. In addition to the Federal resources described below, the State will take advantage of this period of reorganization to create

opportunities to re deploy staff in support of the ongoing initiatives. Even now, staff in the Regional School Services, for example, could take responsibilities associated with professional development delivery and/or school improvement. In addition, new funding opportunities emerge, such as the potentially Federally-funded Early Learning Challenge Grant, for which the State hopes to qualify.

Specifically, NYSED will undertake the following 30 projects as part of the RTTT grant:

Project-by-Project Budget Summary (\$MM)					
Project Name	Assurance Section	State's Project Cost	Total Project Cost	RTTT Requirement, Including Expected LEA Investment	Non-RTTT Dollars and Source
PMO Office For RTTT Initiatives	A	\$14.1	\$14.1	\$14.1	
Development of PK-12 Curriculum Frameworks	B	\$26.6	\$26.6	\$26.6	
Implementation of Regionally-based Professional Development Activities	B	\$1.2	\$60.5	\$1.2	\$59.4 (Title II, Part A)
Adoption of New Common Core Standards	B	\$5.8	\$5.8	\$5.8	
Development of Formative and Interim Assessments	B	\$43.6	\$43.6	\$43.6	
Instructional Improvement System Construction And Rollout	C	\$33.8	\$46.7	\$46.7	
Provision Of Professional Development Through A Statewide Network	C	\$41.2	\$96.6	\$96.6	
Integration Of Higher Education (Public And Independent)	C	\$20.5	\$20.5	\$20.5	
Integration Of Non-Education Systems	C	\$10.8	\$10.8	\$10.8	
Adoption And Development Of Growth Model	C	\$4.0	\$4.0	\$4.0	
Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) For Teachers	D	\$3.3	\$5.8	\$5.8	
Performance Evaluation System For Principals	D	\$1.8	\$1.8	\$1.8	
Creating Teacher And Principal Career Ladder	D	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$2.2	
Increasing The Number And Percentage Of Effective Teachers In Hard To Staff Subjects	D	\$0.8	\$50.8	\$0.8	\$50.0 (Title II, Part A)
Residency Program For Teachers	D	\$6.1	\$30.0	\$30.0	
Transforming Principal Preparation Programs	D	\$4.4	\$22.2	\$22.2	

Project-by-Project Budget Summary (\$MM)					
Project Name	Assurance Section	State's Project Cost	Total Project Cost	RTTT Requirement, Including Expected LEA Investment	Non-RTTT Dollars and Source
Leadership Academies For School Principals	D	\$3.0	\$48.0	\$8.0	\$40.0 (Title I, Section 1003(G))
Model Induction Programs To Prepare All Teachers To Be Teacher Leaders	D	\$0.9	\$39.2	\$0.9	\$38.3 (Microsoft Settlement)
Teacher Professional Development Focused On The Use Of Student Performance And Growth Data For Formative Assessment	D	\$0.6	\$24.6	\$0.6	\$24.0 (Title I, Section 1003(G))
Teacher Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund	D	\$100.0	\$100.0	\$100.0	
Turning Around Struggling Schools	E	\$21.0	\$208.0	\$95.3	\$112.7 (Title I, Section 1003(G))
External Technical Assistance Center For Innovation And Turnaround (ETACIT)	E	\$21.5	\$21.5	\$21.5	
New York State Department Office Of Innovative School Models	E	\$2.7	\$2.7	\$2.7	
Innovative Schools Model Incentive Fund (RFP)	E	\$0.0	\$42.0	\$21.0	\$21.0 (Title I, Section 1003(G))
Statewide Evaluation Of Intervention And Innovative School Models	E	\$1.0	\$1.0	\$1.0	
Virtual School: Digital Learning: Approval Of Course Content	E	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	
Virtual Schools: Digital Learning: Establishment Of Virtual High Schools (RFP)	E	\$6.5	\$17.6	\$17.6	
Virtual Schools: Digital Learning: Build A Statewide Virtual Learning Environment	E	\$7.6	\$7.6	\$7.6	

Project-by-Project Budget Summary (\$MM)					
Project Name	Assurance Section	State's Project Cost	Total Project Cost	RTTT Requirement, Including Expected LEA Investment	Non-RTTT Dollars and Source
Improving Early Learning Outcomes	Invitational	\$10.0	\$10.0	\$10.0	
Full Service Schools RFP	Invitational	\$18.0	\$18.0	\$18.0	
Race To The Top Project Total		\$415.3	\$984.4	\$639.0	\$345.4
Principal Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund	D	\$0.0	\$20.0	\$0.0	\$20.0 (Title I, Section 1003(G))
Instructional Teams To Support Teacher And Principal Reviews	D	\$0.0	\$50.0	\$0.0	\$50.0 (Title I, Section 1003(G))
Total Across All Projects		\$415.3	\$1,054.4	\$639.0	\$415.4

Funds are required to support initiatives across all of the reform assurances, as well as for overall grant management. In particular, projects associated with each of the assurances require shares of the State's Race to the Top budget: 30% for Great Teachers & Leaders, 27% for Data Systems to Support Instruction, 18% to Standards & Assessments, 15% for Turning Around Struggling Schools and the remaining 10% for overall project management and other initiatives to ensure success of the assurance-related strategies, as well as to invest in early childhood education.

Assurance-Level Budget Summary (\$MM)					
Project Name	Assurance Section	State's Project Cost	Total Project Cost	RTTT Requirement, Including Expected LEA Investment	Non-RTTT Dollars and Source
State Success Factors	A	\$14.1	\$14.1	\$14.1	\$0.0
Standards & Assessments	B	\$77.0	\$136.4	\$77.0	\$59.4
Data Systems To Support Instruction	C	\$110.3	\$178.5	\$178.5	\$0.0
Great Teachers & Leaders	D	\$123.1	\$324.5	\$172.2	\$152.3

Assurance-Level Budget Summary (\$MM)					
Project Name	Assurance Section	State's Project Cost	Total Project Cost	RTTT Requirement, Including Expected Lea Investment	Non-RTTT Dollars and Source
Turning Around The Lowest-Achieving Schools	E	\$62.8	\$302.9	\$169.2	\$133.7
Invitational Priorities	Invitational	\$28.0	\$28.0	\$28.0	\$0.0
Race To The Top Project Total		\$415.3	\$984.4	\$639.0	\$345.4

The state will leverage *Federal* funds as follows in support of the above projects to ensure success of the Race to the Top plan:

- NYSED is scheduled to receive an FY2009 grant award of \$261MM in ARRA Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funds. The period of availability for this award is years 2009-10 and 2010-11, with the potential for an obligation extension into 2011-12. The majority of funds will target chronically low-performing schools, including high schools and their feeder schools, to implement robust and comprehensive reforms to dramatically transform school culture and increase student outcomes.
 - Section 1003(g) money will be used primarily to implement the same intervention models that are encouraged in the Race to the Top criteria, ie, turnaround, restart, closure and transformation. Approximately \$113MM of Section 1003(g) dollars will partner with Race to the Top funds to drive this turnaround of struggling schools in the first two years of the grant.
 - Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) money will create an incentive fund providing matching grants to LEAs committing a share of their Race to the Top allocation to open an innovative model school. The State expects to use approximately \$21MM toward this project.
 - Section 1003(g) money will support New York's efforts to expand the use of data to improve instruction and recruit, train and retain effective teachers and principals: funds will supplement projects targeting improved practice for teachers, specifically of professional development on the use of data to improve instructional practice. Approximately \$24MM over four years will be requested for this project.
 - The State has built into the 2009-10 expenditure plan \$10MM to fund development and support of Principal Leadership Academies. This planned use of Section 1003(g) will make possible sustaining the Academies established under the two-year \$3MM Wallace Foundation grant, expanding the reach of those Academies, and creating new Principal Leadership

Academies modeled on those Academies. The State intends to include this \$10MM obligation in subsequent years.

- Where Race to the Top will enable the State to create a fund to incentivize the use of qualifying teacher evaluations in making compensation and other decisions, Section 1003(g) will provide a similar fund to encourage LEAs to tie Principal-level compensation to the new Principal Evaluation. The money can be used for incentives, including financial incentives, to principals who work in high-need schools. This fund will require \$20MM over four years.
- The State will also encourage LEAs to use Section 1003(g) awards to identify and develop a “pool” of individuals (principals, other administrators, peer reviewers, etc.) to provide instructional leader support in preparing and delivering teacher and principal reviews in the highest need schools. We believe that this support for professional reviews is an effective means to identify local needs for professional development and hiring. This support for instructional leaders will require approximately \$50MM over four years.
- In the third and fourth years of the grant, after the ARRA award sunsets, the projects will draw from *non-ARRA* 1003(g) funds (presently approximately \$47MM annually).
- Funds distributed under Title II, Part A, will be used to complement and enhance programs planned under Race to the Top. These Federal dollars, of approximately \$213MM annually, are available to the State for multiple uses in support of preparation, recruitment, and development of teachers and principals. This money has been identified for several purposes to reinforce the work done within the Race to the Top projects.
 - An incentive bonus (described in detail in project D4) to recruit and retain highly effective teachers into shortage teaching positions in the highest-need schools will draw on \$50MM of Title II, Part A, resources over the four years of the grant. New York will use these funds for the \$30,000 per-teacher bonus in order to ensure that the program is funded after the life of the Race to the Top grant. The Title II, Part A, aligns well with this program given the emphasis on recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers by providing differential pay incentives to those who teach in academic subjects and in schools in which there exists a shortage of highly qualified teachers.
 - The State will also encourage LEAs to use Title II, Part A, to provide professional development in support of new standards and curriculum frameworks, using regional networks. LEAs are required to do a Needs Assessment under Title II, Part A. This support for teacher development will require approximately \$59MM over four years.

The State will also make additional alignments of Federal funds with Race to the Top priorities, not projects, as follows:

- In addition, New York has used NCLB Title I school improvement funds to support enrichment programs in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, provide professional development to teachers and principals, and provide grants to the lowest achieving schools to improve teaching and learning.

- ARRA funds distributed under Title II-Part D, Enhancing Education through Technology, of approximately \$56MM, will be used for several aligned projects: to create a technology rich environment through student-centered active learning environments (SCALE), to develop online formative assessment in support of personalized instruction and data-driven decision-making, to develop online learning and instruction connected with NYSED Virtual High School, to ensure better use of technology to support English language learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities (SWDs), and to implement a process for digital content providers to submit for state approval their high school level courses in the four core content areas, ultimately for credit-bearing electronic delivery programs at the LEAs.
- SED has applied for ARRA Longitudinal Data System funding of \$20MM to create teacher-student linkages and to develop a P-20 data system. This Instructional Support System will build a data base to support research and policy analysis and a process for tracking student progress, in coordination with Race to the Top projects described in further detail below.
- ARRA Government Services Funds (\$350,000): “Say Yes to Education” is a grant to increase high school and college graduation rates for New York’s inner city youth by offering a range of services including after-school and summer programming, mentoring, tutoring, and school-day academic support, family outreach, scholarships, and social work/psychological services.
- Teacher and Leader Quality Partnership Program (\$5.6MM): Improve the academic success of New York's students by improving the quality of their teachers.

The state will draw on *State* funds in support of many aligned projects to ensure success of the Race to the Top plan:

- *Bilingual Education* (\$12.5MM)- state funds are used to address the needs of LEP/ELLs consistent with the Department’s Strategic Plan for Raising Standards, with special focus on the implementation of the Seven Essential Elements for the Education of LEP/ELLs in high-need districts. Funds support activities in the areas of higher standards and new assessments involving LEP/ELLs; the preparation and certification of bilingual and ESL staff to incorporate the new standards and assessments into the curriculum for LEP/ELLs; LEP/ELL parent empowerment to increase their knowledge and understanding of the new requirements; capacity building at the school and district levels; and, most especially, the provision of equitable services for LEP/ELLs.
- *Charter Schools Development and Stimulus Fund* (\$4.8MM state, \$14.4MM spread over 3 years) - state and federal funds provide assistance to applicants for planning purposes and to approved charter schools for the acquisition, renovation or construction of school facilities. The Stimulus Fund makes these funds available for the specific purposes of providing start-up grants associated with the development and submission of a charter school application to the Board of Regents as the charter entity. The funds are also available for facilities grants for costs associated with school facilities.
- *Learning Technology* (\$3.3MM) - state funds provide grants to public school districts and Boards of Cooperative Education (BOCES) for progressive integration of instructional

technology in classrooms and library media centers and sustained professional development to increase the skills of teachers in the use of instructional technology in order to help students attain higher levels of performance in the New York State Learning Standards.

- *Computer Hardware Aid* (\$38MM) - School districts are eligible for aid for the purchase or lease of micro and/or mini computer equipment or terminals for instructional purposes. School districts are eligible for aid for the purchase or lease of micro and/or mini computer equipment or terminals for instructional purposes.
- *Aid for Computer Software Purchases* (\$46MM) - Each public school district may claim a maximum apportionment of Computer Software Aid to purchase and loan computer software for instructional purposes on an equitable basis to both public and nonpublic school students attending schools within the district's boundaries during the current school year.
- *Teachers of Tomorrow* (\$25MM) - Awards and stipends to create incentives to retain and attract teachers, especially in STEM subjects and other areas where teacher shortages exist, and to assist subject matter specialists working in private industry to become certified teachers.
- *National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification* (\$0.49MM) – New York funds grants for teachers of up to \$2,500 toward the cost of certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- *Contracts for Excellence (C4E)* (\$854MM) -The C4E program was established in 2007 to provide additional accountability over increased State Aid for low performing school districts. C4E is a comprehensive approach to targeting fiscal resources to specific allowable programs proven to raise the achievement of the students with the greatest educational need. Districts are required to enter a contract and must document the schools, programs, and student subgroups to be targeted for funding, along with specific, achievable performance improvements that will result.

Finally, as result of a class action settlement with Microsoft, New York State will receive between \$70-85MM for distribution to qualifying, high-poverty public schools. The SEA can set requirements for use of the money within broad guidelines established under the terms of the settlement (ie, money will be used for software, hardware, professional development, and/or computer services). New York State will target \$38MM to ensure successful implementation of the pilots of model induction programs to prepare all teachers to be teacher leaders. The administration of this program will be established under Race to the Top funding.

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET TABLES AND NARRATIVES

all figures in tables are in thousands of dollars

Project ID: A1

Project Name: PMO Office for RTTT Initiatives

Associated with Criteria: (A)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$14,120
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$14,120
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$3,530	\$14,120

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual**

Funding for a competitive RFP for a four-year contract to drive and oversee implementation of the grant initiatives. Team will be comprised of a senior director, multiple liaisons for each assurance area, finance, and special initiatives. The team will also have two administrative assistants and coordinators. Funding includes costs for laptops, travel, and office supplies

(including 1 printer, 1 projector and other office supplies). Comparative benchmarks for prior contractors have been used.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Each project year: \$3.5MM
- Total : \$14.1MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding For Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Each project year: \$3.5MM
- Total : \$14.1MM

Project ID: B1

Project Name: Development of PK-12 Curriculum Frameworks

Associated with Criterion: (B)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$10.0
4. Equipment	\$4.6				\$4.6
5. Supplies	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$4.8
6. Contractual	\$8,129	\$6,133	\$6,137	\$6,141	\$26,540
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$8,137	\$6,137	\$6,141	\$6,145	\$26,559
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$8,137	\$6,137	\$6,141	\$6,145	\$26,559

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

The Associate will make 10 trips per year at an average of \$250 per trip to provide technical assistance and monitoring.

4) Equipment

Equipment to purchase includes printer (\$373), laptop (\$639), desk, PC table, and bookcase (\$3,000), and Executive Chair (\$550).

5) Supplies

General office supplies budgeted at \$1200

6) Contractual

The State requires funding for the competitive RFP for a four-year contract for a Statewide Curriculum Resource Center to develop and disseminate Pre-Kindergarten to Grade 12 curriculum frameworks based on the standards and to assist in the statewide implementation of new frameworks. The \$26MM requirement will be apportioned across the four grant years with \$8MM in the first year and \$6MM in each subsequent year.

In addition, the state will contract for an Associate to be responsible for supervision of the Statewide Curriculum Resource Center (commensurate with an initial salary of \$82,000, loaded with benefits and indirect costs).

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1: \$8.0MM
- Project Years 2-4: \$6.0MM
- Project Total \$26.0MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1: \$8.1MM
- Project Years 2-4: \$6.1MM
- Project Total \$26.6MM

Project ID: B2

Project Name: Implementation of Regionally-based Professional Development Activities

Associated with Criteria: (B)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$9	\$19	\$19	\$19	\$65
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$157	\$313	\$313	\$313	\$1,096
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$166	\$332	\$332	\$332	\$1,162

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

4) Equipment

5) Supplies

6) Contractual

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

10) Indirect Costs

11) and 12) Funding for LEAs

Implementation of the developed curriculum framework will happen through professional development delivered through the regional networks. Statewide LEAs will spend from their Title II, Part A, grants to support core curriculum adoption. Funding in the first year will be at 50% of the run-rate level to ensure widespread dissemination and engagement with stakeholders across the State. Full implementation support begins in the second year. Where LEAs cannot qualify for a (sufficient) Title II, Part A, allocation, the State will use Race to the Top funds to supplement the statewide need.

The expected total implementation cost will reach \$60.5MM,

- **11) Funding for Involved LEAs:** approximately \$0.1MM will be provided through Race to the Top as support for involved LEAs
- **12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:** approximately \$1.1MM will be provided through Race to the Top as supplemental support for participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1: \$0.17MM
- Project Years 2-4: \$0.33MM
- Project Total \$1.2MM

Project ID: B3

Project Name: Adoption of New Common Core Standards

Associated with Criteria: (B)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$10.0
4. Equipment	\$13.9				\$13.9
5. Supplies	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$4.8
6. Contractual	\$1,427	\$1,432	\$1,437	\$1,443	\$5,739
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$1,444	\$1,436	\$1,441	\$1,447	\$5,768
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$1,444	\$1,436	\$1,441	\$1,447	\$5,768

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

Travel budget will fund ten trips per year at an average of \$250 per trip to provide technical assistance and monitoring.

4) Equipment

Total equipment for purchase includes: two desktop computers (\$519 each), one printer (\$1,511), one laptop @ \$639, one desk, computer table and bookcase (\$3,000), two L-desks (\$1,800), one

executive chair (\$550), two secretary chairs (\$350 each), one fax machine (\$300), one meeting table (\$800), and six chairs for table (\$300 each).

5) Supplies

General office supplies required.

6) Contractual

This project includes funding for convening various stakeholder groups to review and revise the many standards areas over the course of four years. This also includes contracting with an independent evaluator to assess the impact of new standards on local school districts. The total requirement is \$5MM, spread evenly over the four project years.

In addition, the State will contract for a supervising Associate to oversee the review and revision process for all standards areas (commensurate with an initial salary of \$82,000, loaded with benefits and indirect costs).

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Years 1-4: \$1.4MM each
- Project Total \$5.7MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Years 1-4: \$1.4MM each
- Project Total \$5.8MM

Project ID: B4

Project Name: Development of Formative and Interim Assessments

Associated with Criteria: (B)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$7.5	\$7.5	\$7.5	\$7.5	\$30.0
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$38
6. Contractual	\$10,395	\$10,707	\$11,028	\$11,359	\$43,489
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$10,412	\$10,724	\$11,045	\$11,376	\$43,558
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$10,412	\$10,724	\$11,045	\$11,376	\$43,558

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

The team travel will amount to five trips in two months (\$250 each trip).

4) Equipment

5) Supplies

Office supplies at \$9600 a year

6) Contractual

This project will fund a competitive RFP for a four-year contract to develop new K-12 formative assessment online tools, data management systems, and professional development activities, including the leveraging of new technologies for administration and K-3 early reading formative assessments. The cost will be initially \$10MM, to grow at 3% annually through the three subsequent grant years.

In addition, the State will contract for a team to manage the development and dissemination of K-12 formative assessment tools. The contract will be commensurate with the salaries, fully loaded with benefits and indirect costs, of two Assistants (one in Instructional Services, one in Educational Testing), and 50% of a secretarial support.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$10.4MM
- Project Year 2 \$10.7MM
- Project Year 3 \$11.0MM
- Project Year 4 \$11.3MM
- All Project Years \$43.4MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$10.4MM
- Project Year 2 \$10.7MM
- Project Year 3 \$11.0MM
- Project Year 4 \$11.4MM
- All Project Years \$43.6MM

Project ID: C1

Project Name: Construction and Rollout of Statewide Instructional Reporting and Improvement System (NY-SIRIS)

Associated with Criteria: (C)(2) and (C)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment	\$990				\$990
5. Supplies	\$3,000				\$3,000
6. Contractual	\$6,583	\$10,719	\$4,136		\$21,437
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$10,573	\$10,719	\$4,136		\$25,427
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$182	\$91	\$91		\$364
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$4,003	\$2,002	\$2,002		\$8,006
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$14,758	\$12,811	\$6,228		\$33,797

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

4) Equipment

Increased set of servers, networking and storage will require \$990K

5) Supplies

Increased Oracle licensing costs requires \$3MM

6) Contractual

This project comprises of 3 key sub-projects:

1. Expansion of Instructional System
2. LEA Support for Instructional System Rollout
3. Creation of Teacher Evaluation System

Sub-project 1: Expansion of Instructional System: Includes funding for building out the instructional improvement system at NYSED. Includes infrastructure, design, coding, implementation, testing, and standardized reports for building out the instructional system. This sub-project will have no grants to LEAs. The detailed staffing of the sub-project is as follows:

Cost Category	Sub-category (Type)	Cost/FTE (\$K)	# of FTE Required	RTTT Total Cost (\$K)
Personnel - External (Contractors)				
	Admin Assistant	\$56	4.3	\$243
	IT/Project Manager	\$103	9.0	\$925
	Business Analyst	\$159	30.1	\$4,777
	Data Architect	\$176	4.8	\$835
	Data Manager	\$191	9.8	\$1,858
	Database Admin	\$176	3.3	\$571
	Process Consultant	\$176	0.3	\$44
	Reporters	\$159	23.1	\$3,672
	System Integrators /Consultants	\$176	15.0	\$2,636

Sub-project 2: LEA Support for Instructional System Rollout: Includes funding to LEAs to build, expand, and strengthen instructional data systems. All of the funding will be provided to the LEAs depending on the number of schools in the LEA. LEAs will use these funds to create or expand their instructional data systems to comply with State standards and connect with the centralized state system. The LEAs will need to leverage the Regional Networks for doing this. The Regional Networks will utilize one or more teams of IT implementation experts – each team will serve a group of 25 schools within the state. The staffing of each team is:

Type	FTEs	Duration (Months)	Cost Per FTE Per Year
Admin Assistant	0.25	6	\$56.0
Business Analyst	0.5	6	\$84.0
Data Architect	0.5	6	\$93.0

IT/ Project Manager	0.2	6	\$103.1
System Integrators/ Consultants	1.0	6	\$93.0

NY has approximately 4540 schools. However this will be focused on the roughly 3100 schools in the rest of the state, as NYC schools are already integrated into a district wide instructional reporting system.

Sub-project 3: Creation of Teacher Evaluation System: Includes funding for building out the teacher evaluation IT system. Includes infrastructure, design, coding, implementation, testing, and standardized reports for building out the teacher evaluation system at the state level. All teacher related data is or will be collected as part of enhancements to the state system based on grants from IES and other sources of ongoing funding. This sub-project will have no grants to LEAs. The detailed staffing of the sub-project is as follows:

Cost Category	Sub-category (Type)	Cost/FTE (\$K)	# of FTE Required	RTTT Total Cost (\$K)
Personnel - External (Contractors)				
	Admin Assistant	\$56	1.6	\$89
	IT/Project Manager	\$103	3.1	\$316
	Business Analyst	\$159	6.2	\$978
	Data Architect	\$176	1.5	\$264
	Data Manager	\$191	1.5	\$286
	Reporters	\$159	6.7	\$1,058
	System Integrators /Consultants	\$176	9.0	\$1,581

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$10.5MM
- Project Year 2 \$10.6MM
- Project Year 3 \$4.1MM
- Project Year 4 \$-
- All Project Years \$25.2MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

- Funding provided to the involved LEAs to ensure their systems meet performance and data requirements of the State

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$14.5MM
- Project Year 2 \$12.8MM
- Project Year 3 \$6.2MM
- Project Year 4 \$-
- All Project Years \$33.8MM

Project ID: C2

Project Name: Provision of Professional Development through a Statewide Network

Associated with Criteria: (C)(2) and (C)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel		\$1,110	\$1,110	\$1,110	\$3,330
2. Fringe Benefits		\$474	\$474	\$474	\$1,421
3. Travel		\$22	\$22	\$22	\$67
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)		\$1,606	\$1,606	\$1,606	\$4,818
10. Indirect Costs		\$162	\$162	\$162	\$486
11. Funding for Involved LEAs		\$312	\$625	\$625	\$1,562
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs		\$6,874	\$13,749	\$13,749	\$34,372
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)		\$8,955	\$16,142	\$16,142	\$41,238

1) Personnel and 6) Contractual

This project comprises of 2 key sub-projects:

1. Building PD Oversight Team at NYSED
2. Provision of Professional Development and Training for Instructional System Adoption

Sub-project 1: Building PD Oversight Team: NYSED will create a professional development oversight team that will oversee the administration of professional development and training to the LEAs. The team will provide design and management support for all professional development activities including oversight, communication, knowledge sharing, analytic support, creation of online curricular tools, training logistics and execution. This sub-project will have no grants to LEAs. The detailed staffing of the sub-project is as follows:

Type	FTEs	Duration (Months)	Cost Per FTE Per Year
Center for Inquiry Executive Director	1	36	\$120.0
Director of Educator Development and Educator Development Manager	2	36	\$105.0
Center for Inquiry Director	2	36	\$105.0
Curriculum Developer	2	36	\$95.0
Curriculum Tools Support and Design	2	36	\$95.0
Operations Specialist	2	36	\$95.0

Sub-project 2: Provision of Professional Development and Training for Instructional System Adoption: Provision of PD to LEAs comprises of the regional inquiry teams that will support schools to ensure adequate and consistent usage of instructional systems. The structure of each regional inquiry team is as follows:

Type	FTEs	Duration (Months)	Cost Per FTE Per Year
Network Leader	1	12	\$95.0
Technology Integration Coordinator (TIC)	1	12	\$100.0
Senior Achievement and Technology Integration Facilitator (SATIF)	1	12	\$145.0
Educator Development	1	12	\$100.0

As before, considering that NY has 4540 public schools, all schools and corresponding districts will be served by such teams.

Each additional year assumes a 3% salary increase.

2) Fringe Benefits

Calculated at 42.67% of Personnel costs

3) Travel

- 45 trips a year at \$500 a trip

4) Equipment

5) Supplies

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$-
- Project Years 2-4: \$1.6MM
- All Project Years \$4.8MM

10) Indirect Costs

Calculated using 14.60% as a percent of Personnel costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs; 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Total LEA costs for this provision of professional development to all LEAs, participating and involved, inclusive, is \$91MM.

Funding provided to the involved LEAs for providing professional development for adoption of the instructional system will total \$1.7MM. Supplements to participating LEAs who require additional funds to fully participate in all Race to the Top plans will total \$36MM.

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$-
- Project Year 2 \$9.0MM
- Project Years 3-4: \$16.1MM
- All Project Years \$41.2MM

Project ID: C3

Project Name: Integration of Higher Education (Public and Independent)

Associated with Criteria: (C)(2) and (C)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment	\$1,650				\$1,650
5. Supplies	\$3,000				\$3,000
6. Contractual	\$2,525	\$2,525	\$7,944	\$2,894	\$15,888
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$7,175	\$2,525	\$7,944	\$2,894	\$20,538
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$7,175	\$2,525	\$7,944	\$2,894	\$20,538

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

4) Equipment

Increased set of servers, networking and storage – \$1,650K

5) Supplies

Budget of \$3MM to pay for increased software licensing costs.

6) Contractual

This project comprises of two key sub-projects:

1. Integrating SUNY and CUNY
2. Integrating 4 private colleges associated with CICU

Sub-project 1: Integrating SUNY and CUNY: This will include costs associated with shoring up the SUNY and CUNY systems for activities mentioned in the narrative, as well as integrating them with the statewide P-20 longitudinal data warehouse. This sub-project will have no grants to LEAs. Support will be provided to SUNY and CUNY to support upgrading their systems. The detailed staffing of the sub-project is as follows:

Cost Category	Sub-category (Type)	Cost/FTE (\$K)	# of FTE Required	RTTT Total Cost (\$K)
Personnel - External (Contractors)				
	Admin Assistant	\$56	3.2	\$181
	IT/Project Manager	\$103	5.7	\$582
	Business Analyst	\$159	12.5	\$1,978
	Data Architect	\$176	4.3	\$747
	Data Manager	\$191	3.4	\$648
	Database Admin	\$176	3.3	\$571
	Process Consultant	\$176	0.9	\$154
	Reporters	\$159	8.6	\$1,362
	System Integrators /Consultants	\$176	18.5	\$3,251

Sub-project 2: Integrating four independent colleges associated with CICU: This includes integrating four independent colleges, standardizing the interfaces, gathering best practices, and using the same for integrating the rest of the private colleges. This sub-project will have no grants to LEAs though sub-grants to the four CICU colleges will be provided. The detailed staffing of the sub-project is as follows:

Cost Category	Sub-category (Type)	Cost/FTE (\$K)	# of FTE Required	RTTT Total Cost (\$K)
Personnel - External (Contractors)				
	Admin Assistant	\$56	2.7	\$149
	IT/Project Manager	\$103	2.7	\$275
	Business Analyst	\$159	5.3	\$846

Data Architect	\$176	2.7	\$469
Data Manager	\$191	2.7	\$508
Database Admin	\$176	2.7	\$469
Process Consultant	\$176	0.0	\$-
Reporters	\$159	5.3	\$846
System Integrators /Consultants	\$176	10.7	\$1,874

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$7.1MM
- Project Year 2 \$2.5MM
- Project Year 3 \$7.9MM
- Project Year 4 \$2.9MM
- All Project Years \$20.4MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$7.2MM
- Project Year 2 \$2.5MM
- Project Year 3 \$7.9MM
- Project Year 4 \$2.9MM
- All Project Years \$20.5MM

Project ID: C4

Project Name: Integration of Non-Education Systems

Associated with Criteria: (C)(2) and (C)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment	\$660				\$660
5. Supplies	\$1,500				\$1,500
6. Contractual			\$4,316	\$4,316	\$8,632
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$2,160		\$4,316	\$4,316	\$10,792
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$2,160		\$4,316	\$4,316	\$10,792

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

4) Equipment

Increased set of servers, networking and storage will require \$660K

5) Supplies

Increased software licensing costs requires \$1.5MM

6) Contractual

The plan is to integrate two systems in the next four years, and develop standards and best practices to aid integration of other relevant systems. None of this funding will go to LEAs. The detailed staffing for the project is as follows:

Cost Category	Sub-category (Type)	Cost/FTE (\$K)	# of FTE Required	RTTT Total Cost (\$K)
Personnel - External (Contractors)				
	Admin Assistant	\$56	2.1	\$115
	IT/Project Manager	\$103	4.2	\$433
	Business Analyst	\$159	12.5	\$1,978
	Data Architect	\$176	4.1	\$720
	Data Manager	\$191	1.1	\$200
	Database Admin	\$176	4.3	\$756
	Reporters	\$159	4.8	\$767
	System Integrators /Consultants	\$176	18.1	\$3,186

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$2.2MM
- Project Year 2 \$-
- Project Years 3-4: \$4.3MM
- All Project Years \$10.8MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$2.2MM
- Project Year 2 \$-
- Project Years 3-4: \$4.3MM
- All Project Years \$10.8MM

Project ID: C5

Project Name: Adoption of Growth Model (*IT System Enhancements*)

Associated with Criteria: (C)(2) and (C)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment	\$330				\$330
5. Supplies	\$550				\$550
6. Contractual	\$773	\$1,546	\$773		\$3,092
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$1,653	\$1,546	\$773		\$3,972
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$1,653	\$1,546	\$773		\$3,972

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

4) Equipment

Increased set of servers, networking and storage will require \$330K

5) Supplies

Increased software licensing costs requires \$550K

6) Contractual

Deals with developing the IT system (design, coding and implementation) as well as supporting reports for adopting the new growth model. The costing is developed based on Colorado’s growth model and considered representative of any growth model New York State will adopt. None of this funding will go to LEAs. The detailed staffing of the project is as follows:

Cost Category	Sub-category (Type)	Cost/FTE (\$K)	# of FTE Required	RTTT Total Cost (\$K)
Personnel - External (Contractors)				
	Admin Assistant	\$56	0.6	\$35
	IT/Project Manager	\$103	2.5	\$258
	Business Analyst	\$159	3.8	\$595
	Data Architect	\$176	1.3	\$220
	Data Manager	\$191	1.3	\$238
	Database Admin	\$176	1.3	\$220
	Reporters	\$159	2.7	\$423
	System Integrators /Consultants	\$176	5.0	\$879

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$1.6MM
- Project Year 2 \$1.5MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.8MM
- Project Year 4 \$-
- All Project Years \$3.9MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$1.6MM

- Project Year 2 \$1.5MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.8MM
- Project Year 4 \$-
- All Project Years \$4.0MM

Project ID: D1

Project Name: Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) for Teachers

Associated with Criteria: (D)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$4.9	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$12.3
4. Equipment	\$17.5				\$17.5
5. Supplies	\$1.3	\$1.3	\$1.3	\$1.3	\$5.2
6. Contractual	\$388	\$400	\$412	\$424	\$1,624
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other	\$10	\$3	\$3	\$3	\$19
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$422	\$407	\$419	\$431	\$1,678
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$28	\$14	\$14	\$14	\$71
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$622	\$313	\$313	\$313	\$1,559
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$1,072	\$733	\$745	\$758	\$3,308

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

- Approximately 14 trips in the first year to train the trainers: one to each regional Joint Management Team and one at each of the “Big Five” school districts, made by the 3 staff. At an average of \$350 per trip to provide training and technical assistance, totaling \$4,900
- Three staff will in total make approximately 7 trips in years 2-4. These trips will be follow up training sessions to new trainers in the JMTs. At an average of \$350 per trip to provide training and technical assistance, totaling \$2,450

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes: one laptop (\$639), four desktop computers (\$519 each, for a total of \$2076), one printer (\$1511), one fax (\$300), four chairs (\$550 each, for a total of \$2200), three desks (\$3000 each, for a total of \$9000), and one L-desk (\$1800), for a complete total of \$17,526.

5) Supplies

General office supplies of \$1,300 annually

6) Contractual

A contracted team will carry out the work of the project, with responsibilities and pay commensurate with those of the following grade Personnel:

- 0.9 FTE Associate responsible for overall leadership of the teacher and school leader initiatives involving teacher and principal career ladders, teacher and principal performance evaluation systems, and the reporting of teacher and principal performance evaluation results to the USED as part of the Race to the Top Grant. The Associate will also work specifically to implement the new teacher and principal career ladders described in (D)(2)(iv)(b), including preparation of state regulations for modifications to the certification structure for both teachers and principals to implement the new career ladders; oversee the budget for training staff of LEAs in the implementation of the new career ladders; advising LEAs on the interpretation of the new regulations; responding to complaints and questions from interested parties, such as teacher and principal unions, school board association, and other professional associations (annually \$82,871)
- Assistant responsible for revision and implementation of the revised teachers' annual professional performance review and implementation of the new principals' performance evaluation system. Duties will include drafting of implementing regulations; analyzing public comment, consulting and negotiating with interested parties (including unions, school board associations, and other professional associations); preparation of training materials for implementation in the LEAs; advising LEAs on implementation of the new performance evaluation systems, and answering complaints and questions from all interested parties (annually \$67,607)
- Assistant responsible for advising LEAs and coordinating with the information technology staff to ensure that accurate reporting of teacher and principal performance evaluation results is accomplished to meet the requirements of the Race to the Top Grant. This will include interpretation of new regulations, verifying and validating data, training and advising staff from LEAs (annually \$67,607)
- Secretarial support

Each additional year assumes a 3% increase in contract price.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

Printing of manuals for Performance reviews will require \$10,000 in the first year and \$3,000 annually in the subsequent three grant years.

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.4MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.4MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.4MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.4MM
- All Project Years \$1.5MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs; 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Race to the Top Funds will make possible both the development of the APPR and will supplement performance program training required for the state’s 226,000 teachers. To ensure that all teachers have opportunity to understand the performance programs, the training will be carried out through a train-the-trainer model.

The Boards of Cooperative Education Service (BOCES) will train the LEAs in their component districts and any other public school districts in their geographical area and staff in the big five cities LEAs will be responsible for training their staff in the performance evaluation systems for teachers. Each BOCES will serve as the primary resource to LEAs in their respective geographic area of New York State on an ongoing basis, providing technical assistance, interpreting of performance evaluation requirements, and assistance in resolving data problems. Each of the big five cities will provide training for the staff of their city schools and similarly provide technical assistance to schools as described above for the BOCES. This will require additional staff at each BOCES and each of the big five city districts and additional travel expenses especially in those upstate BOCES covering large geographic areas.

LEA Race to the Top dollars, awarded as subgrants, will largely fund the training of their district-level trainers, as LEAs will be purchasing these aforementioned services. The State has set aside \$1.6MM to provide supplements to participating LEAs and \$80K in grants to involved LEAs, in order to ensure that *all* teachers are appropriately trained in the introduction and use of the enhanced APPR.

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$1.1MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.7MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.7MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.8MM
- All Project Years \$3.3MM

Project ID: D2

Project Name: Evaluation System for Principals

Associated with Criteria: (D)(4)(ii)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	\$550	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$1,750
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$550	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$1,750
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$550	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$1,750

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual**

SED will select a professional organization to design and deliver a training program regarding the new Principal Performance Evaluation System to be made available regionally to principals and their supervisors throughout New York State. The training will be based on the required design elements and components of this new evaluation system and tied to national leadership standards. Costs estimated using available benchmarks for similar programs. This contract is budgeted to require an initial investment of \$550,000, and \$400,000 in each following year.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.55MM
- Project Years 2-4: \$0.4MM each
- Project Total: \$1.8MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.55MM
- Project Years 2-4: \$0.4MM each
- Project Total: \$1.8MM

Project ID: D3

Project Name: Creating Teacher and Principal Career Ladder

Associated with Criteria: (D)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment	\$24				\$24
5. Supplies	\$1.3	\$1.3	\$1.3	\$1.3	\$5.2
6. Contractual	\$513	\$521	\$537	\$553	\$2,124
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other (Printing)					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$538	\$522	\$538	\$554	\$2,153
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$538	\$522	\$538	\$554	\$2,153

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes: six desktop computers (\$519 each, for a total of \$3,114), one printer (\$1511), six chairs (\$550 each, for a total of \$3300), four desks (\$3000 each, for a total of \$12,000), two L-desks (\$1800 each, for a total of \$3600), for a complete total of \$23,525.

5) Supplies

General office supplies of \$1,300 annually

6) Contractual

In addition,

A contracted team will be identified to carry out the work of the project:

- Project Coordinator responsible for the overall Teacher and School Leader career ladders including reporting results to the USED as part of the Race to the Top Grant. The Associate will also work specifically to implement the new teacher and principal career ladders described in D2(iv)(b) and any new pathways to certification identified in (D)(3), including preparation of state regulations for modifications to the certification structure for both teachers and principals to implement the new career ladders and new pathway; oversee the budget for training staff of LEAs in the implementation of the new career ladders; advising LEAs on the interpretation of the new regulations; responding to complaints and questions from interested parties, such as teacher and principal unions, school board association, and other professional associations (annually \$82,871)
- In year 2-4 and beyond, a Teacher Certification office will need to review applications and issue certificates for new levels created in the Teacher and Principal Career Ladders and the new pathway to Teacher Certification created in (D)(2). The Department anticipates at least three new credentials resulting from the new career ladder and one new pathway created in (D)(2). If only 10% of the workforce receive these credentials, that would represent more than 25,000 additional credentials to be issued. The following team of contracted certification specialists would be needed to review applications and issue certificates.
 - Clerk 1: This position will open and enter all information received into TEACH. This person will be allocated 100% of the time at an initial salary of \$29,838
 - Licensing Services Clerk: This position will review and issue the more straight forward applications. This position will be allocated 100% of the time at an initial salary of \$37,486
 - Education Credential Specialist: These positions will be needed to evaluate the increase in applications due to the new certificate structure proposed. These 3.0 Specialists will be allocated 100% of the time each, at initial salaries of \$55,200 each
 - Senior Education Credential Specialist: This position will have the overall responsibility for the evaluation of the new certificate structure. This position will be allocated 100% of the time at an initial salary of \$71,103

Each additional year assumes a 3% increase in contract price.

In addition, SED will contract for development of the Career Ladders levels, including any new certificates for the Teachers and Principal Career Ladder and identification of any statewide assessments necessary as part of both career ladders. This will only include identification of the need for statewide assessments and not include work on developing any assessments required.

7) Training Stipends

8) Printing

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.5MM

- Project Year 2 \$0.5MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.5MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.5MM
- All Project Years \$2.0MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.5MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.5MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.5MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.6MM
- All Project Years \$2.1MM

Project ID: D4

Project Name: Incentive for Highly Effective Teachers Entering Highest-Need Schools to Teach Hard-to-Staff Subjects

Associated with Criteria: (D)(3)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel	\$116	\$120	\$123	\$127	\$486
2. Fringe Benefits	\$50	\$51	\$53	\$54	\$207
3. Travel	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$20.0
4. Equipment	\$12.0				\$12.0
5. Supplies	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$6.0
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$184	\$177	\$182	\$187	\$731
10. Indirect Costs	\$17	\$17	\$18	\$19	\$71
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$201	\$195	\$200	\$206	\$802

1) Personnel

The following requested personnel will be hired as employees of the project.

- Project Coordinator (Associate in Higher Education, Grade 26): This position will meet the minimum qualifications per the New York State Civil Service system and have the overall responsibility to coordinate this initiative including the continuing analysis and review of data, goals and objectives; development of the RFP; the review of applications; provide technical assistance and monitoring; etc... This position is assigned to this initiative 100% of the time at an initial salary of \$82,871
- Secretary (Keyboard Specialist, Grade 6) This position will meet the minimum qualifications per the New York State Civil Service system will maintain all data, files and information pertinent to this initiative, prepare reports, tables, charts and necessary correspondence, etc... This position is assigned to this initiative 100% of the time at an initial salary of \$29,838

Each additional year assumes a 3% salary increase..

2) Fringe Benefits

Calculated at 42.67% of Personnel costs

3) Travel

- Approximately 10 trips per year at an average of \$350 per trip to provide technical assistance and monitoring for a total of \$3,500
- The balance of \$1,500 is to be used to attend one to two conferences annually. This would include the cost of registration, transportation, food and lodging.

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes: one laptop at \$639, two desktop computers (\$519 each, for a total of \$1038), one printer (\$1511), one fax (\$300), two chairs (\$550 each, for a total of \$1100), one desk (\$3000), one L-desk (\$1800), and one meeting table & 6 chairs (\$2600), for a complete total of \$11,988.

5) Supplies

- General office supplies of \$1,3000 annually
- Subscriptions to periodicals and journals, \$200 annually

6) Contractual

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.2MM
- All Project Years \$0.7MM

10) Indirect Costs

Calculated using 14.60% as a percent of Personnel costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Under the guidance of the state program administrators, participating LEAs will create an incentive program using Title II, Part A grants to provide high need schools leverage to recruit and retain effective teachers either certified in one of the STEM disciplines or as teachers of English language learners or students with disabilities (who are actively engaged in supporting the learning needs of students in STEM disciplines).

Race to the Top funds will be allocated to this project only at the level of statewide project administration; the bonuses will be carved out of Title II, Part A, money to ensure that the program is sustained beyond 2013-14.

Further details of the program: Per the tables below, eligible teachers will receive \$30,000 in total bonuses over the course of five years to support the learning needs of students in STEM disciplines and other designated subjects in the State’s high need middle and high schools.

All LEAs with high-need schools will qualify for these Title II, Part A, grants, distributed according to the following priorities: schools with teacher shortages in all four areas (Math, Science, English Language learners and students with disabilities) will be priority one; those with needs in Math, Science, English Language learners or students with disabilities would be priority two; those with Math and Science shortage will be priority three.

Table: Creating a new five-year differential incentive to recruit and retain highly effective teachers to support the learning needs of students in STEM

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
<i>Funds expended per teacher</i>					
Cohort 1	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$7,000	\$8,000
Cohort 2		\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$7,000
Cohort 3			\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,000
Cohort 4				\$4,000	\$5,000
Cohort 5					\$4,000
<i>Teachers participating per year</i>					
Cohort 1	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Cohort 2		1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Cohort 3			1,000	1,000	1,000
Cohort 4				1,000	1,000
Cohort 5					1,000
Total	1,000	2,000	3,000	4,000	5,000
<i>Total Direct Cost Expenditure Per Year</i>					
Cohort 1	\$4MM	\$5MM	\$6MM	\$7MM	\$8MM
Cohort 2		\$4MM	\$5MM	\$6MM	\$7MM
Cohort 3			\$4MM	\$5MM	\$6MM
Cohort 4				\$4MM	\$5MM
Cohort 5					\$4MM
Total	\$4MM	\$9MM	\$15MM	\$22MM	\$30MM

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.2MM
- All Project Years \$0.8MM

Project ID: D5

Project Name: Residency Programs For Teachers

Associated with Criteria: (D)(4)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$20.0
4. Equipment	\$9.4				\$9.4
5. Supplies	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$6.0
6. Contractual	\$583	\$588	\$694	\$600	\$2,464
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$598	\$595	\$700	\$606	\$2,499
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$5.8	\$5.8	\$5.8	\$5.8	\$23.3
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$903	\$903	\$903	\$903	\$3,613
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$1,508	\$1,504	\$1,609	\$1,515	\$6,136

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

- Approximately 10 trips per year at an average of \$350.00 per trip to provide technical assistance and monitoring for a total of \$3,500
- The balance of \$1,500 is to be used to attend one to two conferences annually. This would include the cost of registration, transportation, food and lodging.

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes one laptop at \$639, two desktop computers at \$519 each, one printer at \$1511, one fax at \$300, two chairs at \$550 each, one desk at \$3000, and one L-desk at \$1800, for a total of \$9388.

5) Supplies

- General office supplies (paper, pens, pencils, markers, cartridges for printers, pads, newsprint, folders, staples, paper clips, postage, etc...), \$1,3000 annually
- Subscriptions to periodicals and journals, \$200 annually
- Total \$1,500

6) Contractual

We will assess the efficacy of the teacher residency programs project through rigorous evaluation. The evaluation will include several components, including an assessment of the fidelity of implementation, an assessment of teacher effectiveness employing multiple measures of effectiveness for two years following the completion of preparation, and a survey of teachers to assess various components of the programs. Effectiveness will be judged primarily, although not solely, based on impacts on student achievement. It is estimated that this evaluation will cost \$1.7 million over the four project years.

In addition, to execute the work on this project, the following position will be contracted:

- Project Coordinator to coordinate this initiative including the continuing analysis and review of data, goals and objectives; development of the RFP; the review of applications; provide technical assistance and monitoring; etc (commensurate with an annual salary of \$82,871, loaded with benefits and indirect costs, as well as appropriate secretarial support)

Each additional year assumes a 3% contract price increase.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.6MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.6MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.6MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.6MM
- All Project Years \$2.4MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

According to this project, LEAs will use their subgrants to provide stipends or tuition reimbursement to high-need low performing schools in the district partnering with IHEs to develop teacher residency programs. The programs will provide residency settings to prepare

teachers who will be effective in meeting the needs of the students in the LEA at the highest-need schools. These teachers will be prepared to effectively teach English language learners, students with disabilities and black and Hispanic males, and in content shortage areas. Eligible candidates will receive \$30,000 in stipends or tuition reimbursement during the residency year. The State expects that LEAs will provide \$27.5MM over the four grant years to fund residencies. As part of that \$27.5MM, the State anticipates providing \$3.7MM to supplement participating LEAs.

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$1.5MM
- Project Year 2 \$1.5MM
- Project Year 3 \$1.6MM
- Project Year 4 \$1.5MM
- All Project Years \$6.1MM

Project ID: D6

Project Name: Transforming Principal Preparation Programs

Associated with Criteria: (D)(4)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$7.0	\$7.0	\$7.0	\$7.0	\$28.0
4. Equipment	\$8.9				\$8.9
5. Supplies	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$6.0
6. Contractual	\$383	\$388	\$394	\$400	\$1,564
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$400	\$397	\$402	\$408	\$1,607
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$1	\$3	\$4	\$4	\$12
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$314	\$753	\$878	\$878	\$2,823
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$715	\$1,153	\$1,284	\$1,290	\$4,442

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

- Approximately 20 trips per year at an average of \$350.00 per trip to provide technical assistance and monitoring for a total of \$7,000.00.

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes one laptop at \$639, one desktop at \$519, one printer at \$1511, one fax at \$300, two chairs at \$550 each, one desk at \$3000, and one L-desk at \$1800, for a total of \$8869

5) Supplies

- General office supplies of \$1,3000 annually
- Subscriptions to periodicals and journals, \$200 annually

6) Contractual

In addition, to execute the work on this project, the following position will be contracted:

- Project Coordinator to coordinate this initiative including the preparation of a Request for Proposals (RFP) based on research-based leader preparation program design elements; review of applications; technical assistance and monitoring of transformed leader preparation programs; etc.; (commensurate with an annual salary of \$82,871, loaded with benefits and indirect costs, as well as appropriate secretarial support)

Each additional year assumes a 3% increase in the contract price.

In addition, the estimated cost of a rigorous evaluation of the efficacy of the project as measured by the impact of leadership on student achievement, is \$800,000 over four years

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Years 1-4: \$0.4MM each
- All Project Years \$1.5MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

The State estimates that LEAs will invest \$20.5MM in these transformed Principal preparation programs. Money will be used to offset the costs of Principal tuitions, and of providing an FTE replacement for a school leader for the period of the residency component.

The program provider will be responsible for overseeing the expenditures necessary to transform the leader preparation programs. The competitive RFP process will identify 10 additional leadership preparation programs annually. Programs approved in the RFP process will receive moneys in the form of Principal tuitions from LEAs. (In the first grant year, awards will also be complemented with additional money available via the TLQP project.)

Both participating and involved LEAs with high-need schools will be encouraged to enroll Principals in the transformed preparation programs. The State has established in its Race to the Top budget allowances to supplement participating LEAs to ensure that the costs of program participation are not inhibitive.

Presently, the State expects to provide approximately \$2.9MM to ensure inclusive participation among all high-need schools.

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.7MM

- Project Year 2 \$1.1MM
- Project Year 3 \$1.3MM
- Project Year 4 \$1.3MM
- All Project Years \$4.4MM

Project ID: D7

Project Name: Leadership Academies for School Principals

Associated with Criteria: (D)(5)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$10.0	\$10.0	\$10.0	\$10.0	\$40.0
4. Equipment	\$15.3				\$15.3
5. Supplies	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$12.0
6. Contractual	\$451	\$465	\$479	\$493	\$1,887
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$479	\$478	\$492	\$506	\$1,954
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$6.2
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$266	\$266	\$266	\$266	\$1,065
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$747	\$745	\$759	\$774	\$3,025

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

- Approximately 20 trips per year at an average of \$350 per trip to provide technical assistance and monitoring for a total of \$7,000
- The balance of \$3,000 is to be used to attend one to two conferences annually. This would include the cost of registration, transportation, food and lodging.

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes two laptops at \$639 each, one desktop at \$519, one fax at \$300, three chairs at \$550 each, three desks at \$3000 each, one meeting table & 6 chairs at \$2600, for a total of \$15,347.

5) Supplies

- General office supplies of \$2,800 annually
- Subscriptions to periodicals and journals, \$200 annually

6) Contractual

In addition, to execute the work on this project, the following team will be contracted:

- Three Project Coordinators responsible to coordinate the development of leadership academies including the continuing analysis and review of data, goals and objectives; development of the RFP; the review of applications; provide technical assistance and monitoring; etc (commensurate with an annual salary of \$82,871, loaded with benefits and indirect costs, as well as appropriate secretarial support)

Each additional year assumes a 3% increase in contract price.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.4MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.4MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.4MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.5MM
- All Project Years \$1.8MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

The three coordinators will each launch two Academies in each of the first two years with each requiring an initial investment of \$250K per Academy. Investments will be made possible through Principal “tuitions” paid out of LEA Race to the Top funds. Each leadership academy site will conduct focus groups for Principals and develop curriculum based on needs, research-based best practice on closing the achievement gap. Turnaround coaches will be identified and trained. Once academies are launched, the later years of the grant money will provide for the regional expansion of existing Academies, as well as to focus on sharing practices across Academies. The total expected investment in Principal Leadership Academies over the life of the grant will be \$6MM. The State will provide, from its share of Race to the Top, approximately \$1MM to supplement the investments LEAs make in this program.

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.7MM

- Project Year 2 \$0.7MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.8MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.8MM
- All Project Years \$3.0MM

Project ID: D8

Project Name: Model Induction Programs To Prepare All Teachers To Be Teacher Leaders

Associated with Criteria: (D)(5)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$27.5	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$42.5
4. Equipment	\$11.5				\$11.5
5. Supplies	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$6.0
6. Contractual	\$183	\$188	\$194	\$200	\$764
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other	\$75				\$75
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$298	\$195	\$200	\$206	\$899
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$298	\$195	\$200	\$206	\$899

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

- Approximately ten trips per year at an average of \$350 per trip to provide technical assistance and monitoring for a total of \$3,500. In year 1, an additional \$22,500 is needed to support five meetings of the ten-member work group of teachers and school leaders developing the model program, at \$450 per member per meeting.
- The balance of \$1,500 is to be used to attend one to two conferences annually. This includes the cost of registration, transportation, food and lodging.

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes one laptop at \$639, one desktop at \$519, one printer at \$1511, one fax at \$300, two chairs at \$550 each, for a total of \$1100, one desk at \$3000, one L-desk at \$1800, and one meeting table & 6 chairs at \$2600, for a total of \$11,469.

5) Supplies

- General office supplies of \$1,300 annually
- Subscriptions to periodicals and journals, \$ 200 annually

6) Contractual

In addition, to execute the work on this project, the following position will be contracted:

- One FTE Project Coordinator to coordinate this initiative including the continuing analysis and review of data, goals and objectives; development of the RFP; the review of applications; provide technical assistance and monitoring; etc.; (commensurate with an annual salary of \$82,871, loaded with benefits and indirect costs, as well as appropriate secretarial support)

Each additional year assumes a 3% increase in the contract price.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

- \$50,000 in Year 1 for replacement teacher costs for members of the work group to participate in five meetings.
- \$25,000 in Year 1 to support a statewide conference to roll out the model program.

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.3MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.2MM
- All Project Years \$0.8MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

This project fosters pilots of model induction programs for first- and second-year teachers in the highest-need schools. The model induction program will require approximately \$40MM LEA-level investment. The State has identified funds for this project within a settlement with Microsoft of which the money is intended to benefit highest-need, high-poverty schools. These dollars will provide for replacement teacher costs, coordination costs, professional development, supplies; and travel. The driving estimate of \$6,000 per teacher was derived using the information generated from the existing Mentor Teacher Internship Program grant.

For this project, Race to the Top funds will be used only for program administration, not LEA-level costs.

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.3MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.2MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.2MM
- All Project Years \$0.9MM

Project ID: D9

Project Name: Professional Development For Teachers Focused On The Use Of Student Performance And Growth Data For Formative Assessment

Associated with Criteria: (D)(5)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel	\$85	\$88	\$91	\$93	\$357
2. Fringe Benefits	\$36	\$38	\$39	\$40	\$152
3. Travel	\$0.0	\$3.5	\$3.5	\$3.5	\$10.5
4. Equipment	\$5.7				\$5.7
5. Supplies	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$6.0
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$129	\$130	\$134	\$138	\$532
10. Indirect Costs	\$12	\$13	\$13	\$14	\$52
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$141	\$143	\$147	\$152	\$584

1) Personnel

The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.

- One FTE Project Coordinator (Associate in Higher Education, Grade 26): Coordinate this initiative including the continuing analysis and review of data, goals and objectives; development of the RFP; the review of applications; provide technical assistance and monitoring; etc.; hired an initial salary of \$82,871

Each additional year assumes a 3% salary increase.

2) Fringe Benefits

Calculated at 42.67% of Personnel costs

3) Travel

- Approximately 10 trips per year at an average of \$350.00 per trip to provide technical assistance and monitoring for a total of \$3,500.00. No travel will be required in year 1

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes one laptop at \$639, one printer at \$1511, one chair at \$550, and one desk at \$3000, for a total of \$5700.

5) Supplies

- General office supplies of \$1,3000 annually
- Subscriptions to periodicals and journals, \$200 annually

6) Contractual

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.13MM
- Project Year 2 \$0.13MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.13MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.14MM
- All Project Years \$0.53MM

10) Indirect Costs

Calculated using 14.60% as a percent of Personnel costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs; 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

The entirety of the LEA-level costs associated with this project will be made available through the provision of money from the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant.

An RFP process will be used to incentivize approximately 10 two-year projects, serving an average of 200 teachers per project, at an average cost of \$2.4MM per project, according to the following schedule:

- Project Year One 5 projects; \$6MM
- Project Year Two Initiate 3 new projects; \$9.6MM
- Project Year Three Initiate 2 new projects; \$6MM
- Project Year Four No new projected commenced; \$2.4MM

All LEAs with high-need schools will be eligible to apply for these project awards.

Race to the Top money will support the creation and administration of the RFP process, as well as the evaluation of the pilots, but will not be used to fund the awards.

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1 \$0.14MM

- Project Year 2 \$0.14MM
- Project Year 3 \$0.15MM
- Project Year 4 \$0.15MM
- All Project Years \$0.58MM

Project ID: D10

Project Name: Teacher Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund

Associated with Criteria: (D)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$100,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$100,000

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

4) Equipment

5) Supplies

6) Contractual

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Participating LEAs will partner with NYSED via the Teacher Growth and Accountability Incentive Fund (\$100MM) to develop and implement robust teacher evaluations *to inform human capital decisions*. Specifically, the State plans to use \$100MM of its Race to the Top grant to provide an incentive fund for participating LEAs that use a qualifying performance-based evaluation to inform key personnel actions. This funding is supplemental to the subgrants.

13) Total Costs

- Project Years 1-4: \$25MM
- Project Total: \$100MM

Project ID: E1

Project Name: Turning Around Lowest-Achieving Schools

Associated with Criteria: (E)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)					
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$10,367	\$10,648			\$21,015
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$10,367	\$10,648			\$21,015

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual
- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Total funding for all participating LEAs will amount to \$207,999,564 (see below), half of which will be covered through the LEA allocations of Race to the Top subgrants and the other half through the School Improvement Grant. Where the burden of project implementation on certain LEAs overtaxes the awarded subgrant, however, the State has identified funds to supplement LEA implementation needs for effectively carrying out a turnaround strategy. The provision for supplemental funds is estimated at \$21.2MM.

Districts will have the option to deploy one of the four strategies outlined under Race to the Top that best fits the need of the school in need of turnaround. We estimate 80% of schools will choose either the Turnaround (40%) or Transformation (40%) strategies, while the remaining 20% of schools will choose between Closure and Restart. Each RTTT funded turnaround is expected to last two years. This is however a suggested costing/usage strategy for the funds based on interactions with several providers, and individual providers will have complete autonomy for using funds as long as they meeting the requisite criteria.

Strategy (a): The Turnaround model

For this model, the cost is estimated based on supports needed at the district, school and student level. The district requires a turnaround office to lead the turnaround efforts at the LEA. Responsibilities will include contracting with outside providers, disbursing funding and overseeing and being held accountable for turnaround results. In addition to organizational supports, a staff of district level experts in turnaround is needed to provide oversight and support to the field staff within schools.

LEAs will place a field staff of turnaround experts in every school to spearhead changes and support the building leadership in the critical transitional time. Curriculum trainers, coaches, a social worker and coordinators at the school level have also been factored in. These field staff are expected to serve a cluster of three schools in the district.

At the student level, students will be provided a new curriculum and established schedules and implemented strategies that provide for increased learning time. Recognizing that the foundation of a good school is a safe environment, a violence prevention curriculum will be provided.

The average funding per student from the RTTT grant is estimated at \$625 for turnaround, which will be complemented with, at minimum, a matching grant allocated from the Section 1003(g) funds.

Strategy (b): Restart model.

The cost structure of the Restart model is very similar to that of the turnaround model. Both would rely on a similar portfolio of proven turnaround strategies such as extended day, violence

prevention and a new curriculum. However, one distinct difference between the estimated budgets - in the district-level costs, an outside provider can leverage a regional or national office to receive support for their field staff; whereas in the turnaround model, these functions sit at the district level. An incremental cost for the re-start model is funding for facilities. School Improvement 1003(g) funds will be awarded to those districts who choose to employ the Restart model at a lowest-performing school.

Strategy (c): School closure.

The cost at the district and school level is minimal for a school closure. A staff person at the district level is charged with facilitating the transfer of students, and to coordinate related logistics such as transportation and materials. At the school level, a project manager and 2 research associates transfer records and provide support to the community during the transition. Finally, the bulk of the cost for school closure comes from the incentives offered to neighboring schools to accept students from the closing schools. Thus, the average funding per student from the RTTT grant is \$462 – the lowest of the four strategies. A district will qualify for additional money to carry out school closure from 1003(g) funds.

Strategy (d) Transformation model

The fundamentals of the cost estimations for a transformation model are the same as that of the turnaround. District-level staff support those in the field to drive change management in the lowest performing schools. Meanwhile, curriculum and extended day programs are provided on a student level.

There is one key difference between the turnaround model and transformation model:

- Additional school programs - Secondary School freshmen academies, Summer transition schools, credit recovery programs, Full day Pre-K and AP/IB STEM offerings enrich learning opportunities for NY's children. Costs incurred for a selection of these programs include teachers to staff the additional offerings and extra curriculum

This increases the average cost per student significantly and the average funding per student from the RTTT grant is estimated at \$810, with additional 1003(g) funds complementing the funding.

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1: \$10.4MM
- Project Year 2: \$10.6MM
- Project Years 3-4: \$-
- Project Total: \$21.0MM

Project ID: E2

Project Name: External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround

Associated with Criteria: (E)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$125	\$125	\$125	\$125	\$500
4. Equipment	\$183	\$125	\$125	\$125	\$558
5. Supplies	\$5.7	\$5.7	\$5.7	\$5.7	\$22.8
6. Contractual	\$5,012	\$5,136	\$5,136	\$5,136	\$20,420
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$5,325	\$5,392	\$5,392	\$5,392	\$21,501
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$5,325	\$5,392	\$5,392	\$5,392	\$21,501

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

The center professional staff will be traveling at least every two months to identified LEAs (six trips per year per district, to at least five districts) to provide technical assistance to districts regarding the planning and implementation of the four models. Trips budgeted at \$4,167 per trip for annual total of \$125,000.

4) Equipment

For the establishment of the ETACIT office. The office houses 24 staff.

- 21 Laptops (\$689 each)
- 3 Desktops, including monitors and printers (\$519 per Desktop computer)
- 2 printers (\$1,511 per printer)
- 4 desks and chairs (@\$1,250 per desk)
- 20 laptop stations and chairs for use by 20 staff (\$1,000 per workstation)
- 3 scanners (\$708 each)
- 6 Projectors (\$818 each)
- Yearly office space rental: \$125,000

Total, for the first year: \$183,112

Total for each subsequent year: \$125,000

5) Supplies

Estimate cost of supplies and materials needed for the ETACIT staff total \$5,700 per year

- General office supplies of \$2,700
- Instructional Materials (professional development books, pamphlets, educational magazine subscriptions): \$3,000

6) Contractual

To execute the work on this project, the following team will be contracted:

- Center Director responsible for oversight and management of the operations of the External Technical Assistance Center for Innovation and Turnaround (ETACIT). This individual will have extensive experience (at least 6 years) in managing the operations and administration of educational programs, including contracting with outside educational vendors. The director will be responsible for hiring all staff needed for the operation of the center and in addition, to submit to SED an annual evaluation of the center's activities (paid commensurate with an annual salary of \$200,000, loaded with benefits and indirect costs, as well as appropriate secretarial support)
- Professional Staff of approximate 20 FTE will work with at least five LEAs across the state, and will be assigned according to the number of lowest-achieving schools in each LEA. The responsibilities of Professional staff include: working with participating LEAs to plan and implement one of the four intervention models; gathering and disseminating research to LEAs on effective school intervention strategies; coordinating with other SED offices and outside educational organizations to provide professional development to LEAs; identifying lead partners to work with LEAs, for implementation of the restart and transformation models; outreach and technical assistance to possible lead partners; and collecting data on LEA model implementation and results (paid

commensurate with an annual salary of \$114,472, each, loaded with benefits and indirect costs, as well as appropriate secretarial support)

- Professional staff must have extensive knowledge and experience in school improvement/intervention, with specific experience in one or more of the following areas:
 - school organization and leadership;
 - curriculum content and standards alignment, assessment and instruction;
 - specialized intervention strategies, including serving students with disabilities and/or English language learners;
 - smaller learning communities and grade reconfiguration;
 - zoning or enrollment changes;
 - expanded options for over-age/under- credited students;
 - innovative use of facilities;
 - phasing-out/closing schools and developing new schools; and/or
 - any other effective school intervention strategies.

Each additional year assumes a 3% increase in contract price.

In addition, the following services will be purchased:

- Professional Development - Cost related to design and provision of professional development for LEAs prior to selection of school intervention model, and during the development of the school intervention model Plan. This allocation will cover the cost of consultants and materials.
 - \$400,000 per year
- Outreach and Development of Lead Partners- Estimate cost for conducting outreach activities to recruit new lead partners to work with LEAs in the turnaround, restart and transformation models. This includes travel, meetings, materials, and speakers.
 - \$340,000 per year
- Data Collection and Research - Cost related to gathering and disseminating research on effective turnaround practices to LEAs, and data collection to document LEA efforts and choices. This includes an evaluation conducted by a vendor on the outcomes of the implementation of the school intervention models.
 - \$125,000 per year

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1: \$4.9MM
- Project Years 2-4: \$5.0MM each

- Project Total: \$19.9MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1: \$5.3MM
- Project Years 2-4: \$5.4MM each
- Project Total: \$21.5MM

Project ID: E3**Project Name:** New York State Education Department Office of Innovative School Models**Associated with Criteria:** (E)(2)*(in \$K)*

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel	\$408	\$420	\$433	\$446	\$1,707
2. Fringe Benefits	\$174	\$179	\$185	\$190	\$728
3. Travel	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$10.0
4. Equipment	\$10				\$10
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual					
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$595	\$602	\$620	\$639	\$2,455
10. Indirect Costs	\$60	\$61	\$63	\$65	\$249
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$654	\$663	\$683	\$704	\$2,704

1) Personnel

OISM will have a total of 20 staff, including one Coordinator. A majority of positions will be filled with a reallocation of current SED staff. However, to facilitate building state capacity for the work of OISM, SED will use federal funds to temporarily hire 4 additional staff, and a Coordinator. After the initial grant period of four years, these positions will be eliminated, and the remaining staff will carry on the work of the OISM:

- One FTE Coordinator (G-28) will report directly to the Commissioner regarding the activities of the ETACIT, and the progress of LEAs intervening in the persistently lowest- achieving schools; hired at an initial salary of \$83,000

- Four FTE Professional Staff (G 26) will have expertise in grants management/compliance, procurement, contract management, human capital management and state policy; hired at an initial salary of \$72,000 each
- One FTE Support Staff (G 11), hired at an initial salary of \$37,000

Each additional year assumes a 3% salary increase.

2) Fringe Benefits

Calculated at 42.67% of Personnel costs

3) Travel

Staff will make approximately 50 trips in the first year to support LEAs in developing new policies and implement grants. The budget assumes an average of \$50 per trip based on the assumption that most staff are located in regional offices near the districts/schools being served.

4) Equipment

Equipment to purchase includes four computer stations, with desks, chairs, desktop computer and printer, at \$2,500 each.

5) Supplies

6) Contractual

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Years 1-4: \$0.6MM each
- Project Total: \$2.5MM

10) Indirect Costs

Calculated using 14.60% as a percent of Personnel costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Years 1-4: \$0.7MM each
- Project Total: \$2.7MM

Project ID: E5

Project Name: Statewide Evaluation Of Intervention and Innovative School Models

Associated Criteria: (E)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	\$245	\$247	\$248	\$250	\$990
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$245	\$247	\$248	\$250	\$990
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$245	\$247	\$248	\$250	\$990

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

4) Equipment

5) Supplies

6) Contractual

The state will issue a competitive RFP to select an independent statewide evaluator to evaluate the implementation and performance of all intervention and innovation schools. The budget for the contract allows for approximately 2 FTE at \$100,000 each annually.

In addition, this project will require a Project Coordinator to support the implementation of the statewide evaluator and serve as the conduit between the Department and participating schools. This person is expected to be required at 30% FTE, and paid commensurate to a salary of \$93,000 (fully loaded with benefits and indirect costs). This Coordinator will be required in years after the Race to the Top grant period.

Each additional year assumes a 3% increase in contract price.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Years 1-4: \$0.24MM each
- Project Total: \$0.97MM

10) Indirect Costs

Calculated using 14.60% as a percent of Personnel costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Years 1-4: \$0.25MM each
- Project Total: \$0.99MM

Project ID: E6

Project Name: Virtual Schools: Digital Learning: Approval of Course Content

Associated Criterion: (E)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel	\$347	\$357	\$368	\$379	\$1,452
2. Fringe Benefits	\$148	\$153	\$157	\$162	\$620
3. Travel	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$10.3
4. Equipment	\$8.5				\$8.5
5. Supplies	\$10.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$5.0	\$25.0
6. Contractual	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$200
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$566	\$568	\$583	\$599	\$2,315
10. Indirect Costs	\$51	\$52	\$54	\$55	\$212
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$617	\$620	\$637	\$654	\$2,527

1) Personnel

The following personnel will be required to manage the review and approval of course content:

- 1 FTE Project Manager (Associate, SG-26), hired at an initial salary of \$86,000
- 2.5 FTE Course Reviewers (Assistants, SG-22) , hired at an initial salary of \$70,000
- 1 FTE Web Site Technical Support (SG-18) , hired at an initial salary of \$57,000
- 1 FTE Support Staff (SG -6) , hired at an initial salary of \$31,000

Each additional year assumes a 3% salary increase.

2) Fringe Benefits

Calculated at 42.67% of Personnel costs

3) Travel

Project Manager and Web Site Technical Support will travel to state meetings four times per year at a cost of \$642 per trip.

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes 11 laptops (\$639) and one Printer (\$1,511).

5) Supplies

- Web Site Development requiring \$10,000 in the first year, only
- Web Site Maintenance requiring \$5,000 in each of the subsequent three years

6) Contractual

Purchased services and materials for review will total \$50,000 annually

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Years 1-4: \$0.6MM each
- Project Total: \$2.3MM

10) Indirect Costs

Calculated using 14.60% as a percent of Personnel costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Years 1-3: \$0.6MM each
- Project Year 4: \$0.7MM
- Project Total: \$2.5MM

Project ID: E7

Project Name: Virtual Schools: Digital Learning: Establishment of Virtual High Schools

Associated Criterion: (E)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$10.0
4. Equipment	\$0.0				\$0.0
5. Supplies	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$10.0
6. Contractual	\$3,817	\$526	\$536	\$546	\$5,425
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$3,822	\$531	\$541	\$551	\$5,445
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$479	\$178	\$181	\$184	\$1,022
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$4,301	\$709	\$722	\$735	\$6,467

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

Personnel travel requiring \$2,500 annually

4) Equipment

Equipment for purchase includes three computers (\$519 each) and one printer (\$1,511 each).

5) Supplies

General office supplies of \$2,500 annually

6) Contractual

In addition, to execute the work on this project, the following position will be contracted to manage the establishment of virtual high schools:

- 2.0 FTE Program staff (paid commensurate with an annual salary of \$85,000, loaded with benefits and indirect costs, as well as appropriate secretarial support)

Each additional year assumes a 3% increase in contract price.

In addition, the State will require the following purchased services: Curricula and assessments aligned to 28 NYS Learning Standards (including licenses, subscriptions, user fees, etc.)

- Initial cost for implementation (2010-2011): at \$500,000 per learning standard area, for a total of \$3,500,000
- Revisions and additions (2011-2014): \$200,000 annually

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1: \$3.8MM
- Project Years 2-4: \$0.5MM each
- Total Project: \$ 5.3MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

Total funding for all participating LEAs will amount to \$12,155,850 (see below), largely funded from the LEA allocations of Race to the Top subgrants. Where the burden of project implementation on certain LEAs overtaxes the awarded subgrant, however, the State has identified funds to supplement LEA implementation needs for establishment of virtual high schools. The provision for supplemental funds is estimated at \$1.0MM

The total LEA-borne costs include the following:

- Professional salaries
 - VHS support staff team (6.0 FTE): \$31,000 each initial salary
 - VHS Administrative team (superintendent/principal, financial officer, academic officer) (3.0 FTE): \$96,000 each initial salary
 - VHS Development team (5.0 FTE): \$86,000 each initial salary
 - VHS Technical Support Team (6.0 FTE): \$57,000 each initial salary
 - Management team: \$255,000 per year
- Instructional resources aligned to 28 NYS Learning Standards
 - Initial cost for implementation (2010-2011): \$4,200,000

- Scale-up, Additions and Revisions and additions (2011-2014): \$573,876 per year for subsequent three project years

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1: \$4.3MM
- Project Years 2-4: \$0.7MM each
- Total Project: \$ 6.5MM

Project ID: E8

Project Name: Virtual Schools: Digital Learning: Build a Statewide Virtual Learning Environment

Associated Criterion: (E)(2)

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel	\$1,025	\$1,056	\$1,087	\$1,120	\$4,288
2. Fringe Benefits	\$437	\$451	\$464	\$478	\$1,830
3. Travel	\$6.4	\$6.4	\$6.4	\$6.4	\$25.7
4. Equipment	\$14				\$14
5. Supplies	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$40
6. Contractual	\$300	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$750
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$1,793	\$1,673	\$1,718	\$1,764	\$6,948
10. Indirect Costs	\$150	\$154	\$159	\$164	\$626
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$1,943	\$1,827	\$1,877	\$1,928	\$7,574

1) Personnel

The following personnel will be required to manage the construction of the statewide virtual learning environment:

- 1 Coordinator of NYSED Office of Learning Technology Policy and Programs (M-3) @ \$96,000
- 5 Associates in Instructional Services (SG-26) @ \$85,000
- 5 Assistant in Instructional Services (SG-22) @ \$70,000
- 2 Educational Program Assistants (SG-14) @ \$46,000
- 2 Support Staff - Keyboard Specialist (SG-6) @ \$31,000

Each additional year assumes a 3% salary increase.

2) Fringe Benefits

Calculated at 42.67% of Personnel costs

3) Travel

Staff will travel to out-of-office meetings, conferences, and events, requiring \$6,420 per year.

4) Equipment

Equipment purchases to include 15 laptops (\$639 each) and 3 printers (\$1,511 each).

5) Supplies

Materials and general office supplies will total \$10,000 annually.

6) Contractual

Purchased services to include:

- Development of NYSED.net: \$300,000 first year, only
- Maintenance of NYSED.net: \$150,000 per year in subsequent years

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year 1: \$1.8MM
- Project Year 2: \$1.7MM
- Project Year 3: \$1.7MM
- Project Year 4: \$1.8MM
- Project Total: \$6.9MM

10) Indirect Costs

Calculated using 14.60% as a percent of Personnel costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year 1: \$1.9MM
- Project Year 2: \$1.8MM
- Project Year 3: \$1.9MM
- Project Year 4: \$1.9MM
- Project Total: \$7.6MM

Project ID: I1**Project Name:** Improving Early Learning Outcomes**Associated with Criteria:** Invitational Priority 3*(in \$K)*

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel	692	713	734	1,269	3,408
2. Fringe Benefits	295	304	313	542	1,454
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	1,378	1,801	706	706	4,591
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	2,365	2,818	1,753	2,517	9,453
10. Indirect Costs	101	104	107	185	497
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	2,466	2,922	1,860	2,702	9,950

1) Personnel

The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.

- 1 FTE Director (M-3) in years 1-3, at an initial salary of \$96,018
- 1 FTE accompanying Support staff (G-11) in years 1-3, at an initial salary of \$40,252
- 12 Regional staff (G-14) in years 1-3, assigned to identified struggling schools to assess the strengths of their prekindergarten – grade 4 system as electors to improve as part of improving graduation rates, hired at an initial salary of \$46,297 each
- 5 Directors (M-3) in regional settings in year 4, at an initial salary of \$96,018 each
- 5 accompanying Support Staff (G-11) in year 4, at an initial salary of \$40,252
- 5 Data coordinators (M-3) to assist in developing local systems in year 4, at an initial salary of \$96,018 each

Each additional year assumes a 3% salary increase.

2) Fringe Benefits

Calculated at 42.67% of Personnel costs

3) Travel

4) Equipment

5) Supplies

6) Contractual

Year I, \$1,378,000

- World Class Prekindergarten Standards
 - ~ Use of a national expert for international benchmarking \$5,000/10 days, for a total of \$50,000
 - ~ Use of four content experts to ensure rigor and aligned with content areas @ \$1,000/day/7 days, for a total of \$28,000
- Building an assessment protocol and data system
 - ~ Regional meetings with 0 – 3 system and prekindergarten – grade 4 constituents to assess what is currently used in LEAs and CBOs, \$50,000
 - ~ Purchased Services for a contractor to design protocol and build corresponding data system, \$450,000
- Develop an online early childhood component to the currently existing NYS Reading Academy that is focused upon instructional programming prekindergarten – grade 4, \$500,000
- Parent Assessment Tool for Quality
 - ~ Purchased Service to design a tool for parents so that they can assess the quality of prekindergarten and kindergarten programs and transitions, \$300,000

Year II, \$1,801,000

- World Class Prekindergarten Standards
 - Use of early childhood experts to develop curriculum framework on prekindergarten standard/5 consultants/\$500/30 days, for a total of \$75,000
 - Incorporate curriculum framework into SED web, for a total of \$20,000
- Building an assessment protocol and data system
 - Field test protocols in 2 big cities and 10 struggling schools, \$506,000
 - Continue work to incorporate data into prekindergarten - 12 struggling schools, \$200,000
- Develop an online early childhood component to the currently existing NYS Reading Academy that is focused upon instructional programming prekindergarten – grade 4, \$500,000

- Parent Assessment Tool for Quality
 - Field test tool with parents of newly enrolled prekindergarten students in 2 big cities and 10 struggling schools, \$300,000
 - Develop an evaluation study to assess impact of parent tool, \$200,000

Year III, \$706,000

- World Class Prekindergarten Standards
 - Conduct statewide technical assistance meetings on implementation of standards and curriculum frameworks, \$200,000
- Building an assessment protocol and data system
 - Implement statewide use by working with pilot sites, \$506,000
 - Conduct evaluation study of parent tool

Year IV, \$706,000

- World Class Prekindergarten Standards
 - Conduct statewide technical assistance meetings on implementation of standards and curriculum frameworks, \$200,000
- Building an assessment protocol and data system
 - Implement statewide use by working with pilot sites, \$506,000

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Project Year One \$2,365K
- Project Year Two \$2,818K
- Project Year Three \$1,753K
- Project Year Four \$2,517K

10) Indirect Costs

Calculated using 14.60% as a percent of Personnel costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs

- Project Year One \$2,466K
- Project Year Two \$2,922K
- Project Year Three \$1,860K
- Project Year Four \$2,702K

Project ID: I2

Project Name: Full Service Schools RFP

Associated with Criteria: Invitational Priority 6

(in \$K)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1	Project Year 2	Project Year 3	Project Year 4	Total
1. Personnel					
2. Fringe Benefits					
3. Travel					
4. Equipment					
5. Supplies					
6. Contractual	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$18,000
7. Training Stipends					
8. Other					
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$18,000
10. Indirect Costs					
11. Funding for Involved LEAs					
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs					
13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$18,000

1) Personnel

2) Fringe Benefits

3) Travel

4) Equipment

5) Supplies

6) Contractual

The project will competitively award, through RFP process, \$750,000 annually for four years to total twenty schools for a total of \$15,000,000. In addition to this per-school cost, the State budgets an overhead allowance of 20% (\$3,000,000). These contracts are budgeted to be awarded in equal amounts across the four grant years.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

- Each project year \$4.5MM
- Total \$18MM

10) Indirect Costs

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

- Each project year \$4.5MM
- Total \$18MM

Budget: Indirect Cost Information

To request reimbursement for indirect costs, please answer the following questions:

<p>Does the State have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?</p> <p>YES <input checked="" type="radio"/></p> <p>NO <input type="radio"/></p> <p>If yes to question 1, please provide the following information:</p> <p>Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (mm/dd/yyyy):</p> <p>From: <u>04 / 01 / 2008</u> To: <u>03 / 31 / 2009*</u></p> <p>Approving Federal agency: <u> X ED ___ Other</u></p> <p><i>(Please specify agency):</i> _____</p> <p>*Using prior year rate in absence of current year approved rate per guidance from bidders conference</p>
--

Directions for this form:

1. Indicate whether or not the State has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement that was approved by the Federal government.
2. If “No” is checked, ED generally will authorize grantees to use a temporary rate of 10 percent of budgeted salaries and wages subject to the following limitations:
 - (a) The grantee must submit an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency within 90 days after ED issues a grant award notification; and
 - (b) If after the 90-day period, the grantee has not submitted an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency, the grantee may not charge its grant for indirect costs until it has negotiated an indirect cost rate agreement with its cognizant agency.

If “Yes” is checked, indicate the beginning and ending dates covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. In addition, indicate whether ED, another Federal agency (Other) issued the approved agreement. If “Other” was checked, specify the name of the agency that issued the approved agreement.