

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

RACE TO THE TOP

GRANT REVIEW

Phase 1 and Tier 2 State Presentation

The State of New York

8:30 a.m.

Wednesday, March 17, 2010

Holiday Inn  
550 C Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C.

1 DR. STEINER: Good morning. My name  
2 is David Steiner. I was appointed by the  
3 Board of Regents as President of the  
4 University of the State of New York and  
5 Commissioner for Education.

6 On behalf of the Governor, the  
7 Legislature and the Board of Regents,  
8 it's an honor to be here. I'm proud to  
9 represent New York State and the Board of  
10 Regents and educators across all of our  
11 districts throughout the state to speak  
12 of our commitment to excellence and  
13 education.

14 We have some of the highest-  
15 performing schools and districts in the  
16 country where students are just excelling  
17 in AP exams and international  
18 baccalaureate, sending often almost a  
19 hundred percent of their students to  
20 four-year competitive colleges.

21 We have individual schools and  
22 districts across our state that are just

1 beating the odds and achieving at high  
2 levels from the socioeconomically  
3 diverse, suburban Rockville Centre School  
4 District in Long Island to the small  
5 rural school district of Lowville  
6 Academy. There are districts across the  
7 state that are graduating students at  
8 impressively high rates across all income  
9 categories.

10       However, we have not yet closed our  
11 tragically persistent performance gap  
12 especially for our male students of color  
13 and our English language learners.

14       Our statewide graduation rate is just  
15 over 70 percent and that's simply too  
16 low. We believe that many of our  
17 students are not yet ready for college or  
18 for the workplace in the 21st century and  
19 they must be.

20       We are proud of the progress we've  
21 made over the last ten years, but we're  
22 far from satisfied. We believe that

1 every district in the state deserves  
2 access to the tools, the best tools that  
3 we can give them.

4       That's why New York State has  
5 developed a bold vision for reform.  
6 While our plan is squarely focused on the  
7 four assurance areas, we believe that the  
8 quality of interaction between a student  
9 and a teacher is absolutely fundamental  
10 to every aspect of education and, thus,  
11 fundamental to the success in each of the  
12 four assurance areas.

13       Research demonstrates that effective  
14 teachers and principals are the most  
15 important factors in the formal education  
16 of children and those nations that have  
17 sharply improved student results have  
18 done so, also, by focusing on a robust  
19 curriculum for teachers to use in all  
20 grade levels.

21       In short, focusing on our teachers,  
22 our school leaders and our curriculum

1 creates the indispensable foundation for  
2 every aspect of our reform agenda.

3 John King is our Senior Deputy  
4 Commissioner for P-12 and will oversee  
5 all of Race to the Top's implementation  
6 work and resources. I'd like to turn it  
7 over to him.

8 DR. KING: Good morning. I founded  
9 Roxbury Preparatory Charter School in  
10 Boston because I believe that students'  
11 zip codes should not determine their  
12 destinies.

13 Roxbury Prep has become one of the  
14 highest-performing schools in the country  
15 serving high-need students and I left  
16 Roxbury Prep to help start Uncommon  
17 Schools, a charter management  
18 organization that now has 16 schools in  
19 New York City, Rochester, New York, Troy,  
20 New York and Newark, New Jersey, 16  
21 schools that are closing the achievement  
22 gap for high-need students.

1           And so for me, more germane to this  
2   role of the department was figuring out  
3   how do we take the lessons from Roxbury  
4   Prep, Uncommon Schools and other high-  
5   performing charter and district schools  
6   to scale.

7           Fundamentally, taking it to scale is  
8   about a core set of principles that I  
9   think are reflected in our Race to the  
10  Top application, a rigorous, standards-  
11  based curriculum, professional --  
12  significant investment in professional  
13  development for teachers, data-driven  
14  instruction, a good system of formative  
15  and interim assessments, a longer school  
16  day and a longer school year, careful  
17  selection, evaluation and coaching of  
18  teachers and, ultimately, a relentless  
19  focus on student achievement.

20           But as core, what we knew at Roxbury  
21  Prep and at Uncommon Schools that the key  
22  to our growth and the key to our success

1 was about our people, the quality of our  
2 teachers and leaders.

3 That led us to partner with KIPP and  
4 Achievement First, two other charter  
5 management organizations to found Teacher  
6 U at Hunter. That led us to build the  
7 school leadership fellowship, both of  
8 which had their core trying to take the  
9 best practices in the most successful  
10 classrooms for high-needs kids and  
11 replicate them through the use of video,  
12 through the use of clinically-based  
13 experiences for teachers during their  
14 training.

15 That same notion of investing in  
16 people trying to make teachers and  
17 leaders better and stronger and better  
18 able to get students to college and  
19 career-ready centers animates our entire  
20 Race to the Top application because we  
21 know that raising our standards, higher,  
22 clearer standards won't work if teachers

1 don't have the professional development  
2 to execute on that.

3       We know that building a P-20  
4 longitudinal data system and  
5 instructional reporting system won't work  
6 if teachers and leaders don't have the  
7 skills to use those tools effectively.

8       And we know that more performance-  
9 based, more comprehensive and more  
10 rigorous assessments won't drive better  
11 instruction if teachers aren't able to  
12 differentiate instruction effectively and  
13 principals aren't able to support them in  
14 that work.

15       And so I take my role as Senior  
16 Deputy Commissioner for P-12 education as  
17 driving -- using my experience as a  
18 classroom teacher, as a principal, as a  
19 leader of a network of schools to drive  
20 improvement in how we support our  
21 teachers and principals so they can  
22 continue to get better and continue to

1 serve our students better.

2 Now, I'd like to introduce Laura  
3 Smith who is our Assistant Commissioner  
4 for External Partnerships and Research.

5 MS. SMITH: Thank you, John. Prior  
6 to joining the State Education  
7 Department, I worked for the New York  
8 City Department of Education, and before  
9 that the San Diego City School District.

10 This past November I joined the  
11 Department because I wanted to be part of  
12 a new team that was focused on results  
13 and reforms and build on the lessons I  
14 had learned in reforming two large city  
15 school systems.

16 In both of the districts in which I  
17 worked, I implemented strategic reforms  
18 that completely changed the way these  
19 districts did business, and many of these  
20 reforms are at the core of our Race to  
21 the Top application.

22 Our proposal does have a lot of

1 districts and their schools, but our Race  
2 to the Top reforms are already underway  
3 across the state; a few examples:

4       New York has a strong history of  
5 funding education reform including our  
6 Contracts for Excellence Program, which  
7 we call C for E. It's an 850 million  
8 dollar gubernatorial initiative designed  
9 to provide funding increases targeting  
10 students with the greatest needs and that  
11 are tied to increased accountability for  
12 our school districts.

13       Many of our districts have already  
14 invested deeply in developing their  
15 educators. New York City, Rochester and  
16 Buffalo all have alternative  
17 certification programs that have nearly  
18 eliminated their math and their science  
19 vacancies.

20       We also have principal's leadership  
21 academies in New York City, Rochester and  
22 also in the Hudson Valley.

1 New York has had rigorous student  
2 learning standards and assessments since  
3 the 19th century and we've revised and  
4 enhanced those standards and assessments  
5 four times within just the last 20 years.

6 And since the '70s, we've had high  
7 school exit exam requirements for our  
8 graduates.

9 To support our districts and schools  
10 in implementing our standards and  
11 assessments, we've used statewide  
12 networks, specifically our 37 BOCES,  
13 which stands for Boards of Cooperative  
14 Educational Services, which are  
15 collaboratives of school districts.

16 Numerous cities in New York have  
17 charter schools that have impressive  
18 results. John mentioned some. This  
19 includes the Buffalo Charter School for  
20 Applied Technologies, Rochester Prep,  
21 KIPP Academy and Harlem Children's Zone.

22 Many of our districts have also

1 embraced new small schools that have an  
2 open partnership with external partners  
3 such as College Board, which have schools  
4 in New York, Buffalo, Rochester and in  
5 Yonkers, and also an organization called  
6 Expeditionary Learning, which has schools  
7 that they partner with in Rochester and  
8 Syracuse.

9 Syracuse has launched one of the  
10 countries most comprehensive approaches  
11 to whole district reform with a program  
12 called Say Yes, as an innovative partner  
13 they're working with and they work with  
14 the entire school system.

15 Say Yes provides support to enable  
16 every child to reach his or her full  
17 potential including the promise of free  
18 college tuition.

19 With regard to our STEM work, that's  
20 been quite extensive thus far. The  
21 Questar III and Capital Region BOCES, two  
22 of our BOCES, have collaborated to launch

1 an innovative STEM-focused high school  
2 called Tech Valley.

3 Fairport in upstate New York is  
4 launching all-girls technology courses in  
5 collaboration with the Rochester  
6 Institute of Technology.

7 Whitesboro is introducing a nano  
8 technology curriculum and at Cobleskill-  
9 Richmondville, students are enrolling in  
10 pre-engineering courses as part of the  
11 district's Project Lead the Way Program.

12 We also have districts around the  
13 state that have achieved dramatic gap-  
14 closing gains over the last few years.  
15 Districts like Middletown, which has made  
16 tremendous progress by leveraging  
17 investments in professional development,  
18 technology and closer connections between  
19 students' high school experiences and  
20 their post-secondary aspiration.

21 So you can see Race to the Top for us  
22 does not mean a new direction, but

1 actually an acceleration of all of our  
2 work that's already under way.

3 So I'd like to turn it over to Bob  
4 Hughes, who is the CEO and President of  
5 New Visions for Public Schools.

6 MR. HUGHES: Thanks, Laura.

7 New York State's Race to the Top  
8 application builds upon an extraordinary  
9 record of reform in New York City and New  
10 York State. Speaking from the trenches  
11 let me describe our proposal and why I  
12 believe it promises to dramatically  
13 improve teaching and learning.

14 Let me talk about four things:  
15 turnaround, closing low-performing  
16 schools, using data to improve  
17 instruction, creating new pathways into  
18 the profession of teaching and leadership  
19 and ultimately giving schools greater  
20 autonomy in exchange for meaningful  
21 accountability.

22 In New York over the last eight years

1 working with the New York City Department  
2 of Education, New Visions and community  
3 groups, together with the city's labor  
4 unions, have actually closed 14 large  
5 low-performing  
6 schools, actually, a hundred low-  
7 performing schools over the last eight  
8 years.

9 But in those 14 low-performing  
10 schools that I've been involved with, we  
11 had 35-percent graduation rates when we  
12 started.

13 Working with hundreds of parents,  
14 teams of teachers and civic and community  
15 groups, we've created 99 small schools in  
16 seven years.

17 Those schools have high expectations.  
18 We expect at least 80 percent of the  
19 kids to graduate. We created unique data  
20 systems using yours and other strategies  
21 to make ourselves accountable and  
22 transparent for outcomes.

1           The result is two-fold. We have new  
2 models in science and technology, single-  
3 sex education, ELL and bilingual schools  
4 and transfer schools that target over-age  
5 and under-credited kids.

6           Parents of students have more choice  
7 at scale and, frankly, good teachers have  
8 more choice as well.

9           But more importantly, the graduation  
10 rate for these schools have increased  
11 dramatically. In 2008, the average  
12 graduation rate in our small schools was  
13 75 percent. More importantly, African-  
14 American and Latino students are  
15 graduating at 20 percent, rates 20  
16 percent higher than their peers across  
17 the city.

18           In a portfolio strategy, it's crucial  
19 to use data. We worked to increase  
20 student and teacher involvement in data  
21 analysis through the inquiry team  
22 strategy.

1           In 2003, we piloted this strategy to  
2 empower teachers using standards and  
3 assessments, but also in structuring  
4 schools for improvement.

5           And with inquiry, teach practice is  
6 public and they work aggressively as  
7 grade teams and department teams to  
8 analyze students who are outside the  
9 school's sphere of success and move the  
10 achievement level of those kids together  
11 in their classes and in systems in the  
12 school.

13           Our activities ensure that teachers  
14 concretely measure results of the  
15 strategies they implement on a daily and  
16 a weekly basis.

17           In mid-performing large schools,  
18 we've used inquiry and we've ultimately  
19 seen graduation rate increases of eight  
20 to ten percent.

21           At the core of our emerging work, and  
22 thirdly, we are working to create

1 alternative certification programs with  
2 Baruch and Hunter College. At the core  
3 of these programs, aspiring principals  
4 and teachers graduate and become  
5 certified only when they demonstrate they  
6 have improved student achievement.

7 Race to the Top will enable us to  
8 dramatically improve and increase the  
9 number of these programs throughout New  
10 York City. New York ultimately is  
11 putting greater autonomy at the school  
12 level in exchange for accountability.

13 New Visions has worked for three  
14 years as a partnership support  
15 organization. We are responsible for  
16 providing instructional and operational  
17 support to 76 schools with 35,000  
18 students.

19 In this role, we, like our principals  
20 and teachers, are publicly accountable  
21 for results. We receive autonomy in  
22 exchange for greater accountability for

1 student growth, and credit accumulation,  
2 attendance and standardized assessments.

3 We are working to empower teachers,  
4 but we're also holding them accountable.

5 Last year the leadership of our schools  
6 either rated unsatisfactory, extended or  
7 denied tenure, 13 percent of our  
8 workforce, based on an assessment of  
9 their effectiveness in raising student  
10 achievement.

11 We obviously can improve and are  
12 committed to do so; however, speaking  
13 from the trenches, this proposal is not  
14 built on Smoke and Mirrors, but is on the  
15 real capacity, commitment and experience  
16 of educators throughout the state.

17 With the tools described by my  
18 colleagues, we have turned around  
19 schools. With your support, we will  
20 create the conditions for greater  
21 success.

22 I now would like to introduce Ira

1 Schwartz, the State Assistant  
2 Commissioner for Accountability.

3 MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Bob.

4 For 20 years, I have been involved in  
5 New York's efforts to turn around its  
6 lowest-performing schools. I was  
7 involved in the design of our system for  
8 the registration of public schools and I  
9 have been deeply involved in the process  
10 by which we have charted more than almost  
11 200 schools, including some of the  
12 highest performing in the United States.

13 I led our efforts that resulted in  
14 New York being among the first five  
15 states to have its accountability  
16 workbook approved under the current re-  
17 authorization of the SEA and I also led  
18 New York's efforts that have resulted in  
19 us being one of nine states to be  
20 operating a differentiated accountability  
21 model.

22 I chair the State Education

1 Department School Accountability  
2 Workgroup in which are offices of  
3 assessments, information reporting and  
4 school improvement and other offices  
5 working in collaboration on cross-cutting  
6 issues, such as the development of the  
7 next generation of a growth model.

8         Since I have been at the Department,  
9 I have seen our accountability system  
10 evolve and strengthen.

11         Long before Race to the Top was  
12 conceived, the Board of Regents put in  
13 place a policy under which schools in New  
14 York must perform or they must perish and  
15 be replaced by new institutions that will  
16 better serve our students.

17         During this time, New York has been  
18 one of the first states to adopt such  
19 processes as school quality reviews,  
20 curriculum audits and the redesign of  
21 schools through the replacement of staff.

22         We have also collaborated with the

1 New York City Department of Education as  
2 they have pioneered innovation such as  
3 the Chancellor's District, a government  
4 structure under which schools receive  
5 intent of support and assistance and then  
6 later the creation of the empowerment  
7 zone under which schools and school  
8 leadership teams traded significant  
9 increases in flexibility and autonomy for  
10 greater accountability.

11       These pioneering efforts have  
12 subsequently been either adopted or  
13 adapted by districts both in New York and  
14 across the United States. The Board of  
15 Regents has a deep commitment and  
16 willingness to intervene intensively in  
17 our lowest-performing schools.

18       We have placed more than 300 schools  
19 under registration review and the result  
20 of that effort has been that more than  
21 200 of these schools have significantly  
22 improved their performance.

1           In some 60 cases, we have worked with  
2 school districts and partners, such as  
3 New Visions, to take low-performing  
4 schools and replace them with new  
5 innovative school models.

6           Accountability is not just about  
7 intervening in low-performing schools.  
8 It is also about identifying success and  
9 we have had a lot of success in New York.

10          Recently, we created a list of 214  
11 schools in New York. These are schools  
12 that are accountable for their English  
13 language learners and students with  
14 disabilities subgroups; yet, these  
15 schools have more than 90 percent of  
16 their students who achieve proficiency in  
17 English language, arts and mathematics,  
18 and at the high school level also has 90-  
19 percent graduation rates.

20          In addition, at the elementary and  
21 middle school level, the English  
22 language, arts and students with

1 disabilities groups have achieved more  
2 than 60 percent proficiency, and at the  
3 high school level have achieved more than  
4 70 percent proficiency.

5 Despite these accomplishments, we  
6 recognize that too often our success has  
7 been measured as taking schools that have  
8 been awful and raising them to be average  
9 in districts that themselves are not high  
10 performing.

11 Our goal is to do much more than  
12 that. We want to take our lowest-  
13 performing schools and move them beyond  
14 average to excellence because we believe  
15 deeply and passionately that every  
16 student deserves an excellent education.

17 Working with our districts and  
18 organizations, such as Massachusetts  
19 Insight, and with our partners, such as  
20 New Visions, with the additional  
21 resources that Race to the Top will give  
22 us and the reforms that we commit to, we

1 are confident that we can move forward  
2 toward success.

3 DR. STEINER: Thank you, Ira. It all  
4 begins with teachers.

5 Before I came to be Commissioner, I  
6 had the privilege of being Dean at the  
7 School of Education at Hunter College  
8 with some 3,000 students learning to be  
9 teachers.

10 I, and my colleagues, were convinced  
11 that business as usual was not good  
12 enough. The use of course work and  
13 textbooks wasn't getting it done. So we  
14 decided to begin to do it differently.

15 We have worked in partnership with  
16 high-performing schools, such as the one  
17 that John led, to really develop a  
18 different way of preparing teachers, a  
19 way that was focused on intensive use of  
20 video, intensive use of rigorous rubrics  
21 and the assessment of how you added in  
22 the classroom that those trainee teachers

1 were achieving.

2 We believe that only by intensive  
3 practice in the field can you, in fact,  
4 make a difference for children.

5 We have put those aspects into the  
6 heart of our Race to the Top application.

7 That group called Teacher U that we put  
8 together at Hunter has become a model  
9 recognized by Secretary Duncan as  
10 nationally innovative in the field of  
11 teacher preparation.

12 We believe in doing the same thing  
13 for principals. Once again, its clinical  
14 practice carefully supervised and  
15 assessed that's going to make a real  
16 difference.

17 We also believe that student teachers  
18 ideally should be in their classrooms for  
19 extensive periods before they teach and  
20 that's why, along with Bob Hughes, we've  
21 also started a major residency program at  
22 Hunter College where the student teacher

1 is in the school for a whole year before  
2 she becomes a teacher of record, and once  
3 again, we've put that at the heart of our  
4 Race to the Top application to take it to  
5 the rest of the state.

6 I'm devoted, as you can see, to the  
7 goal of more effective preparation of  
8 teachers and principals and to the  
9 professional development there of that  
10 group; however, that cannot be the whole  
11 story of education reform.

12 My past work with the Core Knowledge  
13 Foundation, my research in educational  
14 policy here and abroad and my deep  
15 commitment to a broader and deeper  
16 curriculum, including the arts, give me a  
17 passion for vision of education reform.

18 I'm very, very proud of the team  
19 assembled here before you. As you can  
20 hear, there's real on-the-ground  
21 experience implementing reforms that have  
22 made dramatic differences for the

1 students of our state. We are fully  
2 prepared to execute on the Race to the  
3 Top.

4 Now, let's spend a few minutes  
5 providing critical contextual facts about  
6 New York State's educational structures.

7 First, the Board of Regents, which  
8 was created in 1784, has a unique  
9 authority over educational policy. There  
10 is no other educational policy board in  
11 the country that has its kind of power.

12 Let me give an example: In terms of  
13 adopting the common core standards, while  
14 the Board, of course, will consult with  
15 multiple stakeholders, ultimately, it's  
16 the Board that will make the decision.

17 The Board of Regents, likewise, sets  
18 requirements for graduation from high  
19 school and standards for all teacher and  
20 principal preparation. Regents oversee  
21 all educational institutions in the state  
22 from pre-K to adulthood, all schools,

1 higher education, libraries, museums and  
2 public television stations.

3 The Regents can and have intervened  
4 in low-performing schools. They've  
5 closed them down and they will, if  
6 necessary, do so again.

7 New York State is committed to using  
8 Race to the Top funding not just for  
9 teacher preparation, principal  
10 preparation and important data systems  
11 and turning around low-performing  
12 schools, but also to develop the content-  
13 rich sequent spiraled curriculum  
14 frameworks as a foundation of our  
15 educational system.

16 We are also committed to a vision of  
17 education that is deeper and broader than  
18 is conventional. We have approved --  
19 Regents have approved a commitment to  
20 adding the arts, economics, domestic and  
21 international, and multimedia computer  
22 technologies to our Regents' assessments

1 and the curriculums that will support  
2 them.

3       As we retool our teacher preparation,  
4 our professional development to ensure  
5 that all practitioners can implement this  
6 new curriculum, based on new common  
7 standards and new federally supported  
8 formative, interim and summative  
9 assessments, we will have the tools that  
10 are essential to produce successful  
11 interactions between students and  
12 teachers.

13       To ensure that we place only  
14 effective teachers into our classrooms,  
15 we will transform the certification  
16 process by requiring that, not only are  
17 we going to use the tools I described  
18 earlier, the video and the analysis  
19 rubrics, but that teachers demonstrate  
20 value added in the classroom as a  
21 condition of their professional  
22 certification.

1           To further foster innovation in the  
2 field of teacher preparation, we will now  
3 allow non-collegiate providers to offer  
4 teacher certification grounded in  
5 clinical practice and high-performance  
6 assessments.

7           We will revise our annual teacher  
8 evaluations to include a measure of  
9 student growth in addition to the eight  
10 other quality measures already in place.

11

12           To further develop the quality of our  
13 existing teachers and principals, we've  
14 set aside 120 million dollars in our  
15 application to incentivize the use of new  
16 multidimensional evaluations that  
17 incorporate student growth to an even  
18 greater degree.

19           Districts participating in the  
20 incentive funds will commit to use  
21 student growth for 30 to 40 percent of  
22 teacher and principal evaluations and use

1 those evaluations in decisions about  
2 compensation, promotion, tenure and  
3 retention.

4 Our two principal unions have  
5 endorsed this incentive fund in the model  
6 for principals. And to be clear, New  
7 York's law regarding the use of student  
8 data is not a barrier to using this data  
9 to evaluate teachers or award tenure  
10 provided other measures are also used.

11 This is made clear in the letter in  
12 our application from New York Assembly  
13 Speaker Sheldon Silver. The intent of  
14 the student data law is that data be a  
15 component of tenure determinations.

16 John.

17 DR. KING: Beyond the teacher and  
18 leader effectiveness initiatives that the  
19 Commissioner just described, there are  
20 other goals that I think is important to  
21 emphasize in our Race to the Top  
22 application: building a P-20 longitudinal

1 data system that integrates not only data  
2 from formative, interim and summative  
3 assessments, but also links unique  
4 teacher identifiers to unique student  
5 identifiers, that links unique principal  
6 identifiers to unique student  
7 identifiers, that creates using course  
8 identifiers so that we can create  
9 electronic transcripts for students,  
10 particularly those students who are most  
11 at risk and most mobile, a data system  
12 that links what we know about P-12 to  
13 higher education.

14       As we describe in the application,  
15 we're already working with SUNY and CUNY  
16 to link their data -- our two public  
17 university systems, to link their data to  
18 our P-12 data, and we also are working to  
19 integrate non-educational data, data on  
20 the workforce and healthcare so that we  
21 can actually ask really important  
22 research questions through that P-20

1 longitudinal data system and then  
2 complement it with an instructional  
3 reporting system model done, New York  
4 City's successful ARIS model that will  
5 drive instructional improvement.

6       We also set out very clearly a goal  
7 of turning around our persistent lowest-  
8 achieving schools and, as Ira said, not  
9 just making them better, but making them  
10 excellent.

11       Part of how we describe doing that in  
12 the application is to use the resources  
13 of the Title I, 1003(g), as well as Race  
14 to the Top, to drive real innovation  
15 particularly in how we approach high  
16 schools.       So many of our 57 schools  
17 are high schools and we think the high  
18 school that's only graduating 35 percent  
19 of its students, you need to do something  
20 radically different to keep those other  
21 65 percent of the students in school  
22 progressing towards college and career

1 standards.

2       And so we talk about creating schools  
3 that have a STEM focus, to have a career  
4 and technical education focus, that rely  
5 on the arts as a way to engage and  
6 motivate students, schools that might  
7 leverage blended instructional models  
8 using online learning. So we have a  
9 vision for transforming high school  
10 education in the state.

11       We also know that we'll need to use  
12 all of the tools at our disposal and are  
13 current law in order to drive that  
14 innovation.

15       We will need to use the ability under  
16 current law for SUNY and CUNY to manage  
17 schools directly. We'll need to use our  
18 AP and remaining charters to try and  
19 create opportunities to replace those  
20 persistently lowest-achieving schools  
21 statewide.

22       We will need to take advantage of

1 alternative governance models like New  
2 Visions where intermediaries are  
3 partnering with districts to support the  
4 schools and their teachers in getting  
5 much better performance for students.

6 And New York City and New York State  
7 have been innovators of the use of  
8 intermediaries like New Visions, like  
9 Expeditionary Learning, like College  
10 Board. And we've got examples all across  
11 the state of those partners  
12 driving improvements in achievement.

13 And finally, I want to emphasize that  
14 our application makes a big investment in  
15 STEM/Science, Technology, Engineering and  
16 Math, because we believe the future of  
17 the state's economy, in part, depends on  
18 those STEM initiatives.

19 And so in each area of the work,  
20 whether it's developing better, richer  
21 curricula in the STEM areas, investing in  
22 finding out good data about students'

1 performance in the STEM areas and using  
2 that to drive instruction, an incentive  
3 fund that we described to attract  
4 teachers in the STEM areas, particularly  
5 teachers who will focus on serving  
6 students with disabilities and English  
7 language learners in the STEM areas,  
8 using our virtual school as a strategy  
9 for making advanced STEM classes  
10 available to under-resourced schools in  
11 the city and in our rural areas, I just  
12 wanted to emphasize we have a  
13 comprehensive strategy for school  
14 improvement.

15 DR. STEINER: Thank you, John.

16 In sum, we believe that the greatest  
17 strength of our application is our focus  
18 on the instructional core of education.  
19 For us, everything comes back to the  
20 skills and knowledge of those who can  
21 make a difference: our teachers, our  
22 principals, our school district leaders.

1           Our Race to the Top goal is not  
2 simply to have a few more students  
3 succeed against the odds. It is to  
4 fundamentally change the odds for all  
5 students. If you give us the tools, we  
6 are committed to getting the job done.

7           Thank you so much for your attention.  
8 We would be delighted to take your  
9 questions.

10          REVIEWER #1: Reviewer 2, why don't  
11 you start first.

12          REVIEWER #2: Thanks again for your  
13 presentations.

14          I think one of the toughest things  
15 that you had in front of you was to, in  
16 the application, talk about how you were  
17 going to translate these statewide  
18 aspirations into local implementations.

19          DR. STEINER: Yes.

20          REVIEWER #2: And what I'd like to  
21 hear you talk a little bit more about --  
22 and I'll give you a specific example from

1 the application -- is about your role in  
2 that translation to implementation at the  
3 LEA level.

4 So for me, I guess the place to start  
5 -- the specific place to start is going  
6 to be with teacher evaluation.

7 So you have, you know, in your -- the  
8 MOU that you had people sign, you had a  
9 clause that was put in there about the  
10 role of the collective bargaining  
11 agreement in some of these very tough  
12 issues like what role is, you know,  
13 teacher effect -- how are we going to  
14 decide what this is going to look like.

15 And so there's a big out. There's a  
16 big out for teachers unions in there  
17 because those things have to be  
18 collectively bargained. And then you as  
19 the state have to, you know, kind of  
20 figure out what your role in those  
21 conversations is going to be.

22 And so what I'd like to know is can

1 you clarify for me what role you think  
2 you are going to play when local  
3 education agencies are talking with their  
4 unions about these very tough questions.

5 DR. STEINER: Let me start and then  
6 hand to my colleagues.

7 I want to be clear, first of all,  
8 that, unlike in many states, our  
9 professional certification requirement is  
10 an absolute; in other words, you can't  
11 continue to teach if you don't achieve  
12 that level.

13 Now, traditionally, that has been a  
14 paper and pencil course work, right, at  
15 its core. We are transforming that into  
16 a performance-based assessment that will  
17 actually have value added at the core of  
18 it. And I want to stress that that is  
19 within the purview of the Regents, right.  
20 That is one of the things that they can  
21 do. So that is a front-end, high  
22 standard of performance before any

1 teacher can do a lifetime of teaching.

2 Secondly, the Board of Regents has  
3 the capacity to establish the criteria  
4 that have to be used in the annual  
5 performance review and they have just  
6 done so; that is, the four different  
7 criteria of performance levels now have  
8 to be entered into collective bargaining.

9 There's no option about that. It  
10 becomes one of the things that's there,  
11 and we have committed to building  
12 professional development around those new  
13 standards.

14 And finally, we have the incentive  
15 package, as you know, which frankly in a  
16 time of unprecedented economic distress  
17 for the state will have a  
18 disproportionate attractiveness for all  
19 of us to be engaged in.

20 John, maybe you can add a couple of  
21 thoughts to that.

22 DR. KING: I would just emphasize the

1 scope of participation across our LEAs,  
2 we have very high participation. Over  
3 550 of our LEAs are signing on to  
4 participate, including that provision of  
5 the MOU.

6 And we're actually quite strict about  
7 the MOU. If districts try to opt out of  
8 that provision of the MOU, we didn't  
9 accept their MOU.

10 So we made it very clear, I think, to  
11 all of our districts that we expect this  
12 work of collectively bargaining the use  
13 of student growth for teacher evaluation  
14 to be at the heart of participation of  
15 Race to the Top.

16 I also think it's important to  
17 emphasize, as we mentioned the  
18 presentation, that both our statewide  
19 principals' union and the New York City  
20 principals' union signed on to the  
21 Principal Incentive Fund, so I think  
22 that's a good sign about the willingness

1 of our collective bargaining units in the  
2 state to engage in this conversation.

3 And the last point I'd make is that  
4 our statewide union, NYSED, has a grant  
5 from the AFT to work on exactly this set  
6 of issues, development of teacher  
7 standards and the use of student growth  
8 as part of teacher evaluation.

9 So I think there's a lot of energy  
10 around this initiative statewide.

11 REVIEWER #1: Okay. I think we'll  
12 probably come back to some of those  
13 themes a little bit later, but we've  
14 structured some of the questions. We're  
15 just going to move across the panel.

16 And I'll jump to the second question  
17 which has to do with the charter school  
18 law and policies. Basically, what we  
19 want to get at here is we understand that  
20 there's a cap of 200 on open enrollment  
21 charter schools in the state.

22 And we're trying to get a sense of

1 how restrictive or inhibiting this might  
2 be on the growth of the charter sector in  
3 turning away or discouraging new  
4 applicants. And we're not really talking  
5 about conversion charter schools.

6 So we really want to learn about your  
7 views, if you can clarify for us, the  
8 level of inhibition there by having a  
9 cap.

10 DR. STEINER: Ira.

11 MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, one of the first  
12 things to know is that in New York we  
13 will have -- even if there is not a  
14 single new charter school added -- and  
15 there will be because we have additional  
16 ones still within the cap -- an increase  
17 over the next four years of 76 percent in  
18 the enrollment of students in charter  
19 schools conservatively estimated based  
20 upon schools that are already in the  
21 pipeline that have been approved and have  
22 not yet opened, as well as because of the

1 natural growth of charter schools as they  
2 move to include new grades.

3 DR. STEINER: So how many students is  
4 that, approximately?

5 MR. SCHWARTZ: That will be an  
6 increase of approximately 36,000  
7 students, very conservatively estimated.  
8 We expect it will actually be somewhat  
9 more than that.

10 DR. KING: And I would just add that  
11 as we described in the application, both  
12 the Governor and the Board of Regents  
13 have said publicly repeatedly that they  
14 are interested in seeing the cap raised.

15 Historically, when the cap was  
16 reached a couple years back in New York  
17 State, the cap was raised and I think the  
18 Board of Regents' expectation is that the  
19 cap will ultimately be raised as we reach  
20 it.

21 DR. STEINER: This is normally done  
22 as part of a budget discussion and that

1 is current.

2 REVIEWER #1: Reviewer #3, let's  
3 shift to you, please.

4 REVIEWER #3: I'd like to go back and  
5 talk a little bit more about your  
6 instructional core and how you're trying  
7 to get at it.

8 And in the section D, particularly  
9 the second part, my question, you talk  
10 about a single teacher effectiveness  
11 score.

12 And in trying to create something  
13 that has equity across all teachers,  
14 could you describe your plan for judging  
15 teacher effectiveness in non-tested  
16 grades and subjects and how your plan  
17 will have the appearance and the  
18 credibility with all of your teachers in  
19 creating a level playing field in this  
20 evaluation instrument.

21 DR. STEINER: Thank you. This is a  
22 national problem, right. We only have

1 state annual exams in some subjects in  
2 some grade levels. So New York State  
3 faces this issue along with every other  
4 state.

5 In the initiative that I described,  
6 Teacher U, we faced this squarely because  
7 we had some number of our student  
8 teachers who were not teaching within  
9 those annual tested areas.

10 So we began to look at other tools.  
11 For example, the use of DIBELS and Terra  
12 Nova; that is, looking at national tests  
13 and seeing whether we could use them to  
14 indicate value added.

15 Where we cannot find tools that are  
16 appropriate to measure value added, we  
17 must, until we have other assessments, go  
18 to a growth model that indicates two  
19 points in time, and performance thereof,  
20 that is developed with the help of  
21 professional organizations, for example,  
22 in the arts, in science and social

1 studies, so that we can do at least a  
2 growth model in the absence of a value  
3 added model.

4 We are doing research along those  
5 lines right now. We established it in  
6 Teacher U.S. Prototype. We're looking at  
7 other models across the states.

8 There's no silver bullet here --  
9 there really isn't -- but we are  
10 committed to putting in place that growth  
11 model where we can't do a full value  
12 added.

13 REVIEWER #3: Thank you.

14 REVIEWER #1: I just -- let me follow  
15 up just slightly on that and it really  
16 links to Reviewer #2's  
17 question earlier in terms of generating  
18 local buy-in for  
19 -- so on Reviewer #3's question, was --  
20 so technically, you know, it was more of  
21 a technical question and then there's a  
22 implementation question and generating

1 buy-in locally, the complications of  
2 mandatory bargaining and so forth.

3 Can you help us to understand how the  
4 role that -- you've outlined that the  
5 state will work with localities to  
6 encourage these things, but can you help  
7 us a little bit more to understand  
8 whether you believe, and the extent to  
9 which you believe, that there will be  
10 local buy-in and rolling out --

11 DR. STEINER: Do you want to speak to  
12 New York City.

13 DR. KING: Take New York City, for  
14 example. It's done a number of things  
15 that will suggest that buy-in is  
16 possible.

17 First, we are piloting a value added  
18 and data initiative with the teachers'  
19 union in New York City; secondly, I think  
20 that we've created conditions where there  
21 is an enormous amount of trust between  
22 principals and teachers so that in the

1 inquiry strategy, for example, you're  
2 actively using data at the skill and sub-  
3 skill level under an enormous amount of  
4 ARIS data, as well as acuity interim  
5 assessments, to judge whether students  
6 and teachers are making progress.

7       So we've, I think, built some systems  
8 that are being piloted across the city  
9 now. I fully expect that we're going to  
10 expand those systems as we learn more and  
11 we are able to generate some confidence  
12 in the validity of the tools.

13       DR. STEINER: I think the key is that  
14 it's not just a single measure, right.  
15 There are multiple measures of teacher  
16 effectiveness.

17       In our incentive program, we've set  
18 30 to 40 percent should be a measure of  
19 actual student growth on data and we've  
20 put an enormous amount of our dollars  
21 right into that incentive package.

22       In fact, we've reduced our own 50

1 percent of our state funding down to 42  
2 percent precisely to indicate the  
3 importance and the weight that we put on  
4 that incentive. These are not small  
5 dollars. So the fact is that the  
6 principals' unions have already signed on  
7 to that incentive and we have a letter  
8 -- general letter of support from the  
9 teachers' unions, as well, and you can be  
10 sure that they know the full application,  
11 including that incentive package prior to  
12 signing that letter.

13 So I think the key is, first of all,  
14 that this is not simply rolled out and it  
15 isn't a punitive single measure. This is  
16 part of an integrated data plan that will  
17 involve dashboards for districts that  
18 will involve the use of these  
19 sophisticated tools of data analysis  
20 making it available to teachers,  
21 students, parents, community and our own  
22 department.

1           And I think that the lessons from New  
2           York suggest that if you wrap together  
3           effective real-time data access with  
4           issues of teacher effectiveness and you  
5           do it carefully, then you can make it  
6           successful.

7           REVIEWER #3:    Could I follow up on  
8           that?

9           DR. STEINER:    Yeah.

10          REVIEWER #3:    First, you're trying to  
11          incentivize that the LEAs are going to do  
12          this, and then by your own estimates  
13          you're suggesting a 50-percent buy-in  
14          rate by the date you have in the  
15          application.

16          That leaves the other 50 percent.  I  
17          mean, if you build it, they will come.  I  
18          mean, you have an uphill thing here and  
19          the way you've described it, I just would  
20          like to hear just a little bit more how,  
21          even as the Race to the Top ends, how  
22          you're going to try to get that other

1 half other than you're suggesting that  
2 it's just going to be a very attractive  
3 thing that you'd want to have in your  
4 schools based at the LEA level.

5 I don't know how you can create that  
6 catalyst for that last 50 percent.

7 DR. STEINER: Well, I think, first of  
8 all, we are in a very unusual situation  
9 in the state. We have 7,500 dedicated  
10 professionals in the BOCES and what we  
11 call the RICs, the Regional Information  
12 Centers, who have been on the ground for  
13 years, right.

14 They are working with  
15 superintendents, with principals, with  
16 teachers. They work with them every day  
17 to implement new data systems, new forms  
18 of teacher evaluation. They've been  
19 doing it for the last ten years and  
20 they're on the ground.

21 So it's not the Department of  
22 Education in Albany just saying please do

1 this. These are people -- and these  
2 superintendents, district superintendents  
3 are our arms and legs, our minds and our  
4 boots on the ground working with local  
5 principals, superintendents.

6 So I think the key is that this not  
7 just be a top-down approach that this be  
8 worked at at the district level.

9 John, do you want to add to that?

10 DR. KING: Yeah. There are two  
11 things I would add.

12 One, is I think the context of trust  
13 is really important and I think part of  
14 how we envision cultivating trust is with  
15 the rest of the things that are described  
16 in the application; that is to say, to  
17 have confidence in the student growth  
18 measure, teachers need to have a clear  
19 understanding of exactly what it is they  
20 are supposed to teach over a given year.

21 And so the curriculum frameworks, we  
22 think, will drive trust because then it

1 will be much clearer for teachers to  
2 understand, oh, this is what I need to  
3 teach in seventh grade science this year,  
4 this is what I need to teach in fourth  
5 grade math.

6 We think having professional  
7 development that's aligned to those  
8 curriculum frameworks, again, would be a  
9 way to build trust because teachers will  
10 see the evaluation isn't just a gotcha  
11 tool. It's a tool to differentiate their  
12 professional development, differentiate  
13 the support and coaching that they get.  
14 So there's that trust element.

15 The other piece, I think, is because  
16 of our ability to implement this for all  
17 teachers through their professional  
18 certification, you know, five years from  
19 now every new teacher over that -- coming  
20 into the profession will know that  
21 student growth is going to be a part of  
22 how that teacher will earn professional

1 certification, and so I think that will  
2 shift the culture profoundly across the  
3 state. And that's a unique tool that we  
4 have that I think many other states do  
5 not.

6 MS. SMITH: I was just going to make  
7 one point. I think we absolutely  
8 appreciate how important the  
9 implementation and just executions of all  
10 of these plans are.

11 And our application calls for  
12 additional funding to enhance the  
13 capacity of the BOCES to really work  
14 additionally at the level of the schools  
15 to help teachers understand all of these  
16 new tools, as well.

17 DR. STEINER: And finally, I would  
18 say that it's important that we are  
19 introducing new career paths for teachers  
20 that will build on their being accustomed  
21 to that value added assessment.

22 We're looking at mentor teacher

1 paths; we're looking at master teacher  
2 paths where the state can add  
3 certification classifications to support  
4 growth of teachers around these new  
5 evaluation tools.

6 REVIEWER #1: Great. Thank you very  
7 much. Reviewer #4?

8 REVIEWER #4: My question relates to  
9 broad stakeholder support.

10 Could you point to us in your  
11 application where you have letters of  
12 support and especially from different  
13 categories of people, such as business  
14 and --

15 MS. SMITH: It's in -- it's  
16 absolutely in the appendix. I don't know  
17 the page numbers off the top of my head,  
18 but it's in our appendix.

19 We had over 100 letters of support  
20 from a broad array of stakeholder groups:  
21 parent associations, business leaders,  
22 business associations.

1           REVIEWER #4: Well, in my copy I  
2 could not find them.

3           DR. KING: Oh, that's very strange.  
4 In the appendix, we have about -- I think  
5 it's -- yeah, it's over a hundred, I  
6 think, letters of support.

7           REVIEWER #5: In the appendix,  
8 there's a reference to receiving 98  
9 support letters; however, it's not clear  
10 where those 98 support letters are. So  
11 if you could point us in the right  
12 direction.

13          DR. KING: We can give you a copy.

14          MS. SMITH: It took us a long time to  
15 scan all of those in.

16          DR. STEINER: Yeah, they're here.

17          REVIEWER #1: Okay. We'll look into  
18 that and see if there's been a technical  
19 glitch because, you know, you referred to  
20 the letters earlier, that they give  
21 evidence of the strength of support.

22          DR. STEINER: Absolutely.

1           REVIEWER #1: So I think we'll just  
2 take the opportunity now to probe a  
3 little bit on that and get some clarity  
4 about the strength of the letters of  
5 support.

6           You mention that a couple of the  
7 teachers' unions had signed on. And were  
8 there any --

9           REVIEWER #4: Did you have any from  
10 business?

11          REVIEWER #1: Can you talk to the  
12 content of those? Are they more a pro  
13 forma, boilerplate type of letter or do  
14 they get to outlining specific ways that  
15 they will help the state and localities  
16 to implement the plan?

17          DR. RING: Let me walk through. So  
18 we had nine from business leaders, many  
19 of which were committing to support  
20 individual initiatives like, for example  
21 -- I'll give the example of Wegmen's Food  
22 Markets in Rochester, which has built a

1 school to our partnership program with  
2 the Rochester Schools, that they're  
3 actually interested in expanding  
4 significantly as part of the Race to the  
5 Top and Title I, 1003(g) efforts.

6 We had, I think, five letters from  
7 non-profits that are interested in either  
8 playing a role in the turnaround schools  
9 or in otherwise supporting the  
10 initiatives in the turnaround schools.

11 We had letters from a series of  
12 charter providers -- I think about ten or  
13 so charter providers -- civil rights  
14 organizations, early childhood  
15 organizations all committing to --  
16 expressing their enthusiasm for  
17 particular aspects of the application  
18 that they wanted to support.

19 And then a number of the education  
20 stakeholders, local associations of  
21 teachers, the National Board of Teachers  
22 for the state, the Association of Small

1 City School Districts, our statewide  
2 Council of Superintendents, statewide  
3 School Board Association, some of our  
4 teacher associations by subject, like the  
5 Science Education Consortium, Science  
6 Teachers Association, we had a number of  
7 letters from higher-ed institutions  
8 supporting the Race to the Top  
9 application and speaking to their  
10 interest in participating in,  
11 particularly, the STEM initiative, as  
12 well as the redesign of teacher  
13 preparation, probably over a dozen  
14 higher-ed institution letters, a number  
15 of letters from intermediaries like New  
16 Visions that are interested in  
17 participating in the turnaround effort,  
18 interested in launching new and  
19 innovative school models, and then  
20 letters from legislative leadership,  
21 including the letter that we referenced  
22 earlier from the Speaker that clarifies

1 the teacher tenure issue, from a number  
2 of organizations that focus on STEM, who  
3 are excited about the STEM components of  
4 the application, and then, as the  
5 Commissioner mentioned, from the New York  
6 State United Teachers to 9th Statewide  
7 Teachers' Union embracing many of the  
8 core components of the application,  
9 although they didn't speak specifically  
10 to the incentive fund, but they spoke to  
11 the focus on curriculum, the more  
12 performance-based assessments, the  
13 redesign of teacher preparation, et  
14 cetera.

15 MR. SCHWARTZ: I might just add the  
16 real experience of New York City and New  
17 York State has been to include these  
18 groups very actively in some of the  
19 toughest work we do.

20 So in the turnaround situation, for  
21 example, in New York City, we had almost  
22 200 community groups working to create

1 new small schools in the city.

2       What I think is unique is those  
3 groups -- and they range from Good  
4 Shepherd Social Services to the Bronx  
5 Botanic Garden -- not only got involved  
6 as vendors in those schools, but actually  
7 worked to improve student achievement.

8       And everybody involved in the New  
9 York City effort made a commitment to the  
10 80-percent graduation goal.

11       So they weren't just looking to kind  
12 of provide a little guidance service  
13 here, but they were actually working very  
14 aggressively to transform the entire high  
15 school experience.

16       I think we're going to really bring  
17 that to the four as we continue in the  
18 turnaround effort across the state.

19       DR. STEINER: It might be useful,  
20 very quickly, to read the last paragraph  
21 of the letter of support from the  
22 president to the teachers' union.

1 DR. KING: As a statewide union of  
2 more than half a million educators, NYSED  
3 pledges our continued commitment and  
4 support for New York State's efforts to  
5 secure a Race to the Top grant.

6 We look forward to ongoing  
7 collaboration in shaping the details of a  
8 plan that is good for students and fair  
9 to educators and one that will sustain  
10 our state's progress for decades to come.

11 REVIEWER #1: I think that probably  
12 satisfies us at the moment, unless,  
13 Reviewer #2, did you want to follow up.

14 REVIEWER #2: Yeah. I only have just  
15 one quick question, and I don't want to  
16 belabor the point.

17 So I think if I've got the numbers,  
18 if I remember correctly, you have 61  
19 percent of the unions that could sign on  
20 that signed.

21 And to me, you make a deliberate  
22 decision in the MOU to insert the

1 language about collective bargaining  
2 agreements, and I appreciate your  
3 response about the certification because  
4 I do understand that you have a way to  
5 deal with these issues in another way.

6 But to have that -- to make that  
7 decision to insert that language and then  
8 still not be able to get closer to a  
9 hundred percent of the unions to sign on,  
10 to me, it just -- it comes back to this  
11 overall question of when things get rough  
12 at the local level, when you're having  
13 these difficult conversations, it's great  
14 that you have thought through a way to  
15 get at this that is a slightly different  
16 track.

17 But I mean, what role do you see the  
18 state playing when those difficult  
19 conversations are taking place that says  
20 this is what New York is about, rather  
21 than, you know, doing something that is  
22 changing -- which is much less of a

1 stakeholder, you know, sort of engaging  
2 peace and which is changing your  
3 certification requirements?

4       So I actually think it's great that  
5 you are being serious about, you know,  
6 engaging stakeholders in those local  
7 level conversations, but there will be a  
8 point where those conversations get  
9 difficult.

10       And the question is, you know, what's  
11 the state going to do then? Is it going  
12 to say like, Well, you know, that's up to  
13 you, or are you going to step in and sort  
14 of --

15       REVIEWER #1: Right. And I think  
16 just to augment the question even more,  
17 you know, in tying in with your not  
18 wanting to be top-down and have  
19 localities reconcile and direct  
20 localities, can you help reconcile your  
21 role in both intervening, but --

22       DR. RING: Well --

1 DR. STEINER: Go ahead, John.

2 DR. RING: Well, I think there are  
3 three tools that we could use  
4 immediately.

5 One is that we have this regulatory  
6 authority that we described in the form  
7 of the annual professional performance  
8 review by which we can require student  
9 growth to be one of the categories in the  
10 evaluation.

11 Now, how much it's weighed and how  
12 exactly it's implemented, that is a  
13 matter of local collective bargaining,  
14 but we can require it to be a part of the  
15 evaluation process. So that's one, you  
16 know, fairly broad authority.

17 The second category is around the  
18 Race to the Top and we'll use and  
19 districts have committed to good faith  
20 bargaining on the subjects.

21 And if they don't engage in good  
22 faith bargaining on these subjects, they

1 won't have fulfilled that MOU or what  
2 will ultimately be our final scope of  
3 work and that will make them not eligible  
4 to receive the Race to the Top funds.

5       So, you know, they've made a  
6 commitment. The superintendents have  
7 made a commitment to that good faith  
8 bargaining. As you say, 60 percent plus  
9 of the unions have committed, as well.

10       And the other districts, I suspect  
11 that their local collective bargaining  
12 units will come to the table because it  
13 will be clear in our final scope of work  
14 that that good faith bargaining is a part  
15 of the requirement for Race to the Top.

16       And then I think -- the third thing I  
17 would say is that certainly in the  
18 districts that have the persistently  
19 lowest-achieving schools, because, you  
20 know, the transformation model requires  
21 evaluation of teachers based on  
22 effectiveness, those districts will have

1 to -- to the extent that they want to  
2 take advantage of the transformation  
3 model, they will have to reach agreement  
4 with their local collective bargaining  
5 unit around that exact authority.

6       So I think, you know, those three  
7 tools will help us drive it forward. Do  
8 I think it will be in every district at  
9 the end of four years, no. But I think  
10 we'll be able to make significant  
11 progress for all the reasons we've  
12 described.

13       MR. SCHWARTZ: And just on John's  
14 last point, we have already brought  
15 together the seven districts that have  
16 persistently lowest-achieving schools  
17 with their local collective bargaining  
18 units to discuss with them the -- all of  
19 the requirements under the four  
20 intervention models and to encourage them  
21 to begin their discussions immediately  
22 around any issues that need to be

1 collectively bargained.

2 DR. STEINER: And that's 65 percent  
3 of all our neediest students.

4 REVIEWER #5: Could you clarify your  
5 process for identifying the lowest-  
6 achieving schools because given a state  
7 the good size of New York, 57 schools  
8 seemed a little bit on the low side.

9 I just wanted to know a little bit  
10 more about your process in identifying  
11 those schools.

12 MR. SCHWARTZ: We followed the  
13 requirements for the identification of  
14 persistently lowest-achieving schools.  
15 The universe of schools that are  
16 identified for improvement, corrective  
17 action and restructuring in New York is  
18 500 schools.

19 So that was the basis upon which we  
20 identified our five percent of our  
21 lowest-achieving schools. We have a  
22 unitary system in New York so that

1 whether you are a Title I school or you  
2 are a non-Title I school; those schools  
3 are all identified in New York as schools  
4 in improvement, corrective action and  
5 restructuring.

6 In addition to doing that, we  
7 identified all of our schools at the  
8 secondary level that had a graduation  
9 rate below 60 percent for our last three  
10 cohorts, which were the 2002, 2003 and  
11 2004 school year cohorts. Those numbers  
12 resulted in us having 57 schools.

13 REVIEWER #1: Did you have another  
14 question that you wanted to ask at this  
15 point?

16 DR. STEINER: Do you just want to say  
17 a quick word about the added schools that  
18 we would like to also support?

19 MR. SCHWARTZ: In addition to the 57  
20 schools that have been identified as  
21 persistently lowest-achieving, it is our  
22 intention to have a fund for districts to

1 opt in and, if they are willing to have  
2 schools that are not on our list also  
3 engage in one of the four intervention  
4 strategies, they will be able to receive  
5 a grant to support that effort.

6 And we are anticipating that there  
7 will be approximately 25 schools that we  
8 will fund as a supplement to the 57  
9 persistently lowest-achieving schools.

10 REVIEWER #1: Great. Reviewer #2.

11 REVIEWER #2: So I think as peer  
12 reviewers one of the difficult things for  
13 us is to sort of judge the credibility of  
14 what you say you're going to do.

15 You're asked to talk about a lot of  
16 things that are in the future if you get  
17 this money, you know, building new  
18 offices, hiring new people. So, again,  
19 I'm totally respectful of the charge you  
20 had.

21 I think that in reading your state  
22 application, a lot of the credibility

1 comes from the fact that you have New  
2 York City and the work that's been done  
3 there over the last ten years to sort of  
4 look at the lessons learned there and  
5 build on it, and you had referred to it  
6 in your comments.

7 And I very much appreciate you being  
8 here, Bob, and I understand the role that  
9 New Visions plays for the portfolio of  
10 schools that it supports in New York  
11 City.

12 But I wanted to just ask you to talk  
13 about the decision not to have someone  
14 from the New York City Department of Ed  
15 here today given that so much in your own  
16 application, your own words, you know,  
17 you refer a lot to the work that's been  
18 done there as a springboard for what you  
19 want to do statewide.

20 DR. STEINER: Well, we felt that,  
21 first of all, you deserve to see the  
22 experience of the team that was going to

1 actually execute on Race to the Top and  
2 the different levels of histories that we  
3 bring to this work, whether it's actually  
4 turning around schools, whether it's  
5 blowing the roof off performance for  
6 under-performing students, whether it's  
7 trying to transform the quality of  
8 teacher and principal preparation. So  
9 these are the folks on the ground. This  
10 is not icing on a cake, right. This is  
11 the engine room.

12       Secondly, we felt that bringing  
13 somebody from the city who's actually  
14 sitting there directly responsible for  
15 working with schools every single day and  
16 working with these data systems and  
17 working with teachers, right, to make  
18 this happen was crucial to the  
19 credibility of saying what we've said.

20       So rather than go the sort of 30,000-  
21 foot route, we wanted to really, as Bob  
22 said, come from the trenches and to give

1 you a sense of the people who are going  
2 to execute on this work.

3 REVIEWER #1: Great. We have a  
4 number of smaller questions that the  
5 panel will just be taking advantage of  
6 the time to have you clarify aspects of  
7 the application at this point.

8 And one that I had had to do with the  
9 STEM focus statewide.

10 Can you help us to understand how  
11 there's a statewide commitment to  
12 providing opportunities for particularly  
13 under-served groups and girls, focuses on  
14 that statewide.

15 DR. STEINER: So let me start and  
16 then invite my colleagues.

17 Let me start with teachers, right,  
18 because we have a crucial need to have  
19 more teachers involved in the STEM  
20 subjects.

21 So we are incentivizing with  
22 differential compensation, \$35,000 over a

1 few years for those teachers who commit.  
2 They've already have to have a track  
3 record.

4 We don't want to invest in those who  
5 are not performing at high levels, so  
6 they have to have shown us a track record  
7 and performance.

8 But once they've done that, we will  
9 have an incentive for them to remain in  
10 those schools committed to teaching  
11 science and STEM subjects.

12 Secondly, we have new plans in the  
13 Race to the Top application for enabling  
14 us to take university professors and  
15 professionals who have expertise in the  
16 STEM areas and develop accelerated  
17 certification focused squarely on  
18 clinical practice, right, and ensuring  
19 that they have the content knowledge,  
20 which is crucial to get them into the  
21 classroom, into the STEM subjects.

22 So, again, we feel we have untapped

1 resources, right, to bring professionals  
2 into those crucial fields.

3 DR. KING: A couple things I'd add:  
4 one is that I think one of the missing  
5 pieces around STEM is the replication of  
6 effective instructional practice.

7 So you have some schools with very  
8 impressive results and lots of schools  
9 with mediocre results and some schools  
10 with abysmal results.

11 And we don't do a very good job, I  
12 don't think yet, of capturing what it is  
13 that those schools that are succeeding  
14 are actually doing.

15 And so part of the reason to make a  
16 significant investment in curriculum  
17 frameworks and professional development  
18 is so that we can try and capture those  
19 best practices.

20 So something that the Commissioner  
21 and I worked on at Teacher U is having  
22 videotape of excellent math instruction

1 and what does it look like to teach a  
2 great lesson on division of fractions,  
3 and making that available more broadly,  
4 we think, will make a big difference.

5       Second, in the turnaround piece,  
6 we've talked about wanting to encourage  
7 the creation of STEM and then CTE/career  
8 and technical education schools, because  
9 I think one of the things that we've seen  
10 is that access to great technical  
11 education which will lead to careers in  
12 the STEM fields is very uneven.

13       Some BOCES are doing a very good job  
14 in that area, but we have other  
15 communities where the schools are much  
16 more in the sort of old vocational model  
17 and aren't really providing students with  
18 the skills that would lead them to a  
19 high-paying job in a STEM field.

20       And so that's another place where we  
21 are trying to leverage change through the  
22 persistently lowest-achieving schools in

1 the 1003(g).

2 And then the last point I'd make  
3 around STEM is I think one of the key  
4 pieces in the teacher preparation sort of  
5 argument is that we don't have very good  
6 feedback loops now.

7 If you're a math methods professor at  
8 a teacher education institution, there's  
9 no way for you to find out whether the  
10 students who left your classroom are good  
11 or bad at teaching math.

12 And so one of the things we're trying  
13 to do with the data system is build that  
14 feedback loop so that our teacher  
15 training programs actually understand  
16 much better whether they are equipping  
17 students with the skills they need to  
18 succeed in science and math in their  
19 classrooms. And so we think that is  
20 another place where we'll be able to add  
21 a lot of value.

22 REVIEWER #1: Okay, Reviewer #4,

1 please.

2 REVIEWER #4: Yes. Would you clarify  
3 for me again just how many -- what you  
4 estimate is going to be the number of  
5 schools that you turn around in the next  
6 few years and how you're going to do  
7 that. Thank you.

8 MR. SCHWARTZ: We expect that each of  
9 the 57 schools that have been identified  
10 as persistently lowest-achieving will be  
11 turned around in the sense that either  
12 there will be new schools that will  
13 replace these schools or the schools will  
14 use the transformation or the turnaround  
15 model and achieve their improvement in  
16 academic results.

17 We are not anticipating that any  
18 schools will not be part of this process;  
19 in fact, we are in the process of  
20 amending our commissioner's regulations  
21 to merge our schools under the  
22 registration review process with the

1 persistently lowest-achieving process.

2       And moving forward in New York State,  
3 schools will then be identified for  
4 registration review in the future because  
5 they meet the requirements to be a  
6 persistently lowest-achieving school.

7       DR. STEINER: I would add that the  
8 State has a real history of taking  
9 action. The State Board of Regents have  
10 closed schools, 60 of them. There have  
11 been further closings in New York City  
12 beyond that list where, in a sense, they  
13 closed ahead of that process.

14       This is an authority that is given to  
15 the Regents acting on recommendations  
16 from my staff and me. So we are  
17 determined not to let these schools  
18 continue if they are not helping students  
19 to learn and to graduate.

20       I would also say that while we tend  
21 to focus, perhaps understandably, on the  
22 lowest-performing schools, the theory of

1 change in our application is a theory  
2 that says two things drive better  
3 performance for all schools, right: the  
4 quality of the teacher and principal in  
5 that school and the absolute commitment  
6 to delivering on a curriculum, right, and  
7 knowing in real time whether you're  
8 successful or not in doing so.

9       So I think the key is that we have a  
10 reform agenda that looks at the entire  
11 state, right. We have 4,500 schools in  
12 New York State. We have 3.1 million  
13 school children.

14       So a strategy cannot be focused only,  
15 right, on 57 or 57 plus 25 or the next  
16 25, right. Life is too short. We have  
17 to have a strategy that raises the tide  
18 for everybody and that's what we are  
19 committed to.

20       REVIEWER #4: I understand that and I  
21 understand that you have a lot of  
22 wonderful things that you are planning to

1 do.

2 But is there nothing in particular  
3 that you plan to do over and above that  
4 for the schools that you want to turn  
5 around?

6 DR. STEINER: Well, the strategy of  
7 turnaround, right, is given to us by the  
8 federal government, right. It's one of  
9 the four strategies.

10 And as John said, as you move through  
11 those strategies and you look at what  
12 could arguably be said to be the less  
13 radical strategy, the transformation  
14 model, right, that strategy itself  
15 requires absolutely critical intervention  
16 including around student performance.

17 So the data sets that we are putting  
18 in place, the intervention strategy will  
19 be tied to and there's nothing uncertain  
20 or ambiguous about that.

21 All of the federal dollars that are  
22 being made available under the School

1 Improvement Grant, as well as Race to the  
2 Top, as well, I imagine, as the new  
3 authorization that was just announced,  
4 will be focused in the same language. So  
5 I don't see much wiggle room.

6 MR. SCHWARTZ: Let me add that these  
7 schools are also part of our  
8 differentiated accountability model, so  
9 that means that schools that are  
10 persistently lowest-achieving are  
11 assigned a joint intervention team, they  
12 can be assigned a distinguished educator.

13 They will be involved in all of the  
14 other activities that we are doing that  
15 are going to support raising the bar for  
16 all. They will get the inquiry teams.  
17 They will have the ability to be part of  
18 the summative and the formative and the  
19 interim assessments. They will be part  
20 of this turnaround in terms of what we  
21 are doing with teachers.

22 So we have, really, three different

1 things here. We have the things that  
2 will be available to all schools as a  
3 result of our Race to the Top  
4 application.

5 We have the specific intervention  
6 strategies that are part of Race to the  
7 Top that will be funded by that and our  
8 1003(g) money, and then we have our  
9 differentiated accountability model which  
10 gives us some additional leverage in  
11 these schools through the support of the  
12 joint intervention team and a  
13 distinguished educator.

14 MR. HUGHES: I would just add that in  
15 New York City we really aggressively  
16 engaged in this portfolio management  
17 strategy, so we haven't been afraid to  
18 close low-performing schools; in fact,  
19 we've closed almost a hundred over the  
20 last seven years.

21 But where the challenge is to take  
22 those mid-level schools and really

1 transform what happens in those  
2 buildings.

3 The inquiry strategy we've described  
4 isn't something that's theoretical. It's  
5 actually being used in 9,000 teams across  
6 New York City in 1,500 schools.

7 And we really do see teachers  
8 analyzing their students' performance at  
9 the skill and sub-skill level and then  
10 making decisions on a daily and weekly  
11 basis together as teams on what they're  
12 going to implement to change instruction  
13 in their classes or what additional  
14 intervention strategies they need to be  
15 putting in place.

16 And I think the performance gains in  
17 New York City in the last few years  
18 really reflect the commitment in a  
19 portfolio strategy to translate data into  
20 action in classrooms amongst teachers.

21 MR. SCHWARTZ: And if I can just go  
22 back and mention two other things.

1           We are also one of the states that is  
2   partnering with Massachusetts Insights  
3   that is going to help us to significantly  
4   increase our portfolio of supporting  
5   partner organizations who work with  
6   schools.

7           And in our application, we also talk  
8   about the creation of the TACIT/the  
9   Technical Assistance Center for  
10   Innovation and Turnaround, which we will  
11   have available to support the efforts of  
12   schools as they go through this process.

13          DR. STEINER: And I think that just  
14   bringing these comments together is  
15   important. We have in our Race to the  
16   Top this external technical support  
17   office. That's important for technical  
18   support.

19          But we have these joint intervention  
20   teams and our inquiry teams that are  
21   modeled on practices that we've seen  
22   working. We've built substantial parts

1 of our Race to the Top resources to  
2 sustain/to train/to support those  
3 intervention teams.

4 They will be on the ground in those  
5 schools making recommendations based on  
6 fine-grained analysis of those schools'  
7 performance to us about the turnaround  
8 strategies.

9 Let me make it very clear that it is  
10 my responsibility as Commissioner to  
11 approve any turnaround plan, right. That  
12 comes to me.

13 And as I look at those in concert  
14 with my staff, we will be looking at the  
15 substance of those plans, do they match  
16 not only the federal requirements, but  
17 what we've learned about turning around  
18 those schools.

19 So we will have real data from the  
20 ground coming back up to the Department.

21 We will have intervention teams, we will  
22 have inquiry teams, and we have a

1 structure through the BOCES and through  
2 our regional centers with long experience  
3 of working with the schools once we've  
4 made those recommendations, once those  
5 plans are approved to actually help them  
6 implement. It's not enough to just say  
7 do it, right. You have to have the  
8 sustaining effort on the ground.

9 REVIEWER #1: We have two questions  
10 in the queue, so if there are others  
11 after that.

12 I'd like to shift from turnaround to  
13 talk a little bit about the plan and the  
14 budget that you've put together and help  
15 us to understand the budget a little bit.

16 It's really an overarching question.  
17 We're hoping to understand if there are  
18 any costs included or line items included  
19 that are non-essential so that we can  
20 better assess the credibility of the  
21 plan.

22 So you've asked for over 800 million

1 dollars and we're curious if you can help  
2 us to understand how essentially each --  
3 don't go through it line item by line  
4 item and, really, just we're looking for  
5 a couple minutes of an answer to this as  
6 we do have some other questions. So it's  
7 a general question to help us understand  
8 the credibility of the plan and the  
9 budget and how it fits in.

10 MS. SMITH: So in developing our  
11 budgets, we did a couple of different  
12 things because what we really wanted to  
13 understand was what is this going to cost  
14 for districts to implement, because the  
15 last thing we wanted to do in this budget  
16 environment was give districts unfunded  
17 mandates.

18 So we really did market studies, you  
19 know, talked to people who were on the  
20 ground, what is it going to cost to  
21 implement this, to develop the line by  
22 line as we developed what we called the

1 state side of the budget and then also  
2 for LEAs, so that within the allocations,  
3 that the districts would have enough  
4 money to implement this.

5       So, you know, we tried to be  
6 conservative in making those, but really  
7 tried to understand what exactly is it  
8 going to take to make this work for every  
9 single project as we line items out,  
10 those individual costs.

11       DR. KING: Yeah. And I guess I would  
12 emphasize that I think we tried to match  
13 our budget to our priorities, and so  
14 there's a very large investment in  
15 curriculum, professional development,  
16 assessments and the data system because  
17 that's at the heart of our theory of  
18 change.

19       We also tried to make sure that our  
20 budget would be sustainable past Race to  
21 the Top. So I think it's almost 80  
22 percent, or maybe a little over, of the

1 monies are one-time investments or one-  
2 time over four-year investments.

3 And we have factored the rest of the  
4 resources and we identified other places  
5 in our budget where we could support that  
6 then other margin, the other 15 to 20  
7 percent over time.

8 So that the whole of Race to the Top  
9 would be an investment in capacity-  
10 building that we could effectively  
11 sustain.

12 DR. STEINER: And I think we were  
13 very conscious of the fact that under  
14 formula -- our Title I formula, as we  
15 broke down the numbers, we saw that  
16 certain districts were going to be under-  
17 funded to do the things that we needed  
18 them to do, so that this reform agenda  
19 would really be statewide which is  
20 totally critical.

21 So that's why we gave more of our own  
22 budget, right, the state's 50 percent out

1 to the districts and that's why 72  
2 percent, right, all of our funding under  
3 Race to the Top goes straight to the  
4 districts.

5 It's not a 50-50 because we want this  
6 to happen and we didn't want to leave the  
7 districts with a huge funding cliff,  
8 right, at the end of the process. We  
9 were very conservative about that in our  
10 budget proposals.

11 REVIEWER #1: Thank you for that.  
12 Let me shift over here and then invite,  
13 after this, a question by another  
14 panelist.

15 REVIEWER #3: This is more of a  
16 comprehensive question.

17 After putting all these four  
18 components together and you want to look  
19 down five/ten years from now, what's  
20 going to be looking different in your  
21 high school classrooms?

22 DR. STEINER: I believe that at the

1 foundation of all of it are going to be  
2 teachers who are free to teach quality  
3 material that is sequential and is  
4 sequenced from what came before.

5       They will know what students learned  
6 before they came into the classroom.  
7 They will have a rich array of  
8 information that is timely and relevant  
9 at their fingertips. They will have been  
10 prepared to analyze that data, to  
11 differentiate their instruction.

12       They will be confident because they  
13 have been in front of the camera multiple  
14 times analyzing their own performance  
15 with master teachers. They will have  
16 access to materials that are online that  
17 they don't today.

18       They will have access to support from  
19 their principals who themselves will have  
20 been through revised leadership academies  
21 that we're putting in place through  
22 totally reformed certification programs

1 of their own that focus on sustaining  
2 better school performance; otherwise,  
3 they won't be principals.

4 And they will have been prepared at a  
5 level of granularity around rubrics of  
6 skills that make a difference that they  
7 simply weren't prepared for anytime until  
8 now.

9 So the actual atmosphere in a  
10 classroom, the interaction between a  
11 student and a teacher will be different  
12 as a result of all of the things that we  
13 put in place.

14 And parents and districts,  
15 communities will have a level of  
16 transparency around what's going on in  
17 the schools that they've never had  
18 before.

19 DR. KING: Let me add a couple  
20 things. One is, I think -- you know, I  
21 think of the schools that the  
22 Commissioner and I have visited since we

1 joined the Department and some of the  
2 moments where you feel like, wow, the  
3 schools are really working.

4       So we were in a school in Yonkers,  
5 Saunders Technical School, where kids  
6 were building robots. They're a  
7 partnership with Cisco.

8       It's a career and technical education  
9 school that actually has a very high  
10 participation in AP exams because it's a  
11 career and technical education school  
12 with very rigorous academic expectations.

13       And some folks don't think those go  
14 together, but they very much can and do  
15 at Saunders.

16       And so when you see students building  
17 these robots, you hear the teacher who is  
18 a former engineer talk about how Cisco  
19 says, We'd hire these kids now for jobs,  
20 because of the skills that they've  
21 developed as high school students.

22       That -- we want to see more of that.

1 We want to see more of there's a school  
2 in Rochester, Rochester School of the  
3 Arts, where the kids will tell you, and  
4 they're being very honest, I'M in school  
5 because I like to dance. I go to my  
6 English Regents class. I don't love it,  
7 but I'm doing well in it because I like  
8 to dance. And I know my friend got a  
9 dance scholarship last year and I won a  
10 dance scholarship because I want to be a  
11 dancer.

12 And so you can see -- whether it's at  
13 Saunders or at Rochester School of the  
14 Arts, you can see where high school isn't  
15 just about checking off a set of academic  
16 boxes. It's really about preparing for  
17 college and careers.

18 And so as we think about the next  
19 generation of high school assessments,  
20 how we use the turnaround dollars, how we  
21 use the innovation dollars, how we push  
22 change in high schools, we want high

1 school to be a much more meaningful place  
2 for kids.

3       And the other thing that will achieve  
4 for us is that there will be more kids in  
5 those classrooms, because right now we  
6 have a 70-percent graduation rate, or  
7 slightly over 70 percent. We don't think  
8 that's a very good return on our state's  
9 50-billion-dollar-plus investment in  
10 public education.

11       And so there is an opportunity, by  
12 making high school much more engaging and  
13 meaningful and rigorous for kids, to have  
14 many more of them finish. We don't want  
15 to have graduation rates in the 50s in  
16 our urban communities anymore. That's  
17 not acceptable, and we think we have a  
18 vision for how we can change that.

19       DR. STEINER: And this can be done.  
20 We were at one of the largest high  
21 schools in the state just outside  
22 Buffalo, very high level of reduced and

1 free school lunch, almost total minority  
2 population from the inner city with a  
3 100-percent graduation rate.

4       And as John and I talked to the  
5 teachers in that school -- and it's a  
6 school that's devoted to technology, but  
7 it's an all-around just excellent high  
8 school -- we were struck by one  
9 overarching fact that is really at the  
10 heart of what we're saying.

11       The teachers were collectively  
12 responsible for the performance of every  
13 single student. They had devised their  
14 own data system that they use twice a day  
15 collectively, both horizontally across  
16 the grade level and vertically across the  
17 subject, to analyze the performance of  
18 every student and to passionately commit  
19 to getting those students to the next  
20 level of learning.

21       They shouldn't have to/4,500 schools  
22 shouldn't have to invent their own data

1 system.

2 REVIEWER #2: Can I interrupt,  
3 please? We're just running out of time.

4 I'm getting a little -- so I think  
5 you're bringing up a really important  
6 issue, right, and for me that is -- so I  
7 don't question the credentials of this  
8 group in here, but we're also judging the  
9 state's will to do what's necessary to  
10 make this happen in most of the schools  
11 in the state.

12 So, to me, I still want to know what  
13 you're prepared to do as the State  
14 Department of Education when push comes  
15 to shove.

16 So for me, that means, you're doing  
17 the right thing saying that these  
18 conversations have to happen locally.  
19 There have to be some -- there are a lot  
20 of people that have to weigh in on this  
21 stuff and, if they don't, there won't be  
22 investment and it won't work.

1 DR. STEINER: Right.

2 REVIEWER #2: But there will be a  
3 time, right, theoretically in a couple of  
4 years when those conversations and the  
5 experiments on the ground have netted for  
6 what you take to be the best practice.

7 And at that time, what's your role  
8 going to be in pushing that best practice  
9 out to the places even where there is --  
10 I mean, you know, pick your poison --  
11 it's a tough union conversation. It's a,  
12 you know, do-it-yourself superintendent  
13 who doesn't want -- how are you going to  
14 push those things out to those states and  
15 deal with the forces that might, you  
16 know, impede you from doing that?

17 DR. STEINER: Well, I think a number  
18 of us should respond, but my  
19 responsibility, first and foremost, is to  
20 tell the story to the population of the  
21 state, to share with parents, to share  
22 with lawmakers, to share with district

1 superintendents and local superintendents  
2 the difference between when it's working  
3 and when it's not.

4       You know, laws can do important  
5 things, but it is in the end the culture  
6 of our education system that has to  
7 change and that's why we've made enormous  
8 commitments already to being out in the  
9 field, to meeting with those  
10 superintendents.

11       You know, I've been to a small  
12 district called Malone like ten miles  
13 from the Canadian border. I've spoken to  
14 superintendents who are anxious for tools  
15 they can't invent, that they can't  
16 afford. They deserve that. But then as  
17 we speak to those superintendents, we're  
18 saying to them we can give you the  
19 capacity, but we can also give you  
20 transparency so that your parents, right,  
21 know how to read the results of your  
22 schools.

1           And we're committed to that,  
2 district-wide report cards that will be  
3 clear and transparent. So it's sunshine,  
4 right. It's a crucial tool, and we can  
5 bring around the use of these new tools  
6 and the results they're getting.

7           DR. KING: I just would point to some  
8 of the hard decisions that are already in  
9 the application to illustrate.

10           One is around the persistently  
11 lowest-achieving schools, not only  
12 identifying them, but saying to them you  
13 must use one of the four models and there  
14 is not going to be flexibility, there's  
15 not a way out of the four models and  
16 being very clear.

17           Not everyone loves the four models,  
18 but we've been very clear those are the  
19 models. That is what we not only are  
20 going to implement as part of 1003(g),  
21 but part of why we're merging the CEDA  
22 process and the persistently lowest-

1 achieving schools process and say it's  
2 not optional.

3       It's not that you can walk away from  
4 that money. It's that you must implement  
5 one of the four models or risk revocation  
6 of your registration, which is under the  
7 authority of the Commissioner. So that's  
8 one example.

9       A second example is around  
10 certification. Taking a stand on the  
11 idea that teacher certification ought to  
12 be based on performance in a classroom is  
13 not typical and that was not popular in  
14 all corners, but we were very clear.

15       And I think that, you know, the  
16 Commissioner speaks very powerfully to  
17 this, the gap when he was a dean watching  
18 students teaching on video and then  
19 looking at their school transcript and  
20 seeing the gap between the video and the  
21 transcript.

22       We can't have that yet. We need to

1 know that when we certify a teacher, they  
2 actually are able to help their students  
3 learn.

4 And so that was a controversial  
5 decision, but that was the decision that  
6 was made and it's in the application.

7 And a third example is around the  
8 non-higher-ed institutions being able to  
9 run teacher certification programs. And  
10 that was not a popular decision with many  
11 of the higher-ed institutions.

12 At the same time, I think some of  
13 them came around because what we pointed  
14 to is what we're getting isn't good  
15 enough and if we want to get something  
16 different, we've got to do something  
17 different.

18 And so we made the decision. The  
19 Regents made the decision to approve the  
20 idea and the concept of non-higher-ed  
21 institutions being able to train  
22 teachers.

1           The Museum of Natural History, a  
2 high-performing CMO, a high-performing  
3 intermediary organization being able to  
4 train teaches, that was perceived as  
5 radical in many corners, but we actually  
6 think radical change is needed because  
7 we're not where we need to be.

8           DR. STEINER: And let me add one more  
9 very powerful example, probably what's  
10 best known from New York State, perhaps  
11 rightly, are our Regents exams.

12           We're one of the few states with real  
13 end-of-course exit exams for all of our  
14 graduating students and we are raising  
15 the standards each year phasing out  
16 what's called the local diploma.

17           You might think that that's good  
18 enough. The Regents announced just  
19 recently that they're putting the top-  
20 working group together to actually look  
21 at the whole question of whether our  
22 standards are rigorous enough, right.

1 Not only are they raising the cut  
2 scores, but they're saying we've got to  
3 have more auditing of our questions,  
4 we've got to have longer tests because  
5 we're not satisfied that we're doing  
6 enough to capture the frameworks.

7 We are looking at performance-based  
8 indicators. We want vertical integration  
9 from college-ready/workforce-ready  
10 backwards. We don't want to build a  
11 tunnel from two directions with no  
12 compass. We've got too many people  
13 flunking out of community colleges.  
14 We're not happy, right.

15 That's not easy when you've spent  
16 many, many, many hours and many millions  
17 of dollars putting in a testing regime to  
18 step back and say, yeah, it's good, but  
19 it isn't good enough, right, and that's  
20 not easy and popular.

21 MR. HUGHES: And I would say look at  
22 New York City. We've had tough

1 conversations in New York City. Those  
2 conversations are not going to go away  
3 and there's a persistence and a  
4 commitment on all of us to make sure that  
5 we're working aggressively and  
6 effectively to improve student  
7 achievement.

8 But don't underestimate the demand  
9 and desire of teachers to be effective in  
10 classrooms. One of the things we've seen  
11 that's extraordinary in large schools and  
12 small schools is the commitment of  
13 teachers to come forward and once they  
14 have the tools to be effective, to  
15 redefine themselves in terms of  
16 effectiveness.

17 What I've seen in Neudorf High School  
18 or Hillcrest High School are teachers who  
19 no longer think about themselves  
20 abstractly, if I differentiate, I'll be  
21 effective. What they do is they look at  
22 whether kids are actually learning and

1 change what they're doing based on  
2 whether they're effective with those  
3 kids.

4       So in five and ten years we're going  
5 to see teachers who have a redefined  
6 sense of themselves, a professionalism  
7 that's defined in effectiveness and, more  
8 importantly, I think we're going to know  
9 not only as teachers whether we're  
10 effective in our classroom in a  
11 particular lesson, but we're going to  
12 know as a school whether we're effective  
13 in moving kids to higher standards,  
14 common core standards and graduation.

15       And, frankly, in New York State,  
16 we're going to know whether those kids  
17 graduate and ultimately enroll in college  
18 and, more importantly, succeed in college  
19 because we're going to have data systems  
20 and reports that enable teachers to  
21 connect their real contribution in  
22 transforming New York State.

1 DR. STEINER: And lastly, very  
2 quickly, let's go to the foundation. We  
3 can change teacher preparation. We will  
4 change teacher preparation.

5 But what about the thousands upon  
6 thousands of teachers who are in the  
7 school today, right. We all know that  
8 professional development is often a hit  
9 or miss activity all over the country.

10 Why? In part, because we have no  
11 curriculum.

12 We have 700 curriculum in 700  
13 districts or more within the same  
14 district. Once we have put in place  
15 sequential content-rich curriculum, we  
16 can actually take what counts most, which  
17 is the support we give to enable teachers  
18 to be more effective, and focus it on  
19 what is real.

20 REVIEWER #1: Good. We've got less -  
21 - fewer than five minutes here. I wanted  
22 to see -- I have one final question, but

1 I wanted to allow other panelists. Go  
2 ahead.

3 REVIEWER #5: We've been talking about  
4 teacher effectiveness. I want to shift a  
5 little bit to principal effectiveness.

6 What wasn't clear within the  
7 proposal, are there current routes of  
8 alternative principal certification and,  
9 if there are, can you spend a little bit  
10 of time explaining that.

11 REVIEWER #1: And you've got really  
12 just --

13 DR. KING: Answer, yes. There are  
14 alternative of routes of principal  
15 certification now in partnership with  
16 higher-ed institutions. So New Visions  
17 has a partnership with Baruch, New  
18 Leaders for New Schools. It has trained,  
19 I think, over a hundred -- has over a  
20 hundred alum's in New York City schools.

21

22 So there are these alternative

1 routes, but Alternating City has built  
2 their Principal Leadership Academy. That  
3 is an alternative route.

4 But each of them is in partnership  
5 with a higher-ed institution. And one of  
6 the things that we described in our  
7 application is wanting to empower non-  
8 higher-ed institutions, again a high-  
9 performing charter network or a high-  
10 performing intermediary that's  
11 demonstrating results with high-needs  
12 kids, empowering them to build teacher  
13 and principal training programs and to  
14 then have those principals earn  
15 certification through a performance-based  
16 assessment.

17 REVIEWER #1: Okay, I think this is -  
18 - we're down to two minutes, so the two-  
19 minute warning.

20 And the wrap-up question here --  
21 again, thank you all for your time and  
22 the care you've put into the application

1 and your patience with all of our  
2 questions which you've given us some very  
3 good answers, so thank you.

4 My last question just has to do with  
5 making data available to researchers.  
6 You talked about sunshine.

7 The question really is the strength  
8 of -- can you tell us about the strength  
9 of your commitment to opening up your  
10 data system to researchers and how that  
11 will happen.

12 DR. STEINER: Well, very recently we  
13 got a powerful example. We have a very  
14 renown expert in testing, Dan Koretz,  
15 from Harvard University who's known as a  
16 tough critic and a thoughtful analyst of  
17 assessments across the country, has a  
18 major and respected book on the subject.

19 And we are asking him, and he has  
20 agreed, to do an analysis of our state  
21 testing results, right. We have opened  
22 up our data to him and his research team.

1 And we have put no conditions on his  
2 research and he will be free to publish  
3 what he finds.

4 We are committed to an assessment  
5 regime, as we are committed in other  
6 areas, to being straightforward and  
7 truthful.

8 The Chancellor very recently and I in  
9 announcing our graduation results, we  
10 fine-grained it. We gave slide after  
11 slide after slide to the press. In fact,  
12 I was criticized for being blunt on the  
13 results in some cases.

14 Again, we have nothing to hide. We  
15 want to work with every one of our  
16 teachers, our principals and our district  
17 leaders to improve the education of every  
18 one of our 3.1 million school children.  
19 That's why we're here.

20 REVIEWER #1: Great. So we have used  
21 up all the time. Again, on behalf of all  
22 of the panelists, I'd like to thank you.

1

2

- - -

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 810, Washington, DC 20036  
Washington: (202) 898-1108 / Baltimore: (410) 752-3376  
Toll Free: (888) 445-3376