

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

RACE TO THE TOP

GRANT REVIEW

Phase 1 Tier 2 State Presentation

The State of Pennsylvania

1:30 p.m.

Wednesday, March 17, 2010

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

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 [Introductory remarks not transcribed.]

3 DR. LANE: I am Linda Lane.

4 DR. ZAHORCHAK: Gerald Zahorchak.

5 MS. COOPER: Donna Cooper.

6 DR. O'SHEA: Larry O'Shea.

7 DR. ACKERMAN: Arlene Ackerman.

8 MS. COOPER: Our goal today is to give you a
9 clear sense of what the impact will be by increasing the
10 resources available to Pennsylvania to boost student
11 achievement. We have the sixth largest public school
12 enrollment in the Nation, and every one of our students
13 will be positively affected by the Race to the Top
14 strategies, and for over 653,000 students in our
15 participating schools, we expect dramatic results.

16 We want to stress that every school district and
17 charter organization that has signed onto our strategy has
18 their school board's and their union's full support for
19 each element of our application, and for their school
20 level specific annual improvement target.

21 Of course, there are still hurdles to overcome,
22 but we are inspired by the fact that our boards and our
23 unions made the wise decision to do what it takes to

1 attract and keep good teachers.

2 We are eager to make sure you know that we have
3 a very substantial technical assistance infrastructure
4 that has proven itself in seven years. It has 12,000
5 professionals ready to go to work and help our district
6 implement a Race to the Top strategy.

7 Larry O'Shea is one of the leaders of our
8 infrastructure, which we call IUs.

9 Arlene Ackerman is the superintendent of the
10 largest district in our state, and Linda Lane joins us
11 from Pittsburgh, the second largest.

12 These three educational leaders and dozens of
13 others helped design our Race to the Top strategy. They
14 rolled up their sleeves and worked side by side with
15 national experts, union leadership, school board members,
16 and other key stakeholders to craft our application.

17 Jerry Zahorchak, our Secretary of Education, led
18 our work for this application, and he insisted that we
19 craft a plan that deepens the reforms we had in place. We
20 didn't start new, and as a result, we are ready to go and
21 to go beyond the expectations of this ambitious federal
22 initiative.

23 As you consider our application, we urge you to

1 understand that we attempted to make sure that every
2 element of our strategy was backward mapped from what it
3 would take to make us work at the classroom level.

4 Our motto was: Our reforms have to work for
5 teachers, or they don't work at all.

6 While there were many terrific ideas that we
7 considered, we focused only on those that offered us
8 practical, research-proven instructions, and leadership
9 strategies, so that we can accelerate our efforts to offer
10 significantly more students access to a high quality
11 education.

12 DR. ZAHORCHAK: We are state-driven by ALCOs,
13 the impact that will come due to the leverage from the
14 Race to The Top funds will be profound for our students,
15 for our schools, for our teachers, and our principals.
16 The infrastructure changes caused by these dollars will
17 ensure that the new, extraordinary results become the
18 springboard to high-level student achievement that will
19 continue and grow for years after the Race funds are
20 invested.

21 Our Race to the Top has been an ambitious and
22 research proven set of strategies. As a result, consider
23 this. We will increase the number of students who were at

1 or above grade level by 100 percent, 100,000 more children
2 to the ranks of ready to go.

3 High school graduation rates and college
4 retention percentages will increase dramatically, and we
5 will cut in half the number of children who are years
6 behind their grade level.

7 We have shown we can make real progress in our
8 state. Our state was the only one in the nation
9 recognized for improving math and reading outcomes for all
10 kids. We have raised their job funds, we set an
11 accelerated rate for closing the gap between white and
12 minority students.

13 We project the achievement gap to decrease by
14 nearly 60 percent. For teachers of English language
15 learners, evidence-based professional development will
16 cause more ELL students to reach goal level.

17 For us, getting to the top does not mean getting
18 students to aim for a floor, rather, to aim beyond the
19 roof. We expect more kids in our advance levels, 113,000
20 more, more kids passing an AP course and doubling that
21 number, as well, 13,000 more kids taking college courses
22 while in high school, and will increase project-based STEM
23 education opportunities for 100,000 kids.

1 For our children to meet expectations, they must
2 learn in school environments, that are responsive, well
3 informed, and focused on quality and scholarship. Our
4 more than 1,100 participating schools will transform,
5 which will result in far fewer kids failing and
6 achievement levels getting 85 percent of students meeting
7 proficiency at advanced levels.

8 Our 128 turnaround schools will adhere to a more
9 prescriptive approach. Remedies based on proven
10 strategies for comprehensive perform, alignment of
11 standards, curricular teaching and interventions, and the
12 use of data.

13 86,000 students in these schools will have the
14 benefit because school leaders and teachers representing
15 these schools have committed to going beyond.

16 A big part of our schools' success depends on
17 grade school leaders, and our strategies will help build
18 the capacity of excellent school principals. We
19 understand that investing in schools means investing in
20 the schools' human capacity.

21 Over 30 percent of our state's share of the Race
22 funds target enhancing the capabilities of our
23 professionals. We will recruit and provide residency

1 training for hundreds of new principals to lead in our
2 turnaround schools, as well in participating districts.

3 All of our participating school principals will
4 receive first-class training in effective planning and
5 implementation, use some data to inform work at the
6 classroom level, teacher evaluations, and understanding
7 our standards of our systems as applied with the student
8 classroom and better levels.

9 The principals will be supported by better
10 turnaround specialists, skilled in operation and business
11 management, and their support will come from our strategic
12 partners. Principal evaluations will be based on results,
13 results that could prove to be rewarding, to them and for
14 their teachers.

15 We expect the leadership at every level
16 especially in the classroom. Teachers are the most
17 important factor in a child's chance for academic success.
18 Our development strategies in this application and beyond
19 are proven and focused on student results.

20 All of our teachers will know how to apply
21 standardized systems to their daily practice. They will
22 understand how assessment and constant data analysis works
23 in daily practice to build instruction.

1 They will understand universal design principles
2 and how to create responsive classrooms. This support
3 will drive effective teachers into the neediest classrooms
4 and weed out those who are not drivers of success.

5 Furthermore, we will continue to build a system
6 that recruits professionals to the education field.
7 Everyone who knows Pennsylvania's work over the last
8 decade knows that we are serious about our strategic
9 investments, our supports for schools and teachers, and
10 our demands for student growth for all students.

11 We will impact all children, their schools,
12 principals, and teachers due to our investments, and
13 especially due to our high expectations.

14 DR. O'SHEA: We are going beyond the ambitious
15 goals of Race to the Top by adopting standards that will
16 translate into every element of the instructional system.
17 Our educators understand this approach, because
18 intermediate units are working in their districts every
19 day training school district staff to use tools, such as
20 the standards-aligned system portal, electronic conduits,
21 principal and teacher resources.

22 We are creating a pipeline that links our K-12
23 work with colleges of education in their teacher education

1 programs. They have had to adapt the programs of the pre-
2 service teachers of being trained in the standards-aligned
3 system.

4 Our IU technical assistant consultants,
5 instructional coaches, and school improvement specialists
6 lead ongoing professional development on SAS tools. Later
7 this year, the SAS portal will provide a curriculum
8 mapping tool that will enable school districts to realign
9 their curricula with the Common Core standards.

10 We are ready to go because we understand how to
11 disseminate each element of the standards-aligned system
12 to impact and improve classroom instruction. We do it
13 through our technical assistance infrastructure that is
14 built around Pennsylvania's intermediate units.

15 Let me tell you about IUs. We are what our name
16 implies, we are an intermediary between the Pennsylvania
17 Department of Education and local schools districts. We
18 do lots of stuff for school districts and charter schools.

19 We provide staff to deliver ELL programs and all
20 ed. programs, for example. But do you know what we do
21 really, really well? We translate statewide instructional
22 and reform initiatives, like SAS, into the every-day work
23 of classroom teachers and building principals.

1 For example, one of our schools, the principal
2 described a school improvement process as a wake-up call.
3 Our school improvement specialists used the planning tool
4 to ask hard question about their students' poor
5 achievement.

6 The school team, which had been comfortable
7 ignoring a down turn and student achievement began to face
8 the brutal facts. They changed school structures by
9 eliminating silos between special and general education,
10 and provided target professional development.

11 For them, school improvement was no longer
12 something that was imposed upon them by the state. IU
13 score improvement specialists had built the capacity
14 within the school staff, so they could use the process
15 themselves to change systems within their schools and
16 raise student achievement.

17 IUs have woven these systems so well under the
18 fabric of school district work, and they will be sustained
19 well beyond the current administration's tenure and well
20 beyond the Race to the Top initiative.

21 We are going beyond the ambitious goals of Race
22 to the Top by providing teachers with a dashboard style
23 interface to our solution-oriented SLBS and technical

1 support system to meet student needs.

2 Pennsylvania teachers are ready because IUs have
3 helped them to change the work in their classrooms. In
4 another one of our school districts, as a result of
5 intensive on-site training by IU coaches and curriculum
6 specialists, teachers are using test bank tools,
7 electronic weight boards, and personal response systems to
8 assess standards-based learning.

9 Instantly, they are analyzing responses to test
10 items across students, modifying instructions in real
11 time, and planning for future lessons. They not only
12 identify the students who are getting the concepts, they
13 can pinpoint other students' misunderstandings.

14 With data dashboards and student learning
15 portfolios available to parents and others who work with
16 students, communication and collaboration with Foster,
17 even better outcomes for all students.

18 We are ready to go because the infrastructure
19 has been driving professional development in the use of
20 student data systems to improve student performance at the
21 district, school, and classroom level.

22 IU data specialists train teachers to understand
23 and use student and classroom level value-added data with

1 numerous center reports that Pennsylvania principals ran
2 over 2 million analytical reports in 2009. Over 300
3 school districts voluntarily used the State's benchmark
4 assessment foresight.

5 These list examples of how schools use data
6 systems and technical assistance to renew their commitment
7 to increasing student achievement. My DC IU staff worked
8 with one district that experienced the wake-up call, made
9 some substantial changes based on student growth data and
10 within two years, the district went from corrective action
11 status to making AYP. IUs are ready to go, day one.

12 DR. LANE: To reach the aggressive learning
13 goals we have for our students, especially those that have
14 been historically underserved, we know that average
15 teaching is not good enough. We also know that school and
16 district leaders must provide support to enable teachers
17 to do their best work.

18 How will we find them for Pennsylvania schools?
19 We have a plan and the resources in place to implement it.
20 We will seek out the best, the rock star teachers from
21 both inside and outside the commonwealth, and the best
22 from inside and outside traditional teacher education
23 programs. Both our House and Senate Education Committees

1 have passed a plan to support alternative certification
2 not tied to institutes of higher learning.

3 Why would these teachers want to teach for
4 Pennsylvania schools? Money does matter to teachers
5 especially those that are just beginning their careers, so
6 we plan to offer signing bonuses with a priority on high
7 needs areas and high needs schools.

8 But our teachers tell us that money is not all
9 that matters. In order for our teachers to teach in our
10 high-need schools, they do need support including that of
11 their colleagues. That is why our plan includes both a
12 covert model where teachers will learn together how to use
13 the useful data they will be provided.

14 They will have a state-of-the-art data system
15 and learn how to use it. Not just the covert model will
16 provide support; these teachers will have mentoring for a
17 full year. Moreover, for children who are behind,
18 opportunity to learn is, as Doug Reeves calls it, "An
19 antecedent of excellence." Our teachers will have more
20 time to teach through an extended year.

21 There is another way time matters. The fact
22 that teachers will have the support of the school board,
23 the union, and the superintendent will provide time for

1 needed reforms to take hold, avoiding the shifting goal
2 that can make progress allusive.

3 In Pittsburgh, starting in July, we are going to
4 have a three-week induction to ensure that our new
5 teachers are confident and ready to meet our children in
6 August. Induction programs are now provided by our
7 intermediate units with targeted skill development,
8 standards-based unit planning, and other aligned topics.

9 In Pennsylvania, we are ready for the Race,
10 ready to go. In 2008, we recognized the need to increase
11 the rigor of our undergraduate education programs, and
12 standards were raised. Our teachers will have the right
13 tools, so that the additional time they will have to
14 address our learning challenges will be well used. We are
15 rolling out the technical assistance infrastructure to
16 provide the best professional development, and we know
17 that that is on the job.

18 School staff members will be held accountable
19 for results. Both Philadelphia and my district,
20 Pittsburgh, already have agreements in place with our
21 unions on a specific approach to include measures of
22 student learning as an element of teacher evaluation in a
23 fair process to ensure that we exit our ineffective

1 teachers.

2 The balance of the participating districts have
3 union and board support to implement a robust teacher
4 evaluation system. In Pittsburgh, we began this work of
5 our robust evaluation system with a group of 130 teachers
6 and administrators that work together as a design team.

7 We had some tough conversations regarding
8 teachers' worries about student [inaudible] as a part of
9 evaluation, including issues around using a single test
10 score, principle, objectivity. We work them through.

11 Our evaluations are being piloted this year in
12 28 of our schools. Last fall, we learned that we had the
13 opportunity to engage in a partnership with the Bill and
14 Melinda Gates Foundation to support the work on effective
15 teaching. We do not have it solved. The work on the
16 value-added measure is ongoing with the assistance of
17 Mathematica and the American Federation of teachers.

18 Our template is the basis for the State plan.
19 Yesterday, I met with about 60 teachers and principles who
20 were spending the day planning a new role, one that we
21 intend to make a career ladder position.

22 The roles were teachers who want to make it
23 their mission to get ninth graders to a Grade 11, on track

1 and on time. The teachers are excited about the
2 opportunity to make a difference with students who need
3 them the most.

4 Of course, we know that not only teachers have
5 the power to put students on a higher learning projectory,
6 strong, effective school leadership matters as well.

7 DR. ZAHORCHAK: We all know the resource is
8 clear. Grade schools are led by great principles.
9 Pennsylvania's Race to the Top application builds on our
10 really strong foundation for improving the readiness and
11 practice of our principals. The School District of
12 Philadelphia has inspiring principles academy as a model,
13 which we build the principals residency project housed in
14 three turnaround academies or labs across the
15 commonwealth.

16 Pennsylvania will steer the most effective
17 teachers who want to become building principals, to the
18 urban principal program that customized a graduate level
19 program for the inspired teachers.

20 Graduates of the programs will be placed in
21 turnaround schools, provided a mentor, has a proven track
22 record, coaching, and ongoing education and support for
23 the first two years on the job.

1 Chief Turnaround Officers will help principals
2 succeed in their leadership. Principals will now execute
3 plans with fidelity and support will be delivered and
4 ongoing. New principals receive world class instruction
5 via a partnership with the National Institute for School
6 Leadership. Their partnership is based on standards that
7 were built in Pennsylvania by superintendents, teachers,
8 principals, UI staff and others.

9 The standards led to the enactment of a new law
10 called the Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership Law, or PILL
11 initiative. All administrators are required to learn how
12 to become strategic thinkers and planners, chief
13 architects in the standard based systems in Pennsylvania
14 and excellent users of data to inform their work.

15 The standards provide the content for new
16 principal evaluation, and accountability systems, which
17 will include student results, linked to professional
18 element, and provide pathways for rewards and promotion.
19 Failure to meet expectations after being designated
20 ineffective will lead to dismissal.

21 Data will be used to inform practice new
22 students to be ready, especially student data will also be
23 used to inform teachers, principals, and other

1 administrators how well their district, school, principal,
2 teachers, and students are doing their jobs.

3 Student results will be an important part of our
4 accountability system and for us, winning behaviors and
5 results will be rewarded, and professionals who struggle
6 will be fully supported, and those who cannot improve will
7 be removed from the work.

8 Principals in Pennsylvania are being supported
9 through world class training, and outreach plans will
10 increase the support and create the rewards that will
11 attract and retain world class leaders.

12 DR. ACKERMAN: I would like to talk about
13 Pennsylvania's willingness to make fundamental structural
14 changes to ensure success for the students in chronically
15 failing schools.

16 Pennsylvania is prepared to go beyond Race to
17 the Top's ambitious goals and turning around are
18 persistently low achieving schools. There are 128 schools
19 in our turnaround efforts, three times the number 37
20 suggested by Race to the Top requirements.

21 By the way, 86 of Pennsylvania's 128 turnaround
22 schools are in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. In
23 Philadelphia, even before Race to the Top, we were

1 committed to turning around eight schools through our
2 Renaissance school initiative for 2010-2011 school year,
3 but even at the rate of eight schools per year, it would
4 take us almost a decade to turn around our worse
5 performing schools, and we all know that our children
6 can't wait that long.

7 We believe that Pennsylvania has the capacity to
8 turn around this many schools. We have made serious
9 investments in technical assistance and support for
10 schools, the teachers, and administrators. We are
11 prepared to bring national experts to the State to help in
12 the design and implementation of turnaround strategies.

13 We will use the field-based supports from our
14 intermediary units in implementing both strategies and
15 providing technical support with data systems.

16 Just importantly, we believe Pennsylvania has
17 the right strategies to get this work done. We know that
18 to accelerate achievement in our persistently low
19 achieving schools, we must implement strategies that go
20 beyond the mandated structural changes.

21 So, we have included college prep counseling
22 assistance, college ready roistering for every student,
23 longer day and year for turnaround schools, data informed

1 instruction, more rigorous coursework, and in
2 Philadelphia, we have already included even more.

3 We have put in place targeted interventions like
4 social workers, more mental health services, parent
5 outreach liaisons, student advisors, more counselors, and
6 lower class sizes to address common barriers that often
7 interfere with teaching and learning in our worst
8 performing schools.

9 We know that Pennsylvania has the broad-based
10 will to accelerate achievement in this endeavor. We are
11 proud that our teachers' unions and education associations
12 at the local and State levels have partnered with us in
13 this important work by signing letters of agreement in
14 support for Pennsylvania's application.

15 Actually, you need to look no further than
16 Philadelphia and Pittsburgh school districts to see
17 historic changes in the relationship between the unions
18 and the districts.

19 In fact, Philadelphia used Pennsylvania's Race
20 to the Top turnaround strategies to serve as a framework
21 for our recent negotiations and ultimate settlement, a
22 settlement that gave maximum flexibility in our lowest
23 performing schools.

1 Longer school days, an 11-month school year,
2 value-added compensation for teachers and school staff
3 that demonstrate exceptional growth, full site-based
4 teacher selection at all of our persistently low achieving
5 schools, a new teacher evaluation process based on
6 national teacher standards, and a peer assistance and
7 review program for all new and struggling teachers.

8 Pennsylvania is ready to implement. We have a
9 successful track record of boosting achievement of
10 children trapped in the worst schools. Since 2000, we
11 have made impressive gains, double the number of students
12 at grade level and cut in half the number of students
13 performing below the basic level.

14 We are a charter-friendly school and -- I am
15 sorry -- a charter-friendly State. In Philadelphia alone,
16 there are 33,000 children attending 67 charter schools.
17 Charter schools like Kipp and Mastery, along with home-
18 grown charter operators, are providing quality educational
19 alternatives for families of students who otherwise would
20 have had few options available to them.

21 These successful charter schools also served as
22 incubators for a new reform. In Philadelphia, under our
23 renaissance school initiative, six charter and private

1 management companies will begin turnaround work in the
2 district the next school year.

3 It is true that Pennsylvania is ready to go
4 beyond, that we have the capacity to turn around many
5 schools. We have the right strategies in place, and we
6 have the broad-based will, and we are ready to go on day
7 one.

8 The late Ron Edmonds once said, "We already know
9 everything we need to know about how to educate our
10 children well. The real question is whether we want to or
11 not." In Pennsylvania, we want to educate all of our
12 children well. We are ready to go.

13 MS. COOPER: Our strategy is sound. Certainly,
14 we look forward to picking up great ideas and sharing ours
15 with competitor states, but we have read every one of the
16 applications and with few exceptions, we are all going in
17 the same direction. So, the real question is will we get
18 this done.

19 We know we can't do this by sitting in the State
20 capital and making rules, although rules are important.
21 Instead, we know we have to rely on a tested and proven
22 essential element needed to implement a plan of this scale
23 at fidelity, with fidelity.

1 Our private sector leaders and tools,
2 experienced superintendents, State Board of Education,
3 intermediate units, and our Department of Education, our
4 elected leaders especially our governor, are all single-
5 minded about fidelity to our Race to the Top application.

6 Pennsylvania stands out as one of the few states
7 with a real tested technical assistance infrastructure.
8 It is this infrastructure that makes it possible for us to
9 effect the operations of over 1,000 school, and to turn
10 around over 100 of our most challenged buildings within
11 four years.

12 Some pundits have suggested that Pennsylvania
13 may be less competitive than other states who have a
14 greater percentage of their districts signed on. We
15 simply don't see it that way.

16 Our building level performance targets, which
17 are linked to continued Race to the Top fund, the
18 fundamental shift we are making in the way teachers are
19 evaluated already underway, and the mandated structural
20 and instructional changes required in our turnaround
21 schools made the bar for union and school board agreement
22 very high in Pennsylvania.

23 Because we did the heavy lifting while we

1 crafted this application, we are confident that our sign-
2 on is real and that these partners are ready to move
3 forward with the systemic changes proposed in our
4 application.

5 In fact, our proposal design process was so
6 transparent, and it engaged so many sectors, that we can
7 confidently say that the backlash will be greater if there
8 are efforts to weaken our strategy, that if we move full
9 speed ahead to implement our plan.

10 As you know, we see evaluators in two roles,
11 first, to help us learn and do course corrections, but our
12 evaluators who are working in a consortium for our State
13 Board of Education will be the key drivers in keeping with
14 Race to the Top implementation on track.

15 They provide the sunshine to keep all players
16 focused on outcome. Finally, our Governor and the
17 Secretary of Education will leave this December, but we
18 know our State and local Race to the Top staff, our
19 superintendents, our technical assistance system, and our
20 partners will remain focused on this work.

21 They have committed to do so, or said another
22 way, this will be their work for the next four years. So,
23 too, has the House Education and Senate Education

1 Committee chairs, who expressed their unequivocal support
2 for the elements of this application, we have great faith
3 in these individuals, but we also hope that you understand
4 that the future of well over a million public school
5 students rests with your decision.

6 Funding for the Commonwealth locks in these
7 reforms. Our reform train left the station seven years
8 ago. With Race to the Top, our train will accelerate to
9 an even higher speed, and we can tell you once that
10 happens, there is no stopping us from succeeding. We are
11 ready to go, and we will go beyond the ambitious
12 expectations of this Race to the Top.

13 That concludes our presentation.

14 REVIEWER 3: Thank you for the presentation.

15 Our objective is to get to as many questions as possible.

16 The only caveat I would indicate as an apology in advance
17 for appearing rude is that if at anytime we are going on
18 too long in the wrong direction, I cut you off.

19 REVIEWER 5: Actually, I am going to ask you a
20 question that relates to your concluding comments. You
21 talk about setting a high bar for participation. Convince
22 us or explain a little bit more about how you can do
23 statewide reform when only 28 percent of your LEAs have

1 signed on.

2 MS. COOPER: We will start with two things and
3 then I would like our biggest school districts to add.
4 Sixty percent of our poorer students are in those LEAs, so
5 in terms of affecting the students who have the greatest
6 challenges, we have almost every one of the districts that
7 we need.

8 So, that is the first thing, and that we know in
9 those LEAs, everybody is ready to do this.

10 The second thing is that our State-aligned
11 reforms are going to affect every school district, not
12 just participating districts. Our student level data
13 system is available to everybody, our staff portal updated
14 for Common Core is available to everybody.

15 REVIEWER 5: Keep going, but for clarification,
16 when you use the term "available," does that mean required
17 by everybody, or available if they want it?

18 MS. COOPER: Okay. For non-participating school
19 districts, the SAS portal, which is our standards, our
20 model curricula, all that, that is available to school
21 districts, but everybody has got to teach to our
22 standards, that is required, and everybody has got to
23 implement our high school, and, of course, exams, and that

1 is required. So, in order for them to successfully get to
2 their high school exams, which will be aligned to the
3 Common Core, they are going to need to access all that
4 stuff.

5 I will tell you a few other things that are
6 available to everybody in the State. The training that we
7 will be doing on how to use data to inform instructions,
8 delivered through the IU, will be available to every
9 district.

10 Our experience -- and Larry can talk to this the
11 best -- is that when we have made mandatory things
12 available, pretty much everybody is using them, and so I
13 would like these guys to chime in just quickly.

14 DR. ZAHORCHAK: If I can just add one example of
15 that, pretty much everybody is using, we started with a
16 benchmark assessment, and we said the school has been
17 sharing, some of the worst performing schools were sharing
18 some of our tutoring money, \$66 million, would use these
19 benchmark assessments. They helped us figure out how that
20 is best done, and that was about 175 school districts.

21 Now, over 300 districts use those benchmark
22 assessments inside of Race for all districts our benchmark
23 assessments will be readjusted based on the Common Core,

1 and we anticipate again everyone is going to see the
2 sensibility of using these kinds of tools. That is one
3 tool we can list over and over, the kinds of tools that
4 everyone is using, so a big part of the State investment
5 are those tools.

6 REVIEWER 3: To clarify that point, then, what
7 you are saying, what I hear you say is that your belief is
8 that although there are quite a few districts not
9 participating, that your view is that they will, in fact,
10 become de facto participants, but this is an example.

11 DR. ZAHORCHAK: Absolutely.

12 DR. O'SHEA: When we do trainings, we don't
13 discriminate among our districts that we serve. Each of
14 the 29 intermediate units has a geographic reason to set
15 up school districts. We have 15 school districts with
16 whom we work, nine of which are participating districts or
17 have turnaround schools.

18 When we deliver these in-service trainings, they
19 will not be just those nine districts, there will be two
20 staff from all of those districts. The districts that are
21 participating, they will get some more intensive resources
22 made available to them, for instance, the data coaches
23 that will be assigned to each of those districts, but

1 others will be trained in the process, in the systems for
2 analyzing student data, use of the dashboard.

3 The SAS portal, as I indicated already, it is
4 not required by anyone, but it is a good resource for
5 districts and teachers in particular, define things
6 easily, and when we start to aggregate data into a
7 dashboard type of interface, and that is all going to be
8 through the portal, this is going to be something the
9 districts are going to want to do. It is not a matter of
10 forcing them to do it, it is a matter of them wanting to
11 do it.

12 REVIEWER 4: Any other comments?

13 MS. COOPER: Just a small point. Our teacher
14 evaluation system, right now the -- our teacher evaluation
15 template, so as that is updated in this process to ensure
16 that student level [inaudible] people are going to use
17 that.

18 Now, where the rubber is going to hit the road
19 obviously, is where the unions are going to push back on
20 the degree to which student growth is used in teacher
21 evaluation. The 128 schools have signed onto that,
22 affecting 60 percent of the kids.

23 We got an e-mail the other day of a non-

1 participating district that said, hey, we are already
2 doing it. We didn't sign on, but we want to let you know
3 I hope you win because we are already doing it.

4 So, I think people will -- you know, people see
5 the way that things are going.

6 DR. Ackerman: I also want to remind everybody
7 that while we have the two largest school systems here,
8 Philadelphia is six times larger than all of the other
9 school districts.

10 The majority of the young people who were in
11 will be affected by the Race to the Top, are in this
12 school system, 76 schools, thousands of young people, so I
13 just want to -- and all of our schools are ready embarking
14 up on many -- what this will help us do is accelerate the
15 work that we have already started even before Race to the
16 Top application was submitted by the State.

17 DR. Lane: Yes, and even though Philadelphia is
18 obviously quite a bit bigger than even Pittsburgh, we do
19 obviously educate a large number of low income minority
20 students, and 10 of those turnaround schools are actually
21 in our district.

22 So, we think that the opportunity to participate
23 in this can really have a big impact for us.

1 REVIEWER 3: Thank you. REVIEWER 1, do you have
2 a follow-on?

3 REVIEWER 1: I don't, thank you.

4 REVIEWER 3: One question I would like to
5 quickly ask is in the budget narrative and in the
6 application you talk about expecting the 6 percent
7 sustainability number going forward. Can you talk to me
8 just for a minute about how you came up with that figure?

9 MS. COOPER: Sure. Our 6 percent is about \$10
10 million dollars a year that we would need, at the State
11 level, to continue to support. Here is how we see this
12 working. At the same time that we are getting Race to the
13 Top funds, remember it is predicated on the state
14 continuing to meet its obligation to fund the schools in
15 accordance with our costing out formula.

16 So, in that same period, additional resources
17 from the State are also being distributed to the schools.
18 Most of our Race to the Top interventions are imbedded
19 training.

20 Once teachers know how to do data-informed
21 instruction, once the principals know how to do a fair
22 teacher evaluation system, once we have created the
23 dashboard, what needs to happen at the district is they

1 need to absorb that training process together with the IU
2 in their own regimen.

3 Most of our money is to get, is basically an
4 infrastructure and Train the Trainer framework. So, the
5 10 million is to continue the evaluation, to continue some
6 of the expansions that are enabled in the turnaround
7 schools, and we have a commitment.

8 We have discussed this is with our legislature,
9 and they know we are going to have to pony up an extra \$10
10 million on top of the \$4.8 billion that we put in there.

11 I don't think that is going to be that hard.

12 DR. ZAHORCHAK: A good example of the
13 sustainment. We had outside help with building how do you
14 analyze the results of your value-added data and of your
15 benchmark assessment.

16 Recently, well, about a year ago, I was in
17 contact with folks from Johns Hopkins, and I said, you
18 know, tell me what the next level of that is, and the
19 leader said you don't need to talk to us anymore, we are
20 gone.

21 You have this embedded in your IUs now, that
22 training of how do we analyze to get the solutions at the
23 kid level is in your state, you own it. It will never

1 leave it. This is the example of the kinds of sustaining
2 things we will do.

3 REVIEWER 3: Thank you, thank you very much.

4 REVIEWER 5: Wait a minute, I want to probe a
5 little. We have got a few more minutes. I want to probe
6 a little bit further on this participation rate.

7 Was the number 28 percent all that were willing
8 to do it or all that you went after?

9 MS. COOPER: We invited every school district in
10 the State to participate. We worked very hard to
11 encourage as many superintendents in school districts to
12 participate, and we will say that our most aggressive
13 efforts were at the school districts where kids were
14 performing, and so everybody was invited to participate,
15 and, you know, Larry can talk to -- talk about just your
16 county.

17 DR. O'SHEA: In our county we have 15 districts,
18 15 of them had signed on a letter of intent to enter into
19 an MOU. We had nine that ultimately signed the MOU,
20 received the signatures of their union president, school
21 board --

22 REVIEWER 5: What were some of the reasons that
23 others didn't?

1 DR. O'SHEA: Because in the districts that
2 didn't are relatively high performing school districts who
3 frankly weren't going to get the kind of financial support
4 that other districts are going to receive.

5 Interestingly, the day before yesterday, one of
6 those districts, it's a fairly affluent district, called
7 us up and said, you know, we are having second thoughts
8 about this, do you think that maybe we could get into the
9 Race to the Top, and that's not right now something that
10 we have dealt with.

11 But, you know, I was privy to conversations with
12 superintendents outside of their meeting with the
13 Department of Ed. staff. We had some really good
14 deliberations about this, and I think one of the things
15 that came out through that process was a recognition that
16 the things that are in Pennsylvania's plan are things (a)
17 that they have already started to do in most cases; (b)
18 that they believe these are good, effective ways to change
19 their schools even for those districts, and there is a
20 number of them in our intermediate unit, there are high
21 performing districts that still signed up, because they
22 want to get even better, and they see the benefit, they
23 see that this is the future in terms of structural changes

1 that have to take place in their district.

2 So, they understand, because there is an 18-page
3 detailed list of items that folks had --

4 REVIEWER 5: Here is where I am trying to go
5 with this. They see the benefit, but the others don't,
6 and how that impacts on statewide reform is the real crux
7 of these questions.

8 MS. COOPER: I think one of the things that
9 Larry said that is pretty important is there are a set of
10 school districts that we are fortunate to have, that are
11 very high performing. They are wealthy suburban school
12 districts that in many cases are doing some of these
13 practices already, and they are not going to get a lot of
14 money out of this, but if we sent them a new teacher
15 evaluation system, they would probably use it.

16 There is a set of districts, very small, you can
17 count them on two hands, where there is no way the union
18 is going to let them agree to the teacher evaluation
19 thing.

20 REVIEWER 5: That is honest.

21 MS. COOPER: Yeah. And then there was a set of
22 people in between that I remember in some of our meetings
23 where people got nervous about their capacity to do

1 everything we said they needed to do.

2 I mean I can remember a couple of the meetings
3 where some of the world's supers like, you know, I totally
4 think what you guys are doing is right, and the systemic
5 things they will be able to do, but they had a cost-
6 benefit analysis. Do I have the capacity to extend my
7 school days, extend my school year, fight with my union
8 over this, and my kids are mostly performing?

9 So, the districts that need this are in. We
10 worked to get all them in, believe me.

11 DR. O'SHEA: And again our experience tells us
12 we are one of those with 500 districts, "me, too"
13 organizations. As soon as it rolls, people start saying
14 oh, that benefit was just unknown, or we were sort of
15 asleep at the wheel. This is a "me, too," a lot of people
16 are already enlisting if we open again their school
17 districts.

18 So, we have a lot of support for this.
19 to push you on that.

20 REVIEWER 4: I am focusing on your IUs, because
21 that was something, and you gave a lot of good information
22 already, so I am pleased about that.

23 I would just like for you to take us a little

1 bit deeper on them. You know, I would like some specific
2 numbers. You talked about your county, because you know
3 it well, but I am assuming that you came because you know
4 more about the others, as well.

5 DR. ZAHORCHAK: Yes.

6 REVIEWER 4: Can you give me some numbers, the
7 districts, the number of -- you have different titles for
8 folks, you have coaches, and you have data specialists,
9 because I am concerned about who is getting into the
10 schools, how much time they are spending, how much time is
11 allowed for them, how are teachers released. You know,
12 the nuts and bolts of really making it work.

13 DR. O'SHEA: The important point I think is our
14 longevity. We have been statutory on the end of it since
15 1970, so we have been around doing these various roles as
16 initiatives have changed, and, in particular, over the
17 last seven years around this initiative.

18 Frankly, this Administration has really
19 recognized the infrastructure that they have with
20 intermediate units. It has really pushed us to do more
21 than we have perhaps done in the past -- in areas around
22 instructional strategies, around school reform.

23 One of the other examples about how things have

1 been embedded and woven in, and have been taken over, the
2 school improvement process. Actually, it's staff in my
3 intermediate units who have done the last several
4 generations of that tool, and continue to work on that
5 tool. It is our staff who works in conjunction with their
6 peers in other intermediate units throughout the state, to
7 drive that whole process through.

8 You know we have talked with the Department of
9 Education, but frankly, you know, we can do this, and they
10 have recognized that, so they gradually faded their input
11 out, and we have taken that process over more and more.

12 So, we have staff who are curriculum
13 specialists, who focus in, some of them on data analysis,
14 some on instructional practices within particular content
15 areas, but the key is all of our staff are cross-trained,
16 so they know about these other areas, so that when they go
17 into a school district, and they may be there to talk
18 about aligning the curriculum, but something comes up with
19 regard to data analysis, and they are able to deal with
20 that spontaneously.

21 We know their work because we are also a direct
22 service provider. We provide staff and run and operate
23 programs for English language learners, we do it for

1 alternative education, for special education programs. In
2 some cases, and actually many cases, those programs are
3 embedded within the school districts themselves, so we
4 have staff in there on a continuous basis.

5 The other part of our training regiment, for
6 instance, is using the Train the Trainers model. Our goal
7 is to fill capacity and work ourselves out of a job. So,
8 we go into a school district, we go in and work with that
9 staff, and train lead teachers or principals to take over
10 the work and to continue that process on an ongoing basis.

11 Now, when we have turnovers, for instance, we
12 have new staff coming in, and over time, there is just a
13 couple here, a couple there, we can aggregate those folks
14 together, bring them back and do it in a much more
15 effective manner.

16 We have just been provided funding over the last
17 few years to build regional wide area networks, and have
18 the technology infrastructure in different regions around
19 the state. Two years ago we received a grant through
20 another funding mechanism within the State, and PD being a
21 large part of that, to build a statewide virtual private
22 network that connects all of our school districts and all
23 our intermediate units.

1 We are starting to use that as a training
2 mechanism, a tool where we can efficiently and effectively
3 reach out right in the classrooms if need be, but that
4 deliver instruction across the state in real time, or to
5 do it in a synchronous manner. So, there is a lot of
6 things that are in place, I think, that we can do.

7 MS. COOPER: Can I add two things on? In terms
8 of the scale on Race to the Top, you take Larry's
9 infrastructure, and you put on top of it, 228 people who
10 deploy to our participating and turnaround districts in
11 tandem with his folks.

12 So, teaching teachers on how to use -- not how
13 to use the data -- how to change their instructions. The
14 data part we teach, but it is really changing instruction,
15 that is along with his curricular folks who are already
16 there.

17 So, they are reinforcing that.

18 REVIEWER 4: To observe the 228 are --

19 MS. COOPER: Race to the Top funded.

20 REVIEWER 4: Race to the Top funded.

21 MS. COOPER: IU coaches. So, the 116 people
22 deployed across our districts to teach people, and mostly
23 through Train the Trainer, on data-informed instructions,

1 how to change instruction. Thirty-eight people will be
2 deployed to train principals how to run a fair teacher
3 evaluation system, how to use the teacher evaluation
4 system.

5 We will have 16 people that will work with
6 principals and Chief Turnaround Officers on -- yeah, you
7 saw that stuff -- so, these people, they work for the IUs,
8 and we all collaborate together. I mean we use video
9 conferencing and meetings, and we all work together, we
10 are all on the same page.

11 They are in school all the time, and they are in
12 classrooms. So, we recently wrote out three years ago, a
13 major technology initiative to upgrade every high school
14 classroom and instruction high school classroom. Those
15 coaches are in and out of high school classrooms, talking
16 to teachers about how to improve their instructions all
17 the time. So, they are fluid, they are liquid, they are
18 part of the school.

19 REVIEWER 4: They are, the relationships have
20 been developed over time their in the building.

21 MS. COOPER: A long time.

22 REVIEWER 4: My other question then is -- and
23 the states I come from, it sounds like a similar situation

1 -- are you more into counties as opposed to being in the
2 large districts, because the large districts pretty much
3 have their own people, how does that work?

4 DR. O'SHEA: Well, interesting you should ask
5 that question, because in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh,
6 they are their own intermediate units.

7 REVIEWER 4: Oh, they are. But they are
8 considered an intermediate --

9 MS. COOPER: Yes.

10 REVIEWER 4: -- and they come to meetings?

11 DR. O'SHEA: They do, they do come to meetings,
12 and the 27 others, obviously, comprise the other 65
13 counties in the state.

14 REVIEWER 3: On that point, the IU
15 infrastructure you have, this is important, would you say
16 that, generally speaking, that the proportion of non-
17 participating districts by IUs is similar to the one you
18 described for your own county?

19 DR. O'SHEA: I think there is some degree of
20 variation on that, but I think probably generally, that is
21 the case. In looking at the number of school districts
22 and where they are located across those IUs, I think it
23 seems as though in some of the more rural areas, there was

1 probably a lesser degree of participation.

2 REVIEWER 3: And you wouldn't have an IU, they
3 would have no participation.

4 DR. O'SHEA: I don't believe so, no.

5 REVIEWER 3: Thank you.

6 REVIEWER 1: You're planning to expand the
7 capacity of the IUs, 228 people, where are you going to
8 find those people, how do you know they are going to be,
9 have the same expertise as the ones you have already got,
10 i.e., is quality going to go down as you get bigger?

11 DR. O'SHEA: We certainly don't anticipate the
12 quality going down, because we are insistent that we have
13 good, strong folks. We kind of do this in some other
14 initiatives. I think Jerry or Donna had mentioned a
15 classroom for the future initiative where we are trying to
16 integrate and train staff for integration of technology
17 into instructional regimens.

18 We had to go out and hire 350 classroom
19 technology integrationists for that, and we did it, and
20 trained them well, and we continue to work with them on an
21 ongoing basis to really infuse that technology.

22 One example I gave was an example of the
23 benefits of that, the classroom where there is two

1 teachers, co-teachers, a special ed. teacher and a math
2 teacher, teaching a secondary algebra course.

3 In using the technology from that initiative,
4 electronic white boards, overhead projectors, and a
5 personal response system to co-teach algebra, it was
6 phenomenal. We found good people who were able to instill
7 that, and embed that in those two classroom teachers and
8 many, many others throughout the State.

9 REVIEWER 1: So, where did they come from, are
10 they teachers moving out of the classroom?

11 DR. O'SHEA: Yes. In a large extent, we will
12 look at teachers because for them it's a career ladder
13 step for them. They get to come out of their classroom,
14 these have been very effective classrooms. There is the
15 down side to that, but they are still -- they are so
16 motivated to come out.

17 I just moved from another intermediate unit
18 about 15 months ago, and in our other intermediate unit,
19 we had this woman who was a teacher, she had a number of
20 years under her belt. She was not technology really
21 savvy, she became savvy, and then when we grabbed her,
22 because of her enthusiasm and -- she was like a sponge in
23 absorbing this information, and because of her skill as a

1 teacher, was able to translate the technology into
2 classroom procedures that made it fit, it made it seamless
3 for those teachers, it wasn't a big deal for them to make
4 that transition, to go from overhead projectors to
5 electronic white boards.

6 REVIEWER 1: Thank you.

7 MS. COOPER: I will just add one other small
8 point. I think some of the IUs, I have noticed that are
9 DEs, and some of the other folks, they are people who are
10 in their early 50s who retired as teachers, too.

11 We have a relatively early teacher retirement
12 age, so there is a lot of people that have lots of years
13 of experience. As long as they are state of the art, and
14 smart, you know, they will be absorbed.

15 DR. O'SHEA: Just another point in terms of the
16 structure of all of this -- if I can continue or --

17 REVIEWER 3: Let's move on.

18 DR. O'SHEA: Okay.

19 REVIEWER 1: I want to ask my other question.
20 Your proposal depends a lot on contractors, on outside
21 vendors to do a lot for you. How can you assure us that
22 those vendors will have the quality and the expertise that
23 you need for such a large ramp-up, even for where you have

1 been already? You already have been very active.

2 So, again, how can you assure us that those
3 services are going to meet the needs of your state?

4 MS. COOPER: You are very right. We need a lot
5 of vendors, and obviously, we will follow State
6 procurement rules and we will do our RFIs and RFPs, and
7 that causes a number of unusual things to occur often, but
8 the very first thing that we do upon hearing that we are
9 getting a Race to the Top award, in two areas we have
10 already begun this, is writing the RFP.

11 The RFP specifications in my mind are the way
12 that you ensure quality. The clearer we are about what we
13 want, the more specific we can be about qualifications,
14 the more careful we can be about saying who is on your
15 team, the more likely we will get what we ask for.

16 My experience and our experience in education
17 has been spectacular. In other parts of the State
18 Government, because I work with lots of agencies, the
19 quality of the vendors decreases the more the RFP was
20 unclear.

21 So that is the first part of this. The second
22 part of it is we are not novices at this work. We know
23 who is good and we know who is bad. So, that is important

1 when it comes to value-added assessment, when it comes to
2 reading recovery, when it comes to teacher evaluation,
3 when it comes to early warning, when it comes to
4 kindergarten assessment, those are areas where we have a
5 lot of expertise.

6 Now, there are areas where we won't, and we hope
7 our competitor states are going to help us understand how
8 to make that better. Certainly, I mean all of us are on
9 the cutting edge of technology. Now, we work with a lot
10 of technology partners, and we are going to need to make
11 sure we have a really high quality technology partner for
12 our teacher dashboards and the integration of our
13 information system.

14 So, I can't say we have expertise everywhere,
15 but certainly on most of the areas in which we need
16 vendors, we have been around the block in the field, and
17 know who delivers quality, so if we can write the RFP in a
18 way that the quality respondents are likely to be in that
19 pool, we are better off.

20 DR. ZAHORCHAK: And then it is also execution
21 and monitoring. So, the State Boards Consortium and our
22 turnaround officers in the 128 schools are there for that
23 reason, how does all of these things get executed day-in,

1 day-out, minute-by-minute, and second-by-second according
2 to the plan.

3 MS. COOPER: We will have feedback.

4 REVIEWER 3: We need to move forward.

5 REVIEWER 1: Yes. Switching gears. Why do you
6 believe that the strategies you are proposing will result
7 in a very significant improvement system?

8 DR. ZAHORCHAK: First of all, we build off of
9 something we have been doing from day one for seven years.
10 One is building our capacity immediately, because if any
11 State Department tells you it doesn't have capacity, when
12 it has regional service providers like IUs, it's a systems
13 problem, not a capacity problem. We can build capacity.

14 Two, we have the standard align systems. Look,
15 when we really align and are clear, comparing about what
16 are the standards, what are the progressions, concepts,
17 and skills for the grades that we are targeting, unlike
18 most countries that win, we have never done that well. We
19 have done that well as a State, though, clear about that,
20 and then that is what the assessment systems get wrapped
21 around, aligned in very tight ways, too.

22 Our best teaching practices, respond to
23 classroom formative assessment type practices, when we can

1 say, a tie to then intervention, and then carefully tied
2 to the ever-growing abundance of materials and resources
3 under stuff, right? But they don't get the rule. It has
4 got to be tightly aligned around all 6 of those component
5 parts.

6 That is our standard aligned systems that you
7 keep over and over again, and when you can do that in
8 front of frame at the top, Common Core standards through
9 the States are our standards in this work, we have done
10 it, right down into the classroom work to the child.

11 None of it is easy, improving is easy, but it is
12 really hard work, and our folks need help. This will give
13 us acceleration in the help and more tools for our
14 teachers and principals.

15 REVIEWER 1: The same approach that you have
16 been doing, but just a bit bigger?

17 DR. ZAHORCHAK: Well, it's the core of the
18 approach. This gives us more training, changing out and
19 supporting our higher ED preparation systems, our
20 principal training systems. It gives us more, and it
21 gives us more fidelity, I am thinking.

22 MS. COOPER: The one other thing I would add is
23 that I think what we have seen is that our projectory on

1 improvement, which we are really proud of, is going to
2 keep going, but if we are going to get to the depth of the
3 challenges, where buildings have persistently been slow,
4 they need more resources.

5 So, it is not just about -- it is about the
6 standards and align system, but it is also about, is every
7 kid in pre-K, coming into that school, is their extended
8 learning time.

9 You know, the changes, the delta here, we don't
10 mandate extended learning time or pay for it right now, we
11 will. So, the delta of those instructional practices that
12 Arlene identified, together with this, gets us to the
13 places where we can't get to the tipping point.

14 REVIEWER 5: Let me know if I am correct here.
15 Basically, in terms of the student performance data you
16 reported, we talked about fourth and eighth grade math and
17 eighth grade reading scores on NAPE went up pretty well.
18 Fourth grade reading remained the same, and overall,
19 student subgroup achievement, you know, reductions was not
20 really there, is that correct?

21 MS. COOPER: No, that's not correct. That is
22 why I am curious what you are reading.

23 REVIEWER 5: There is no statistically

1 significant reduction on NAPE.

2 MS. COOPER: On NAPE.

3 REVIEWER 5: On NAPE, right.

4 MS. COOPER: Yes, on our PSSA, we have different
5 results.

6 REVIEWER 5: Well, here is my question.

7 MS. COOPER: But also the time horizon on NAPE,
8 I would just say it this way. There hasn't been a
9 statistically significant improvement in NAPE in many
10 places or almost anywhere.

11 REVIEWER 5: Yes, but we are talking about
12 Pennsylvania.

13 MS. COOPER: Yes.

14 REVIEWER 5: And you are talking about your plan
15 and what you have been doing.

16 MS. COOPER: Yes.

17 REVIEWER 5: Which goes back to the crux of the
18 question, convince -- describe, explain, provide greater
19 clarity about why doing more of the same, only larger and
20 bigger --

21 DR. ZAHORCHAK: It's not.

22 MS. COOPER: So, that is why I said there is a
23 delta.

1 REVIEWER 5: Hold on just a minute. It didn't?

2 DR. ZAHORCHAK: Let me say this. Our standards
3 of seven years ago, standards getting the chiropractics
4 vertically, aligning them with our assessment system was
5 done.

6 Between present and back today, we now have our
7 learning progressions across all of our standard areas
8 done. Our RTII or interventions, we are going to have
9 something like the reason we are covering intervention,
10 that is not in place now, so it is not more of the same.

11 The training, the preparation for teachers,
12 look, we have preparation institutions that were, you
13 know, heretofore, all over the board on how you are
14 preparing the person to come in and work.

15 REVIEWER 5: What I think I hear you saying is,
16 to clarify, that some strategies have been in place, some
17 have recently been put in place on a more comprehensive
18 scale, and you will be adding some new strategies moving
19 forward.

20 DR. ZAHORCHAK: That's correct.

21 REVIEWER 5: And that is why you think you will
22 see significant improvement.

23 DR. ZAHORCHAK: It is not what we think; too, I

1 want to be clear. What we have learned from international
2 comparisons, the teaching gap kind of work, is that when
3 you do type alignment of those component parts, it gets to
4 achievement. Now, getting that said, it is easy, getting
5 that done takes time to build off of. We are building off
6 of that.

7 We have had remarkable results. Half the kids
8 to three-quarters of the kids at our State assessments
9 going up. Cutting that up by 50 percent, the number of
10 kids below basic. The Center for Education policy here in
11 Washington, D.C., Jack Stanning's [ph] report said the
12 most comprehensive study on student achievement ever
13 performed just this past year, Pennsylvania was the only
14 state to show that kind of remarkable improvement for all
15 --

16 REVIEWER 5: On state assessment.

17 DR. ZAHORCHAK: State and NAPE assessment.

18 COOPER: No, he said NAPE. I understand what you
19 are reading from our proposal. The timeline in Jack's
20 study was from 2000 to 2008, and it looked at reading and
21 math in every grade tested, and it said Pennsylvania was
22 the only state to make significant improvement in each
23 grade tested in each subject area.

1 So, what I am curious about, and remembering now
2 from the proposal, is the time horizon in Jack's study,
3 and those are not the same.

4 REVIEWER 5: '03 to '08.

5 MS. COOPER: Yes.

6 REVIEWER 5: But even then, most of your gains
7 would have been early on.

8 MS. COOPER: Yes, it could be, that could be.
9 That is what that would imply. What we did for our data
10 analysis, and what we normally do is our -- we assumed
11 that our advance to the NAPE proficient, right, so we
12 don't have NAPE -- NAPE advance and PSSA advance are not
13 the same, we are pretty much PSSA advanced to NAPE
14 proficient, and that is how we basically looked at our
15 trajectory over time, is how many more kids are we getting
16 to NAPE proficiency.

17 We see a change in that, and that is what Jack's
18 study indicated. So, what we are not seeing, however, is
19 NAPE and PSSA in basic and below basic are fuzzy.
20 Sometimes we are higher in basic, sometimes they are
21 higher in basic. In fact, reading and math work in eighth
22 grade, basic and below basic in NAPE, we both have
23 opposite results.

1 So, there is not consistency. The only place we
2 are able to measure consistency, which would be the only
3 valid data, not NAPE to NAPE categories, would be PSSA
4 proficient, PSSA advanced to NAPE proficient, and that is
5 what we charted for our targeted methodology.

6 REVIEWER 5: Thank you.

7 REVIEWER 3: Let me shift subjects for a moment
8 to in your presentation, you spoke eloquently about
9 starting in the classroom teaching level and moving up.
10 Specific to your student information systems, can you show
11 me in the application in the section in C3, we are talking
12 about encouraging districts to adopt local student
13 information systems.

14 It mentions finding out is it just a State, top-
15 down thing, or how do you allow for districts to make
16 local choices and then incorporate it into your State
17 system?

18 DR. LANE: In our district, the district has a
19 legacy system called RTI, and we also use the State system
20 as well. So, for example, our student data loads from
21 PENS into RTI. What we are trying to do with this is to
22 pull together more pieces into that whole mix, because we
23 want not just, for example, we want not just our student

1 achievement data, we may also want what kind of discipline
2 record does this child have.

3 We might want to know other -- one of the things
4 that we really want to know, we have a lot of our kids in
5 interventions and support, and we want to be able to say
6 which of those actually are making a difference for
7 children, and so we need to pull data in to know who is
8 working with which provider for after-school tutoring, for
9 example.

10 So, those are some of the things that we need --
11 I think it is called Middleware in the trade -- but the
12 Middleware that ties these different pieces together and
13 allows us to generate reports that pull from multiple data
14 sources. So, that, for us, is what we are looking forward
15 to.

16 REVIEWER 3: That does get to the essence of the
17 question because there are many differences with districts
18 we will see that the State is not providing, that they
19 want the ability to do.

20 My question is do you encourage that, and I
21 wanted to look for evidence of that as something that the
22 plan required, and then also when those choices are made,
23 what does the State do now, or what is in your plans to

1 roll that into your state data system?

2 MS. COOPER: So, because we have 500 districts,
3 you know, we are envious of a place like Maryland, that
4 has so few, our approach to this is to hire a very
5 proficient flexible vendor that will help districts
6 identify what is useful for them at a teacher level for
7 their student information system at a principal level, and
8 what needs to be brought into the State data warehouse and
9 brought back down for them.

10 So, our goal is not that we design a system and
11 ship it out, and everybody has to use it. It is to figure
12 out how we can provide the technical capacity for their
13 system to talk to each other, and if they can't do that,
14 we will be offering an off-the-shelf comprehensive student
15 information system that is useful for the teacher.

16 REVIEWER 3: So can the districts choose?

17 MS. COOPER: Yes.

18 REVIEWER 3: Their own, okay.

19 MS. COOPER: Yes, we would help them. We say,
20 you know, you don't have attendance, teachers can't see
21 attendance. How many times that kid missed school, they
22 need to see --

23 REVIEWER 3: All right. All I need, then, if

1 you would help me, is just show me where that speech -- so
2 I can know that.

3 MS. COOPER: That was a long time ago.

4 REVIEWER 3: Show me.

5 REVIEWER 2: Do you want to give her a moment to
6 look --

7 REVIEWER 3: Sure.

8 REVIEWER 2: I have a question about --

9 REVIEWER 3: I can do it at the end.

10 REVIEWER 2: I have a question about the
11 measurement of student growth. If you would please
12 clarify how student growth will be measured specifically
13 related to the Teacher and Principal Evaluation System,
14 and how that growth will be incorporated into those
15 values.

16 DR. LANE: I can start on a couple of things
17 that we are doing, working on right now. As I said in my
18 presentation, we are working on value-added measure with
19 Mathematica AFT in our district.

20 We are dealing with some of the tough questions
21 around value add, and one, of course, I mentioned was what
22 about teachers in non-tested graded subjects, are we going
23 to use a single test score or is it going to be over time,

1 which we knew if we have two or three data points, it is
2 going to be a more reliable and valid measure of growth.

3 So, those are some of the things that we are
4 dealing with right now. We are also doing a total review
5 of value add measures around the country. So, we want to
6 know, learn lessons from districts like Denver, who really
7 got out there early on connecting student data, and that
8 kind of thing.

9 So, we are working to learn more about what has
10 already been done and then figure out how we might use it,
11 but I will tell you that for right now, for our
12 principals, we are using difference in scale force, and
13 this is a methodology that was developed by Rand
14 Corporation for our principal growth measure.

15 It is not -- we are not totally satisfied with
16 it, and we still have a design team that needs and
17 discusses the inputs and how that is being used right now,
18 so that is one way we are doing it currently.

19 However, to answer your question, do we have the
20 answer to how exactly it is going to be used, no, but as I
21 said, we have got a team working on that right now.

22 In Philadelphia, as I said, we kind of crossed
23 that the first step. We are still working to identify the

1 final elements of our value-added performance criteria,
2 but we have, for all of our principals in all of our
3 schools, school performance targets, and we measure 50
4 percent of our principals evaluation is based on student
5 growth disaggregated.

6 We have already sort of made some of those
7 steps. We have a school performance index where we can
8 measure a school's growth using value-added elements, and
9 that is 60 percent.

10 So, we have already started testing some of
11 this, and we are now, since we have gotten the union on
12 board, we are looking at this even more, but our principal
13 evaluations are already linked to, as well as our regional
14 and central office are linked to the schools, so we are
15 all kind of tied together.

16 We have already, it looks like it is going to
17 be, that we are going to look at either the 60 percent or
18 the 40 percent. We have put in place, we use acuity, back
19 to the other question, and so we have benchmarks, but we
20 also use the predictive test, and we give it at every
21 grade, because what we are measuring is growth over time,
22 we are looking for one year's growth.

23 Maybe that's the key there. We are looking for

1 one year's growth for every student at every grade level;
2 we are not just looking at the PSSA. Is that helpful?

3 REVIEWER 3: I would just add, beyond the large
4 urban districts, where in the application, where can we
5 find the most compelling argument that you are using
6 statewide the growth of students' achievement as a
7 significant factor in evaluating your teachers and
8 principals?

9 MS. COOPER: Well, I think the most compelling
10 argument and the evidence is in the memorandum of
11 understanding that the district signed, so if they signed
12 on to do that, that means that they are going to do it.

13 REVIEWER 5: You are not doing it yet, but if
14 you were to get these funds, based on that memorandum?

15 MS. COOPER: Yes, is that your question? Okay,
16 yes. Other than these guys, there is a few of the urban
17 districts? Yes.

18 REVIEWER 4: And then tied to that, there are a
19 number of LEAs that are listed, that it says "Not
20 applicable for the unit," does that mean that --

21 MS. COOPER: They are charters.

22 REVIEWER 4: They are charters, and so they are
23 not union connected.

1 MS. COOPER: Right, so they don't need any
2 agreement. Every traditional public school had its union
3 sign on. That was a mandate for us.

4 Actually, may I make one point? We would have
5 had a lot more districts sign on if we didn't mandate
6 three signatures. We weren't interested in trying to work
7 with districts where the union and the school boards
8 weren't not on board.

9 REVIEWER 3: You should have told us that up
10 front.

11 MS. COOPER: I am sorry. Just now I understood
12 where you are going. You couldn't come into our
13 application without the three.

14 REVIEWER 3: That's very important.

15 DR. ZAHORCHAK: Just elaborate one sentence.
16 The statewide unions both said nodding. The locals then
17 had the option and they made their decisions, and some of
18 them, I had people calling me literally, presidents of
19 their local unions, truthfully saying can we come back,
20 you know.

21 REVIEWER 5: Let's do a "what if." What if you
22 get the funding, and you have these 28 percent of your
23 schools, districts that have signed the MOUs, does their

1 signature automatically commit them, can they pull out
2 once you get it?

3 MS. COOPER: In our application, we spoke to the
4 fact that there is a 90-day work plan, they have 90 days
5 to complete a work plan. Immediately upon award from the
6 Feds, we would say IU's to work with them.

7 REVIEWER 5: Fine. You answered it. Okay.

8 MS. COOPER: But we may not keep them in.

9 REVIEWER 5: I understand. That is what I
10 wanted to know.

11 REVIEWER 4: You may not keep them in.

12 MS. COOPER: Yes, they may not submit and we may
13 not --

14 REVIEWER 4: Your work plan.

15 MS. COOPER: Right.

16 REVIEWER 4: You have a criteria, there is
17 criteria for the work plan.

18 MS. COOPER: The degree to which they have
19 fidelity and the implementation, follow the intervention,
20 yes.

21 REVIEWER 1: I want to just back up if I may, to
22 the discussion we have been having on value-added growth
23 models. Because this is sort of the first stages of this,

1 and you are going about it in a very analytical way, and
2 you allow just two districts, what do you see the time
3 frame in reality of there being this measure that is part
4 of evaluations for teachers and principals, that you would
5 look to Pennsylvania and say yes, that is the state that
6 is doing it?

7 DR. ZAHORCHAK: For the last five years, we have
8 been giving reports to school districts for the last few
9 years, we have been giving value-added reports to every
10 district, so they have the data that they need.

11 The know how to analyze the data.

12 REVIEWER 1: Using the teacher evaluation.

13 DR. ZAHORCHAK: That's right. I just wanted to
14 set the context. Using it for teacher, conversations that
15 there is going to be the difficult work of us deciding,
16 watching Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and those others that
17 are in front, how did you go about this.

18 There is lots of lessons to be learned of how
19 did you go about this, what did your model look like, what
20 is the combination of the teacher evaluation, teacher
21 doing behaviors and gaining in skill, and then value
22 added, what do the achievement results look like, and what
23 is the percentage weight.

1 Those conversations have to go on, so we won't
2 be able to define necessarily how fast it will happen. We
3 think it will happen --

4 REVIEWER 1: Two years, five years, ten years?

5 DR. ZAHORCHAK: I think --

6 MS. COOPER: We actually say in the application
7 that the school district must have a teacher evaluation
8 system in place or use ours by September 2011.

9 People at the unit will work this out, or they
10 are normal as to the one we design. Now, we want people
11 to work it out, because we -- back to your issue or
12 statewide or -- the backlash on this is going to kill it.

13 We are a union state and now we are in Pennsylvania,
14 union-controlled legislature. So, we have to be very
15 careful over the next 15 months to do this right, or we
16 are going to lose the opportunity to do it.

17 DR. Ackerman: I just think it helps, though,
18 that the two biggest unions are out there doing it. Our
19 target date is 2011. We have the new evaluation system,
20 now we are putting the place the elements and the
21 criteria, and the union has agreed that 2011.

22 I think once Philadelphia is out there,
23 Pittsburgh is out there, it is going to be easier for the

1 others to come.

2 REVIEWER 1: Thank you.

3 REVIEWER 2: I was wondering whether you might
4 provide an overview of your STEM plan and how it addresses
5 or how it is incorporated into the four areas.

6 DR. O'SHEA: Part of our STEM plan is ensuring
7 that there is a schematic statewide for getting more
8 people -- first of all, it builds on our Science is
9 Elementary project, professional development for science
10 teachers, our power math project.

11 Our STEM project considers a configuration where
12 kids come out of middle school really proficient in
13 understanding technology and engineering, science and
14 mathematics, and then as opportunities and choices, we are
15 looking for I think one of the more innovative things is
16 the work that we will do with kids after school,
17 summertime's, internships, those kind of things,
18 innovation camps, et cetera, that will be STEM-based,
19 technology-based, engineering-based.

20 Our application doesn't speak to it, so I won't
21 speak to some of the initiatives already going on, but
22 there are serious similar instances going on in our state.

23 MS. COOPER: But our application does speak to

1 the Common Core standard. We are trying very hard not to
2 have a lot of programs. It has got to be embedded in what
3 happens every day in a school.

4 So, when we adopt the Common Core and we create
5 the high school end-of-course exams. Kids are going to
6 need to know biology and chemistry, and we have five years
7 from the time that the exams are first rolled out to when
8 they become a mandatory passage for graduation.

9 We have State resources, and we spoke to this,
10 in tandem with ours, to help kids build those skills. So,
11 while we have fun things like innovation camps and
12 internships, and partnerships, and we are improving what
13 elementary school teachers are doing, because we are
14 really into getting elementary school science right.

15 The real framework for changing the affiliation
16 to science and math and technology is the degree to which
17 our systems have backward mapped the ability of those kids
18 to pass high school level science and math.

19 REVIEWER 5: Thank you.

20 REVIEWER 2: Actually, I have a follow-up. I am
21 wondering how that is also incorporated into teachers and
22 leaders programs and your school turn around.

23 MS. COOPER: Very good question. In the

1 teachers and leaders, I will speak to that one
2 specifically, we are on the cusp of passing legislation
3 that will enable us to make career professionals from the
4 fields of math and science and technology, do an
5 internship as a teacher and get certified without having
6 to go through a higher ed.

7 We also currently have a system where I think
8 about 15 higher eds. have a relatively accelerated, but
9 still probably too onerous for the average, normal person
10 who works in the real world, ability to become a teacher,
11 because we are a state right now where you can only become
12 a teacher by being certified by an IET.

13 So, we are trying to create ways of more
14 expeditious volunteering quality, and so, you know, the
15 House passed out legislation, the Senate passed out
16 legislation to reconcile the bills, and we would be ready
17 to go in terms of making it possible.

18 Philadelphia already has some infrastructure in
19 place in that regard, so does Temple University, but I
20 will say that I would love these guys to talk a little bit
21 about --

22 DR. Lane: I can follow a little bit about that.
23 I am actually on teachers and leaders, but part of our

1 plan is to have an alternative certification program for
2 math and science as well as special education that would
3 start in August 2011, and this would help us, we believe,
4 to prepare strong teachers for these areas for our
5 schools.

6 REVIEWER 2: The legislation would enable.

7 DR. Lane: Enable us to do it, yes.

8 REVIEWER 3: Why don't we move on if it is all
9 right. The remaining of our time, why don't we go
10 sequentially and allow everybody to have another chance to
11 talk.

12 REVIEWER 5: I have just a series of very quick
13 answers to the kind of clarification for me, if you would.
14 You have not passed legislation at this point on
15 alternative certification, is that correct?

16 MS. COOPER: Correct.

17 REVIEWER 5: I would ask you why, but we don't
18 have time. Second question.

19 MS. COOPER: It is going to happen between now
20 and June 30th.

21 REVIEWER 5: You have mentioned that you are
22 going to be hiring experts to come in for turnaround
23 schools, and given your history of lack of success in that

1 whole area of turning around large numbers of low-
2 performing schools, who are the people specifically you
3 are going to be bringing in, do you know yet?

4 DR. ZAHORCHAK: I think we do. We know the
5 types.

6 REVIEWER 5: But you don't have anybody, any
7 group or you are not a part of --

8 DR. ZAHORCHAK: Contracting with someone to do
9 that?

10 REVIEWER 5: Right.

11 DR. ZAHORCHAK: No. We are looking for people
12 who have operational skills and abilities, the MBA type.
13 We think this recession-driven economy will add desire
14 from more and more people -- in schools naturally. We are
15 also using Teach for America type, and --

16 REVIEWER 5: That's fine. The only thing I
17 wanted to know is whether or not you had identified or
18 whatever, and I was just curious.

19 DR. ACKERMAN: You can look at Philadelphia. We
20 are looking at Mastery, Charter Schools Kipp, Johns
21 Hopkins.

22 REVIEWER 5: But it is still open as far as that
23 is concerned.

1 DR. ACKERMAN: Right.

2 REVIEWER 5: That is fine, that is all I wanted
3 to know. Go ahead.

4 REVIEWER 4: I am going to try to go back to
5 that, because it is more specific about CTO for the
6 turnaround schools, the Chief Turnaround Officers. I am
7 wondering if this is a new -- it seems like it is a new
8 position that was listed in the application. Okay.

9 We talked about a little bit about the
10 description, but I was wondering about some specifics
11 about how many schools each CTO will be responsible for,
12 the required experience and background for these people,
13 sort of like what you just mentioned, but more
14 specifically for the turnaround, and we have access to the
15 -- what level, how much?

16 MS. COOPER: How much power?

17 REVIEWER 4: Power, authority they will have.

18 MS. COOPER: Each turnaround we will have Chief
19 Turnaround Officer in the building. They are responsible
20 for --

21 REVIEWER 4: For what?

22 MS. COOPER: Full time.

23 REVIEWER 4: Okay.

1 MS. COOPER: They are responsible for making
2 sure that all the things we say we are going to do,
3 actually, get done. So, with the principal who does what
4 they do every day, has somebody consider that. The
5 principal, because of Arlene and Mark Roosevelt, and our
6 turnaround districts, principals going have to empower the
7 people to be able to run those buildings, and that was
8 part of the MOU. Let me finish.

9 So, then, in districts that have more than three
10 turnaround buildings, they get a Chief Turnaround Officer,
11 too, at the district level, so that there is somebody in
12 Arlene's office and Mark's office who is making sure that
13 this is all happening in the building. Okay. And we are
14 full time, and that is all they do.

15 They are supported by tools, we work with
16 partnership with GE, and GE's project management tools are
17 going to be a platform on which we begin to peg our work,
18 is this happening, is it happening right.

19 It has performance metrics in it. We will be
20 meeting with every turnaround school at the state level
21 three times a year to ensure that they are following up on
22 their proposal, and then these guys are in there all the
23 time.

1 The one thing I want to say is your premise on
2 the -- if I might -- on turning around schools, we have
3 only 3 districts left on our State empowerment list, or 4
4 districts left of 14, and --

5 REVIEWER 4: Three schools or 3 districts?

6 MS. COOPER: Districts.

7 REVIEWER 4: Left.

8 MS. COOPER: Right. But we have also, in all
9 the empowerment schools, we have cut the number of kids
10 who are below basic in half, and the number of kids who
11 had advanced is twice the level than it was.

12 REVIEWER 4: So, you are telling me that I am
13 wrong.

14 MS. COOPER: I am telling you that it was hard
15 for us to suggest.

16 REVIEWER 4: Thank you very much. You answered
17 it.

18 REVIEWER 3: That's fine.

19 DR. O'SHEA: We have pretty good systems for
20 that. You know, one weakness that the principals always
21 had -- and everybody talks about it -- is the ability to
22 do the operational work, execution, and do it with
23 fidelity, and you see what Harvard is doing just with the

1 superintendent to combine MBA skill with the
2 superintendent, and MBA programs with Kennedy School
3 government, our expectations, too.

4 We have higher education communities responding
5 to that, and you see more MBA programs starting to
6 intersect with our principal preparation program by
7 design, so we are pleased about that, and we think that
8 was a skill set that will help get to greater achievement
9 if there is something new building on our strong
10 foundation.

11 REVIEWER 3: That's excellent.

12 REVIEWER 3: And everything you are describing
13 to us we can find in the application, because as you know,
14 we are challenged --

15 MS. COOPER: Right, and I have the page to give
16 you.

17 REVIEWER 3: Two quick things that I had. One
18 is with regard to new charter schools. There is a
19 reference that you do withhold some expenses. I am
20 talking about parity in dollars that charter schools get,
21 and we discussed end of plan, but there are some expenses
22 that are withheld, but then they delineate how those are
23 determined.

1 MS. COOPER: Actually, our application speaks to
2 the fact that per student level, charters get more money
3 than regular kids. That is very clear in our application.

4 REVIEWER 3: But you also talk about --

5 MS. COOPER: We do not reimburse for facilities.
6 That is the only thing --

7 REVIEWER 3: That is the only thing.

8 MS. COOPER: Yes.

9 REVIEWER 3: That's it.

10 MS. COOPER: Yes.

11 REVIEWER 3: Thank you.

12 REVIEWER 2: I am going to pass to --

13 MS. COOPER: And that is only capital. We do
14 reimburse for rent, but we don't reimburse for capital.

15 REVIEWER 1: In several places in your
16 application, you talk about the reforms that are either
17 going on or expected in higher education in teacher
18 preparation.

19 Could you review those for us and tell us what
20 interaction has been in place with higher education to
21 assure us that what you are going to describe will
22 actually happen?

23 MS. COOPER: I would say that when the Governor

1 took office, there were two things that he talked with us
2 about. You know obviously, we need to work on K-12, but
3 that the teacher pipeline just wasn't delivering the
4 quality of teachers that we needed in his estimation.

5 So, after we had spent the first two years
6 focusing a lot of time on K-12, in the third year of the
7 Rendell Administration, we began the process, and it was a
8 two-year process with our higher ups to redesign the way
9 in which people get accredited to offer undergraduate
10 degrees of education in Pennsylvania.

11 It required significant changes in the degree to
12 which faculty were teaching, first of all, to our
13 standards, that people left understanding our standards, a
14 minor detail, but getting the faculty to spend time in
15 school.

16 The way they earn their professional development
17 credits now in Pennsylvania is actually going to school
18 and be there and see things, not present at conferences,
19 they can't earn their credits that way.

20 We had to change the certification, so we no
21 longer teach in a K-8 way, we teach pre-K4, 4 to 8, with
22 much heavier cognitive development and special ed. into
23 those lower grades, which has forced significant changes

1 in the four years syllabi of the schools.

2 We have created emphasis, they must introduce
3 people to differentiate learning strategies, responsive
4 instruction, how to identify kids' learning styles, in
5 addition to having content. That is a two-year very hard
6 process.

7 DR. Lane: And higher GPA and longer students.

8 MS. COOPER: Yes, and they had the boost in GPA.

9 REVIEWER 1: Students entering the programs, is
10 there a cutoff?

11 MS. COOPER: No. I will tell you how that
12 works. The point is that now they go through that, we now
13 put out the reg's. Now, all of our schools of higher ed.
14 are submitting their program approvals against those regs.

15 DR. ZAHORCHAK: With very different look-fors in
16 program approval, we are taking our long-needed
17 responsibility much more seriously to frame this up, so do
18 a lot of standardized practice in terms of the outcomes.
19 They can then control some of the means, but it is that
20 kind of coupling.

21 MS. COOPER: So, we changed our view finally
22 now, we also have everybody on board with transparency for
23 the success of the teachers that prepare for the field, so

1 that we will be on the web, people will know that
2 performance of these teachers once they are placed in the
3 district.

4 It has been a lot of work, and not so always
5 nice, but people see the value, there is not resistance on
6 the value, there is resistance on the how, and our great
7 Secretary of Education and Deputy Secretary just plowed
8 through this. It's a huge change.

9 REVIEWER 3: We will take another quick pass.

10 REVIEWER 5: Are you going to do the final
11 close-out question or shall I do it?

12 REVIEWER 3: Go ahead, why don't we do it now.

13 REVIEWER 5: In a nutshell, why should
14 Pennsylvania get Race to the Top funding?

15 DR. O'SHEA: Let's start with we've been at
16 reform. We have created a capacity, not whined about it,
17 because we have created systems that go back through
18 teacher preparation and aligned data systems and work.

19 We have experience and hard work that now is
20 starting to accelerate, and the wheels are starting to
21 turn. We have systems that won't depend on the Governor
22 or Jerry Zahorchak when we are leaving, because they are
23 systems, and we are targeting.

1 I am going to ask how many other states are
2 actually saying these are the outcomes right down to the
3 child's level in every school building, here is our
4 outcomes. We will get these. We have commitments from
5 very passionate people to get this done, people who know
6 what this is by definition.

7 We were deliberate in taking time to bring on
8 board lots of people thru lots of sessions, having read
9 throughs of the expectations, answering millions of
10 questions of and how will that work, and getting to a
11 place where we have represented more than half, 60-plus
12 percent of all of our poor kids will be represented by the
13 start of this, and a me-too state by history, as we start
14 rolling out these tools, these approaches, we will add
15 districts and districts.

16 We are ready to go, and we are reaching the
17 beyond, no doubt about it.

18 REVIEWER 3: We would like to hear from both of
19 the school people.

20 DR. ACKERMAN: I would love to speak to this,
21 because our plan for empowering effective teachers is a
22 coherent plan that we have put together about this time
23 last year, and it includes everything from the resource

1 human capital issues, around evaluations, professional
2 development, how do we treat tenure --

3 REVIEWER 5: Wait a minute. Go back to the
4 question. Why should Pennsylvania get the funding?

5 DR. ACKERMAN: I am going there, believe me, I
6 am going there.

7 REVIEWER 5: You have got 30 seconds.

8 DR. Lane: I have got 30 seconds, okay.

9 The reason that we believe that we deserve it,
10 need it, and will use it well is because we have put
11 together a plan in conjunction with the State of
12 Pennsylvania and Race to the Top will allow us to get to
13 implementation of our plan around having effective
14 teachers, an effective teacher in every classroom. I am
15 very excited about that.

16 DR. Ackerman: We have worked with the State
17 very closely as they put this application together. We
18 have already been on the forefront of some serious reform
19 and changes at every level, bold changes, and we believe
20 that Pennsylvania getting the Race to the Top will
21 accelerate our efforts to get where we need to get.

22 Remember it will take us a decade if we continue
23 at the pace that we are going at this point in turning our

1 underperforming schools around. It will take us to 2123
2 to get all of our chosen supervision, time is of the
3 essence, and we need this grant to make that happen.

4 REVIEWER 3: Thank you very much.

5 - - -

6