



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Mexico Application #3600NM-10



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	35
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	3
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	20
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) In this opening section, the state summarizes its activities that are included in the application. The plan that emerges from the application, however, does not provide a compelling statewide agenda that will improve student outcomes statewide in the near term, nor does it describe how interventions for particular schools can be expected to meet with success. The proposal does not describe clearly how participating LEAs will be involved in the work of the Race to the Top (RTTT) grant. In most sections, it appears that all districts will be served through the new systems that are developed. And yet no expenditures are shown for involved districts - those who will participate in some activities but have not signed an MOU.</p> <p>The goals set in this proposal are ambiguous. Short-term goals are set (2010-2011) for student achievement. It is difficult from the charts provided in the appendix to identify base data, but Figure A.3.10-13 suggest that these goals represent growth of 10 points for 4th grade students, and between zero and 5 points for 8th graders. A ten-point gain on NAEP at the 8th grade is targeted for 2013. The state's long-term goals of 100% proficiency and steady decreases in the achievement gap have no timeframe. And finally, the goal of moving high school graduation rates from 63% to 83% in ten years is ambitious. The proposal does not provide a convincing plan to move the state forward on these targets.</p> <p>(ii) The MOU includes a strong commitment from participating LEAs to many sections of the proposal. However, the proposal is weak on setting annual targets and key performance measures, and so LEAs in turn are not called upon to commit to specific outcomes. In referring to Section D of the proposal, the MOU asks only that participating LEAs "support and participate in the Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Task Force" which will develop approaches to measuring teacher effectiveness and building a revised evaluation system. Since the recommendations for implementation are not expected to be in place until January 2014, what the LEAs are committing to implement is unknown at this time. All superintendents and school board presidents signed on, as did 71% (32 or 45) local union leaders.</p> <p>(iii) The 69 (of 89) participating LEAs and 18 (of 33 state-authorized charter schools) represent 89% of students and 81% of districts, providing good statewide coverage and by subgroup for implementation, thus earning a score in the high range.</p>		
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	16
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	10
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	6

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The state has established state-wide councils and task forces with broad participation and senior-level leadership for some but not all of the State Success Factors. The work of these groups will proceed with or without funding from RTTT. It is also clear that the Governor is very committed to education reform in his state. The state's department of education plans to hire 28 temporary and 4 permanent staff to assist with implementation, many of whom will be involved in computer systems development and implementation. The plan for management oversight is strong. They will designate three staff for project management that includes grant administration, monitoring and reporting. There will also be fiscal oversight from a separate Office of Recovery and Reinvestment. But the 50% LEA match appears to be incorporated into the state's plan, and so it is difficult to understand how capacity will be built statewide to implement, scale up and sustain the proposed plans. Much of the LEA funding (including the 50% match) is targeted to 20 schools that will be selected for turnaround, and those schools will be required to follow the State Improvement Grant application and protocols. The proposal does not clarify whether this portion of grant funds will follow Title I status as called for in RTTT. The five permanent staff will be assigned to the effort of these 20 schools, but the state did not provide evidence to show that it is currently successfully implementing its State Improvement Grant. The proposal does demonstrate a strong commitment to align spending from other sources with RTTT goals. The state itself has made significant allocations already to efforts that align with the state's RTTT efforts, and private funds are also aligned. The state proposes to strengthen local involvement by involving the community, students and parents, but it does not describe adequately how this will happen, nor who will be leading that effort. Thus, overall, the state's application has strengths and weaknesses in its efforts to ensure capacity to implement, and is given a medium score.

(ii) There is support from a wide group of stakeholders for the proposal, including the major research laboratories that are located in New Mexico. But the proposal does not then take much advantage of this support in the detail of the proposal. There appears to be no legislative support identified, although the legislature has been admirably pro-active in funding new reforms and programs for P-12 education. There was no support from Native American Tribal leaders despite the significant role of this subgroup of students in the state.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	17
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	13

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The state is making progress on standards and assessments, especially with regard to comprehensive alignment initiatives, where it was ranked second by *Quality Counts* (2010) and ninth by NCES. Progress has been promoted through a Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation grant for the College and Career-Ready Policy Institute, and the state has participated in other national efforts. It has had a unique student identifier since 2003, and has begun work on a P-20 statewide longitudinal data system. With \$15 million invested so far, it is making progress. It has reformed its teacher licensure system, improved teachers' salaries, and reached almost 100% for highly qualified teachers. These and more that are enumerated and provide a good foundation upon which to build.

(ii) New Mexico's record of improving student performance and closing achievement gaps is mixed at best. Most change is inconsistent, although there is some overall modest improvement in mathematics, especially in 4th grade. In the middle of the decade, New Mexico began investing in early childhood education and these improvements at the lower grades likely reflect that effort. The state mentions other programs that may also have contributed, although by its own admission progress is slow. Indeed, achievement gaps increased between groups in 2009. With regard to high school graduation rates, the state has improved its methodology for calculation and now has a 4-year cohort method in place for 2009 data. With no comparable trend data, New Mexico finds itself 10 percentage points behind the national

average of 70%. Overall, New Mexico's record of improvement is modest at best, and is given a medium score.		
Total	125	68

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	35
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	15
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) New Mexico has signed on to the CCSSO/NGA common core standards, as have 49 other states and territories.</p> <p>(ii) New Mexico will publish final rules for adoption by August 2, 2010. Final adoption will occur "no later than November 2010" but the gap is simply to allow committees to review whether existing New Mexico standards should be retained as well. However, since the standards will not formally be adopted until the later date, the state is not given full high points.</p>		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) New Mexico is participating in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium for common formative assessments and summative tests in English language arts and mathematics that will link to curricula, learning progressions, and student competencies. New Mexico is also participating in the innovative National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE)'s Board Examination Pilot Project. New Mexico has committed to using these college-entrance exams that are internationally benchmarked to demonstrate readiness to enter and graduate from open-admissions colleges.</p> <p>(ii) The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium comprises 45 states, and New Mexico has signed on as a governing member, meaning it is committed only to this consortium. The NCEE pilot includes just eight states, but it will provide a great demonstration of a completely new approach to student testing in the United States, and New Mexico deserves applause for volunteering as a pilot state.</p>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	13
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>New Mexico has participated in several national efforts to develop policy frameworks to improve college and career readiness for youth (College and Career Readiness Policy Institute and the American Diploma Project), which gives it a good head start for implementation of enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. Indeed, the legislature has already passed bills relating to high school redesign, although further details are not given. Furthermore, collaboration between NMPED and the New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED) to align college placement and high school exit requirements is very important and exemplary. Budget items and a narrative for development are included in B(1) and B(2) of the budget and include acquiring formative tests for the lowest performing schools and contracting with the</p>		

National Student Clearing House to enable cross-state analysis of student performance after secondary graduation.

Technical assistance will be provided by current and contract personnel and some will come from the Consortium and NCEE. The new assessments will be administered statewide as computer adaptive tests (CATs) by 2014-2015. The plan is to use supplemental funding to participating LEAs to provide mobile computer labs at remote and technologically limited schools, especially those that are persistently lowest-achieving schools. What is not clear is whether the selected schools will have to be located in a participating district. Other school costs across the state will be funded from a legislative appropriation for student assessments. Gates Foundation funding will support implementation of the NCEE Board Examinations. Schools will also pay for testing (\$1,500,000) from the state appropriation for student assessments. Importantly, NMPED will provide enhanced training for district test coordinators. The timeframe and activities for implementation are clearly delineated, but no assurance is provided that activities such as the development of professional development that is aligned to all components of the standards and curriculum, nor the monitoring and feedback system, will indeed be the high quality that is promised. Finally, the promise to provide social and other student supports is without an explanation of implementation, or a budget.

Total	70	58
-------	----	----

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	16
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The Data Quality Campaign reports that New Mexico has nine of ten essential elements - missing only evidence of preparation for college success. Although New Mexico states that it has since begun to collect college preparation assessments, and that this is "operational", no information is provided regarding what data are collected, and what "operational" means. Indeed, a number of data elements are described as being operational, or obtained through manual matching across systems, but do not appear to be part of a data system that can yet be described as a longitudinal data system that is amenable to analysis and reporting on a regular basis. Items in question are:</p> <p>4. capacity to communicate with higher education system. New legislation requires all public higher education institutions to use the unique student identifier, but implementation is under development. (No).</p> <p>9. transcript information. This does not appear to be in electronic form, and thus is not yet integrated into a longitudinal data system. Improved reporting work is underway (No).</p> <p>10. Student-level college readiness test scores. No information is provided regarding which test scores are available, and whether they are available for all students or only those taking college-entrance national tests. Improved reporting work is under way. (No.)</p> <p>12. Data to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in post-secondary education. With the alignment task force just being established, it appears that New Mexico cannot yet identify elements of secondary education that address this data element. (No.)</p> <p>The time frame and activities suggest much work to be done, including for example converting agency data from multiple sources. The responsible parties are LEAs, Charters, Institutions of Higher Education, but no explanation is given about their capacities to do this. So it is difficult to interpret to what degree elements that are operational are in fact currently integrated into a longitudinal system of data.</p>		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

NMPED appears to have a well-developed reporting capacity through the P-12 data warehouse and plans for expanding access are clear. But much hard work lies ahead to integrate data from other systems and sources, and a time frame and approach is not provided for this. The state also intends to provide training on how to use data to inform education policy decisions, which seems ambitious given that there are graduate-level programs that provide opportunities for the study of policy analysis. Even though data are available only for P-12, the state has provided sufficient evidence of its ability to make this accessible that a high score is given.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	12
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	3
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	3
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

- (i) New Mexico plans to build on the experience of Albuquerque and Las Cruces Public Schools (who serve about 34% of New Mexico's students, both of whom signed MOUs) who already have systems that allow them to examine data at the school and classroom level. No information was provided regarding whether these two districts are using their systems successfully. The plan is to create and support a consortium and to purchase student instructional information systems for districts without these systems currently. What is not clear from the proposal is how many LEAs will receive such support. The budget shows that 20 will receive assistance with system creation and 100 will receive training on use of the systems that are created. Eighty-seven LEAs (including charter schools) are participating LEAs, so it appears that all districts will receive training assistance, even though no costs are shown for involved LEAs. Even more puzzling is where the costs to purchase the systems are budgeted, since the narrative states that they would be purchased for districts without them.
- (ii) NMPED and the Office of Education Accountability in the Department of Finance and Administration has experience in providing professional development to principals in the use of data. To build the capacity of LEAs and charters, New Mexico will rely on the New Mexico Leadership Institute to reach more principals and superintendents, provide online training for rural LEAs and charters, and provide online access to a resource system of best practices and other resources. It does not appear that the grant will reach teachers directly, nor does it describe an expectation that principals will disseminate their knowledge to their teachers.
- (iii) New Mexico is open to having a variety of researchers access the state's education data, and plans to build data marts around particular analytical and research topics. Importantly, access will be provided to researchers in state agencies, the legislature and the executive branch, and to independent academic and other researchers. It appears that all researchers will need to apply for access to data through the P-20 Data Governance Council for authorization and use of data. The question of access to unit-record data is always sensitive, and such approval groups are not unusual. However, since many policy issues need to be swiftly addressed, it would have been useful to know to which the state would commit. But generally, the state appears to understand the uses to which researchers can put the rich state data sources, and are ready to make them accessible.

Total	47	32
--------------	-----------	-----------

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	21
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	7
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	7
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) New Mexico's statutes allow alternative routes to certification for both teacher and principals, as described in Appendix D-1-1, 2 and 3. The array of options in this state is impressive, including non-higher education (portfolio) and community college routes with just a 3-credit reading course in addition to assessments through state tests. The pathways offer alternative or provisional licensure, but these appear to lead to the same levels of licensure as traditional pathways. There are specific options for those who have taught for five and six years or more at the post-secondary level, which likely enroll academically talented people who already have the credentials to teach in higher education. The portfolio option and the fast-track option do not appear to be selective in admission. No information was given regarding what supervised, school-based experiences are provided to teachers, although there appears to be required mentoring for school leaders. Districts may also offer leadership programs.</p> <p>(ii) New Mexico gave initial teaching licenses to 216 teachers in 2008-2009, with 48 awards through the portfolio option and 7 post-secondary administrator licenses. Importantly, the majority of non-portfolio licenses were obtained through a community college. New Mexico plans to expand the number of Teach for America teachers with RTTT funding to LEAs.</p> <p>(iii) The NMPED has a good approach to identifying shortage areas by using a licensure discrepancy analysis in teaching assignments to identify shortages by subject and level. Plans are required from preparation program providers with measurable objectives for increasing the number of teachers trained in core academic areas including math, science and technology. The state also encourages retired teachers to return to work through a state-authorized Return to Work Program. At the administrator level, the innovative New Mexico Leadership Institute tracks demand and increases needed supply. In addition, fellowships are used to support candidates working in high-needs schools and math and science.</p>		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	12
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	8
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	2
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	0
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>New Mexico lays out a clear plan for moving towards measuring student growth and using this information in teacher assessment, but the timeframe for developing specifics extends until 2014. However, the state recently committed publicly to tying student growth to teacher/principal evaluation with the support of a wide group of stakeholders, including the state's union leaders. New Mexico thus has committed to this action independent of RTTT funding.</p> <p>(i) The state has first to adopt revised regulations to allow student growth to be measured. The state expects this to happen by October 2010 but no information is given on what the process for revision is and whether barriers might arise. Given the public commitment mentioned above, it is probable that the revision will occur. Beginning in 2011, the Professional Practices and Standards Council (PPSC) will have</p>		

the responsibility of leading the development of a model that measures individual student growth in a "valid and reliable manner". Growth will be based on new assessments developed with NCEE and the Smarter Balance consortium - not its current standards-based assessments. While no timeframe is given (the work of the task force will proceed until July 2014 in toto), it appears that it will be some time before student growth data are available in New Mexico. The process that is described will likely produce a good system that is acceptable to the professional community, but because of the time lag and the move away from using its ESEA assessments as the criterion calls for, a medium score is given.

(ii) The PPSC will continue with broad input to the re-design of the teacher and principal evaluation systems. Finalization of the system to measure and determine the weight student growth will play in evaluations will not be complete until July 2014. New Mexico has worked hard to create a collaboration with buy in from both the state's union leadership and the participating districts, although the latter commit in the MOU only to supporting the work of the task force. The extended timeframe recognizes what needs to happen in the state to ensure buy in, but is problematic with regard to RTTT since growth data will not begin to be used until the end of the grant period, and the state will not be able to identify effective and highly effective teachers and principals until after that time. And it will not be known until that time how New Mexico will define significance with regard to the weight of student growth in evaluations. So New Mexico is strong on commitment and planning, but is given a medium score because of the time lag in the process.

(iii) New Mexico requires districts to submit evaluation plans. In order to ensure that participating LEAs and charters actually conduct evaluations, the state will participate in the development and implementation of a system by January 2012 for training of principals and superintendents that culminates in the award of certification for participating in the training. What is not clear from the proposal, however, is how this will ensure that evaluations are actually done. No mention is made of providing teachers with student growth data, perhaps because it will not soon be available. A low score is awarded because of the lack of assurance that evaluations will be done, and the lag in having student growth data.

(iv) The application describes the state's commitment to a mentoring program for beginning teachers and principals. However, this is not based on student performance but on developing professional growth goals. So evaluations as defined in RTTT are not linked to this process. New Mexico plans to use RTTT funding to offer signing bonuses to highly effective teachers and principals to work in high-need schools. But New Mexico will not be able to identify highly effective teachers until 2014 at the earliest, even though in this section the state suggests that it will have this in place by the third year of the grant (i.e. 2012). So there is a disconnect here between the intention and the reality of implementation. The current competency criteria associated with the state's three-tier licensure system is not fine-tuned enough to identify a small number of teachers that would receive special recognition, but to set minimum standards for progression through a career path. The state proposes with RTTT funding to collect data to inform decisions on compensation, promotion and retention. But no information is given regarding how this will be done, let alone the issue of the time lag for implementation of the growth model and new evaluation system. Finally, it appears that state statutes detail requirements for termination or discharge decisions, and yet there is no mention of the process that will be undertaken to revise these requirements to include the use of student growth data. In short, there is no evidence that New Mexico will in fact be able to accomplish the aims of this criterion within the timeframe of the grant, and no points are awarded.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	5
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	0
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) New Mexico reports that 99.44% of its classes are now taught by highly qualified teachers as defined under NCLB, and has a plan to develop an equity plan that considers other teacher characteristics such as levels of licensure, years of experience and salaries. But they then jump to the term "highly effective" even though they will not be able to identify such teachers until 2014 at the earliest. Posting results of effective

teacher and principal distribution on their web site by June 2011 (or June 2012 in the Time Frame and Activities list), as they propose to do, will not in fact be possible. Nor is it explained how such posting will lead directly to a better distribution of effective teachers, even if such a measure was available. Furthermore, there is no plan to demonstrate that the state will move to a more equitable distribution of teachers, even based on the teacher characteristics they intend to use. The goals that are provided under performance measures start in the 2013-2014 year, but they will not in fact have the requested data even by that time, even though they promise this in the table.

(ii) New Mexico plans to address inequitable distribution of effective teachers and principals in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas by increasing the pipeline of new teachers and delivering training to teachers and principals in 200 of the lowest-achieving schools. The state has several strong programs upon which to build - the Division of Indian Education, the Strategic Action Plan for Advancing Math and Science Education, and a "Grow Your Own" program. The state bases its belief that more math and science teachers can be produced on the exhortation that colleges of education will revise their programs and encourage students to become K-12 math and science teachers. The state provides no plan for how New Mexico institutions of higher education will accomplish this dramatic change in their teacher preparation programs. The plan to recruit more teachers from out of state in these fields through Teach for America and Troops to Teachers may be more realistic in the short run. Local grow-your-own programs will be used to attract local career switchers into teaching, and in addition other recruitment and planning activities are outlined. So there are hopeful strategies to increase the number of new math and science teachers, but this falls short of ensuring that these teachers are effective. The proposal does not address other hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas such as special education. A medium score is awarded.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	0
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	0
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	0

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) This section begins by describing how teacher performance data will be linked to something called the Educator Accountability Reporting System (EARS). This was not in fact described in Section C, as stated, so it is difficult to understand what this means in practice. There is also no mention of working with institutions of higher education in this process, although they will be expected to post their specific results on their web sites, and their deans and directors of the colleges of education are being called upon to act as a responsible party to implementation as early as June-August 2010, working with NMPED information technology and licensing staff. No explanation is given for who defines a "high need" individual college of education, nor what it means for Deans and Directors of Education to "interface with their work" with NCATE. Furthermore, the promise is made to provide preparation programs with growth data of their teachers' students in 2010 using the current assessments of students, but nowhere else in the proposal is mention made that NMPED plans to undertake this data production. And at the end of the paragraph, the promise is made that programs will have results from the revised evaluation system in 2011. Later in the section, it appears that it is the current teacher and principal evaluation results that will be made available during the 2010-2011 year. But there is no evidence in this or other sections that these are readily available, or even undertaken with a consistency that would provide any useful information from which to assess the effectiveness of preparation programs. Finally, there is no budget requested for developing and implementing this reporting system, which seems unrealistic. This is a weak section that does not mesh with the timeframe proposed in other sections of the application.

(ii) The plan to give up to \$100,000 to effective IHE education programs to use as they wish is not large enough to generate scale-up changes that would have an impact on the quality of teachers produced in New Mexico. There is no plan to learn what best practices may be leading to superior performance of these programs. The reliance on seeking formula funding changes to support these changes does not provide a firm path to expansion.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	4
(i) Providing effective support	10	2
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	2
(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) This criterion calls for evidence and a plan to provide effective support to teachers and principals in participating LEAs, but the New Mexico goal is to do so only for those in the lowest-performing schools. The proposal identifies what the state considers to be high-quality professional development. Since their plan is to build on these requirements it would have been helpful to know how they are enforced and evaluated. A number of activities are then listed, including extending the on-line student learning system to teachers, improving the mentoring system for new teachers, and expanding the New Mexico Leadership Institute. These activities do not address many of the items identified in the RTTT criterion, including coaching, common planning and collaboration time, and other job-embedded support. Indeed, no vision is proposed of how to reach all teachers in participating LEAs and provide them the support they will need to cope with new core standards, making data-based decisions and plans, changing school environments, and designing instruction to meet the needs of high-need students. New Mexico's approach appears to be mainly more of the same, and apparently just to the lowest-performing schools. The budget narrative mentions that major emphasis will be on developing Professional Learning Communities, but this activity is not mentioned in the narrative. Funding is requested for mentoring activities, probably to support the new teacher mentoring program, and supplemental funding to a few of the participating LEAs to support the costs of aligning the revised evaluation systems and the system of professional development. There is no evidence that these lowest-performing schools have the capacity, nor should they be taking on, this technical task that should be a statewide endeavor.</p> <p>(ii) New Mexico's planned approach to measuring, evaluating and continuously improving the effectiveness of support is to collect data on which professional development teachers and principals participate in, and to evaluate those services through self-reported initial and follow-up surveys. No attempt will be made to measure the change that occurs in teachers' and principals' practice that leads to improved student achievement. The approach described in this section is minimum professional development, and minimum evaluation, and a low score is awarded.</p>		
Total	138	42

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The state has strong authority to intervene in the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools.		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	25
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	20
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The state plans to identify twenty additional lowest-performing schools and require them to use the School Improvement Grants Application to undergo turnaround. There are several major problems with the design of this section, with implications for the whole application.		

- The application referred to many appendices in this section, but some were not numbered and others had duplicate numbers so it was difficult to examine the supporting material, although every effort was made to do so.
- The budget narrative mentions a state statute that provides guidance on what is required and expected from the Department, school districts and schools for identifying and supporting low achieving schools but no further information on the implications of this are given.
- Other gaps in the proposal for this section include a statement in the budget narrative that there was a plan with goals, timeline and responsible parties but this was not in the narrative.
- Finally, the budget for this section utilizes a large portion of the 50% set-aside for LEAs. The proposal does not explain whether the targeted schools reflect the Title I distribution of this set-aside funding that is required under RTTT.

(i) The state used the definition and process approved by the USDOE in its School Improvement Grant (SIG) application. This section referred to Appendix E-2-2 which is a copy of its School Improvement Grants Application. For those unfamiliar with the SIG application design, this proved to be a difficult document from which to glean the information that was intended for reference. It would have been helpful if the proposal had used the page numbers that appear on some of the pages for guidance. After much examination, the referenced list of nine schools was located on page 4 since there were 9 schools in the Tier 2 column.

The state also identifies 20 additional schools for turnaround using RTTT funding. Apparently these are the schools listed as Tier 1 schools on pages 2-4 of the SIG application. The proposal does not report whether all these schools are in participating LEAs. Seven are in a single district - Gallup-McKinley - which from the list of MOU LEAs appears to have 36 schools in total and 9,460 students. Since each school will be allocated \$500,000 per year (from the LEAs' portion of the funding apparently, see comments above), this district will be receiving a large share of RTTT funding, including the LEA set aside.

(ii) The state will require these additional 20 schools to submit a plan to the state using the same LEA application process developed for the Title I SIG application. Each school will be given \$500,000 per year to turn themselves around. No further information is provided as to how they will do this. The state simply states in its application that its goal will require them to build capacity, improve the conditions, and organize for support in these identified schools. The approach is to use the lessons learned from successful turnaround schools in the state. Data are provided later in the section that show 39 schools used "other restructuring" (that is, not major restructuring) to come out of NCLB status. Modest funding is requested to implement the approaches that apparently were successful, including hiring a turnaround leader, engaging teachers, involving parents, students and the community, aligning the instruction to standards and student data, and leveraging resources to support the strategies. But no evidence is provided that New Mexico has successful experience using one of the four turn-around models called for in RTTT.

Even though the RTT funding for turnaround schools is coming in large part from the LEA's own allocation, the state intends to intervene directly where districts that house these 20 schools lack the capacity or will to implement dramatic reforms. It will be involved in finalizing and approving turnaround plans. The state will identify schools that will use an alternative governance structure called the School Success Alliance (SSA), a concept developed by New Mexico stakeholders. This is described as a collaborative of school and community leaders committed to leveraging resources and creating a sense of urgency to intervene and turn around a school. It would have been helpful if the applicant had addressed more directly the school intervention models called for in Section E of RTTT, and explained whether and how this home-grown approach meets or augments those models. What is exciting is the use of Elev8, a wrap-around approach to schooling. (It is worth noting that this was not included as Appendix E-2-3 as referenced but as the first of two Appendices E-2-6s. It is errors like this that make it difficult to follow the substance of the proposal, and raises the possibility of overlooking useful information.) Hiring a team of outside evaluators to assess schools' strengths and weaknesses using a state-developed evaluation tool (Collaboration, Leadership, and Accountability for Student Success or CLASS), develop recommendations for improvement and assist the schools in writing detailed implementation plans seems like a useful way of helping these 20 schools get started.

Another component of support will come in the form of implementing an online resource called e-PLCNM.com. It is not clear from the proposal whether this will be a tool that is built to serve all teachers and instructional coaches in the state or just those in these 20 lowest-achieving schools. Either way, this is a tool that has been designed and not implemented for lack of funding, and it could have the capacity to improve professional development opportunities for teachers across the state when fully implemented.

NMPED will also use funding to reward any school that demonstrates dramatic improvement, for example making AYP for two consecutive years after being in some form of school improvement status. While this may be an incentive for improvement, it would have been good to learn whether the state plans to study their success and develop lessons learned for wider dissemination.

In sum, the approach laid out by New Mexico to turn around more of its lowest performing schools is logical, and builds on a model with which they are already familiar. But here is not a history of using any of the four models of turnaround (schools use an "other restructuring" model) and the lack of specificity in this section does not build confidence that the state can implement turnaround on this scale and intensity. A medium score is given because the plan is rational, but there is not sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the interventions will lead to success.

Total	50	35
-------	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(i) New Mexico has increased its support of education even in a shrinking budget demonstrating that education is a priority.		
(ii) The state's funding formula is designed to benefit specific categories of students with more support. Furthermore, the formula guarantees each LEA 100% of its calculated program costs, so that apparently funding is more an entitlement portion of the budget than a discretionary portion. This is a strong funding formula indeed. And while funds are dispersed among schools within districts, they must report publicly regarding how funds are dispersed which will provide transparency for equitable distribution.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	40
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(i) New Mexico has a 'high cap' restriction that does not, in practice, restrict the number of charter schools in the state.		

(ii) The state has laws that govern charter schools. Until 2007 only local districts were empowered to authorize charter schools, but now there is state authorization also, and some have been approved. One state charter has already been denied renewal due to lack of academic progress, as has one district charter school, with more closed due to fiscal mismanagement and governance issues.

(iii) School districts must allocate no less than 98% of their school-generated program costs to their charter schools, and may withhold 2% for administrative support of the charter school. The state distributes \$3,712 per pupil based on the formula, including charter schools. At the beginning of this section, the statement was made that the funding formula ensures that "[n]o LEA in New Mexico relies on its property tax base to support its operational needs" and that it "removes the inequity caused by local wealth." But it is hard to imagine that \$3,712 is the total spent per pupil in New Mexico schools, and that there is not a local contribution. How this local contribution is distributed is not addressed in the proposal, and leaves open the possibility that charter schools may not receive an equitable share of that funding. This would be especially important when considering the state charter schools that are not part of a local LEA. However, using only the information provided in the proposal, high points would seem to be needed for this criterion.

(iv) New Mexico law requires that charter schools receive local bond funding and a national association for charter schools placed New Mexico among five states with strong facilities support policies.

(v) The state does allow LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools in addition to charter schools, and examples are given in the proposal. For example, one school in Albuquerque graduates students with associate degrees.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>New Mexico has made a strong commitment to early education, the benefits of which are known to flow through to better student achievement, etc. As a majority-minority state, New Mexico also supports bilingual programs. Among other initiatives listed is one regarding the appointment of a task force for the Schools Most in Need of Improvement that will examine failing schools and make recommendations regarding intensive interventions. It is puzzling that this was not mentioned in Section E and it would have been helpful to know how the work of this task force might enhance the practices that are intended for implementation in that section.</p>		
Total	55	55

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>New Mexico's commitment to strengthening math and science education is addressed throughout the proposal and nicely summarized in this section. Here they add an important program to supplement their efforts described in Section D to promote teacher effectiveness. In 2009, STEM requirements for licensing teachers were increased, even as more than 30% of their STEM teachers are not certified in the subject they are teaching (even though they are highly qualified according to NCLB definitions - see earlier discussion). New Mexico proposes developing a Master STEM Certificate through the NM Leadership Institute, which will allow teachers then to take a funded summer fellowship with an industry partner. Funds are requested to support this program and the overall STEM priority and represent an innovative approach to strengthening STEM teachers' capacities.</p>		

They add two other initiatives here. One is a public/private partnership to promote computing as early as 5th grade, and another to launch a public awareness campaign - STEM Matters! in partnership with the national labs and major corporations - both excellent innovations.		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>This application has many strengths and weaknesses that will propel it forward in some areas and constrain its progress in others. There are elements within the plan that will place New Mexico as a leader nationally, especially regarding student assessment. The time needed within the state to work with a wide array of stakeholders is necessary for them, but will act to slow down progress to the point where little progress will have been made within the timeframe of the grant. And the lack of consistency of detail across sections and appendices casts some doubt on the state's plan, and its ability to accomplish the overall intent of Race to the Top. But overall, the proposal demonstrates a good faith effort to address the four educational reform areas of ARRA and the state success factors.</p>		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	305
-------------	-----	-----



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Mexico Application #3600NM-7



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	49
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	35
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	9

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A(1)(i)

Within the introduction to Section A, the applicant makes very candid statements that the state continues to struggle with closing achievement gaps and enhancing student achievement despite efforts at education reform through House Bill 212. This bill (public school reforms) was passed in 2003 and was aimed at attracting and retaining quality teachers and principals; holding students, teachers, schools, LEAs, charters, and the State accountable for student performance; providing a culturally diverse curriculum with high expectations for all students; and providing better support for students, educators, families, and schools. In addition, important demographics of the state's students were also provided in the introductory section. Overall, the applicant provides a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda, provides a concise articulation of goals for each of the four ARRA reform areas with an eye towards improving student outcomes, and the information provided for A(1)(i) is consistent with the rest of the application. This section receives full points.

A(1)(ii)

The applicant indicates that New Mexico currently has 122 Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), composed of 89 traditional school districts and 33 state-authorized charter schools. The applicant reports that 87 of the 122 LEAs signed the MOU with the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED), thus agreeing to the goals, activities, and annual targets of the state's RTTT application. The participating LEAs include 69 traditional school districts and 18 state-authorized charter schools (there are an additional 59 district-authorized charter schools that fall under the traditional school district LEA). The MOU is provided in Appendix A and provides terms and conditions aligned with the sample MOU provided in by the federal RTTT guidance. The scope-of-work requires all participating LEAS to implement and "fully participate" in all portions of the RTTT plan (with the exception of the implementing intervention models for lowest-achieving schools, as not all LEAs include such schools). Overall, the applicant indicates that 100% of the participating LEAs agreed to all elements of the RTTT application and the MOU does not provide an "opt-out" clause or other clause that might limit the eventual execution of the RTTT reform efforts – this is an "all or nothing" MOU for LEAs. Detailed table A(1) was intended to only list participating LEAs, but the applicant provided information on 109 LEAs (six of which appear to be new state charter schools slotted to open for the 2010-2011 academic year). It is not explained why there are 109 LEAs listed and why that number is inconsistent with the 122 LEAs reported to exist in New Mexico. In addition, there are some concerns raised by the information provided in the detailed table. First, several districts that did not sign the MOU are indicated as having agreed to participate in E(2) (e.g., Des Moines, Hondo, Lordsburg), suggesting that the applicant may be providing RTTT funding to districts that have not committed to the

RTTT reform initiative. Second, Central Consolidated School District houses four of the 35 persistently lowest-performing schools, but did not agree to participate in the RTTT reform efforts. Similarly, Gallup-McKinley School District houses 10 of the 35 schools identified for improvement, but the LEA was unable to garner union support for the RTTT reform efforts. This raises serious questions as to whether the district can successfully implement all elements of the RTTT reform (given that over 25% of low-performing schools reside within its boundaries, this is a critical district to ensure statewide impact of the RTTT reform efforts). Third, given that the detailed table shows some LEAs did not even respond to the state regarding participation in the RTTT reform, it would have been helpful for the applicant to indicate why these LEAs might not have responded to the state (e.g., extremely rural). Fourth, several LEAs signed the MOU but the detailed table suggests that they did not agree to the scope of work and, therefore, cannot be considered to be fully committed to the RTTT reform efforts (e.g., Maxwell, Mosquero, Roy). Finally, the MOU splits the scope of work for E(2) into two components (one component signed alongside the rest of the components and one with a separate signature), yet the detailed table does not provide any indication of which districts were agreeing to take part in the intervention section of E(2). Given that the vast majority of funding for LEAs is provided through E(2), it would be important to know which of the identified districts are involved and to what extent their leadership is committed to these specific reform efforts. The MOU includes a signature line for the NMPED Secretary of Education and the LEA (school district or charter school) on page 5, page 10, and page 11 (the three locations where signatures are required), yet there is no area for the president of the local school board or representative of the local teacher union to sign. As such, it is not clear how the applicant was able to determine that these individuals agreed to the MOU and whether they provided binding consent to the MOU and the RTTT initiative. Regardless, there is concern that 29% of LEAs with unions were not able to engender union support of the RTTT reform efforts; given the black-and-white nature of the MOU, it is possible that the inability to gain union support when writing the 90-day plans may exclude further LEAs from participating in the RTTT initiatives. Finally, the RTTT initiative is mistakenly identified as a "Top of the World" grant in the MOU under participating LEA responsibilities – the state's lawyers may need to ensure this does not impact the agreement. Given the concerns indicated above, but taking into account the strength of the MOU language, this section receives moderately-high points.

A(1)(iii)

The applicant indicates that 69 out of 89 (77%) traditional school districts and 18 out of 33 (54%) state-authorized charter schools have agreed to participate in the RTTT reform initiatives. The state proposes goals in (1) reading and mathematics for fourth-grade and eighth-grade students (both for the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment and the NAEP measures), (2) decreasing achievement gaps, (3) increasing high school graduation rates, and (4) increasing college enrollment. While this is very ambitious, given the current gaps, it is unlikely that the state will be able to achieve 100% proficiency in reading and math for all students and eliminate achievement gaps by the end of the RTTT grant period. In addition, the goals for increasing college enrollment are not well developed, and it is not clear whether they are ambitious or achievable given the information provided. In terms of whether the RTTT application and participation of LEAs will translate into broad statewide impact, the applicant notes that the participating LEAs represent 81% of all LEAs, 83% of all schools, 89% of students, and 88% of all students in poverty. Given the statements of need provided throughout the application, it would also be important for the applicant to indicate the proportion of students in these LEAs from the other sub-groups within the state (e.g., proportion from the various racial groups, proportion of all Native American students, etc.). Several of the concerns mentioned in the comments for A(1)(ii) may also decrease the ability of the participating LEAs to have broad statewide impact overall, as well as by student subgroups. In addition, the budget provided indicates that most of the RTTT funding will go towards supporting the state's persistently lowest-performing schools, resulting in the vast majority of support to LEAs consumed by this one aspect of reform. The allocation of substantial funding for only a relatively few number of schools raises concerns as to whether the participating LEAs can effectively accomplish the goals of the application and whether the RTTT will have broad statewide impact. This section receives high-moderate points.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	16
---	-----------	-----------

(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	12
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	4

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A(2)(i)

The applicant provides evidence that the State's current administrative structure is committed to education and education reform. The applicant reports that the state amended the constitution to make the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) an Executive Agency led by a cabinet level Secretary of Education. In 2003, the state passed an education reform bill (HB212) aimed at attracting and retaining quality teachers and principals; holding students, teachers, schools, LEAs, charters, and the State accountable for student performance; providing a culturally diverse curriculum with high expectations for all students; and providing better support for students, educators, families, and schools. The candid statements in the application are much appreciated, such as the discussion of a stakeholder meeting when determining whether to pursue a Phase II RTTT application. It is particularly impressive that the state is committed to pursuing these reform efforts (to some extent) regardless of whether RTTT funding is obtained. In support of these statements of unwavering commitment, the budget provided by the applicant shows several efforts that are entirely funded through state or other funds. In addition, Appendix A-2-2 provides RTTT work group members coming from a wide variety of stakeholders from the state department, schools, corporations, and other important agencies. In order to maximize leadership of the RTTT reform initiative, the applicant indicates that the NMPED will reorganize in July 2010 to designate three staff to take the leadership role in the department to integrate the RTTT plan into the work of the department. The applicant states that the project team will address the requirements of A(2)(i)(c) and that it will meet the requirements of A(2)(i)(b), though there is not substantial detail about how the leadership will ensure these requirements are met. This process could have been further clarified and strengthened, particularly given the amount of funding dedicated to contracts and stipends for professional development. Impressively, the applicant will contract for independent reviews and evaluations of RTTT implementation and impact, and the Office of Education Accountability (OEA) in the New Mexico Department of Finance and Administration has statutory authority (NMSA 1978 9-6-15) to provide independent evaluations on New Mexico's Assessment and Accountability Act and the School Personnel Act. The OEA will manage these independent evaluations to provide New Mexico with evidence about which initiatives are successful and should be sustained with State resources after *Race to the Top* funding has ended. Finally, the applicant indicates various sources of funding (SIG, ARRA, Title I, Title II, state funding, and private funding) in place to support the RTTT reform initiatives. Although the information provided is informative and thoughtful, the applicant does not provide sufficient information consistent with RTTT guidance on a high-quality plan. In particular, the applicant does not provide key goals for providing statewide leadership; only some of the necessary leadership and capacity activities are discussed; there is no definitive timeline for implementing specific activities (aside from the reorganization of the NMPED); and with respect to proposed performance measures to assess the statewide leadership provided, it is not clear whether the hired evaluator will assess statewide leadership in addition to the impact of RTTT activities. This section receives moderate points.

A(2)(ii)

The application includes letters from a wide variety of stakeholders, including a strong letter from the Governor and support letters from corporations, LEAs, NMBREE, private corporations, and institutions of higher education. The letter from the AFT New Mexico and Albuquerque Teachers Federation are the only unions represented in the submitted letters. Moreover, the one from Albuquerque references assurances made to the educational community regarding teacher assessment; but it is not clear whether these assurances were made in a legal document or by "gentleperson's agreement." There is no letter from any principal's association or organization representing the principals, and there are no letters from any of the Native American tribes, pueblos, or nations. Both of these impact the credibility of the statements made in the narrative regarding overwhelming statewide support for the RTTT application and reform initiatives. The applicant indicates that the letters evidence a strong plan to implement the overall RTTT reform, and that the state will leverage the support generated by members of the RTTT workgroup and leaders. However,

the applicant does not provide an actual plan for how the state will utilize support from these group of stakeholders (e.g., will there be an advisory council, how will these letter-writers be engaged after RTTT funding, will there be sub-groups developed for the specific types of reform efforts, when/how will the state communicate with stakeholders, will the state continue to pursue additional stakeholder supports, etc.). This section receives low-moderate points due to the lack of letters from important stakeholders and the absence of a high-quality plan for this criterion (i.e., no clearly-defined ambitious goals, timeline, responsible parties, or performance measures for determining whether the plan is on-track).

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	15
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A(3)(i)

The applicant provides information about progress in the four education reform areas, and clearly provides information about how federal, state, and private funding has been used to propel the state in these efforts. The information provided is very clear and concise, and it is evident that the state has put forward a strong effort to reform the educational system in these four areas. Given the struggles identified elsewhere in the application, it is hoped that some of the strong reform efforts with limited impact (e.g., Gadsden Mathematics Initiative) will be translated into broader statewide implementation if found effective. This section receives full points.

A(3)(ii)

The applicant states that average student performance on NAEP and NMSBA showed incremental improvements over the past several years. The charts provided are helpful, but they are difficult to interpret without more detailed data from which the summary tables were developed. The charts highlight information on student performance for all students overall and by race/ethnicity, yet the data is not disaggregated by other important subgroups focused upon in other aspects of the application and identified in the RTTT reform initiative (i.e., students in poverty, ELL students, and students with special needs).

NAEP: Overall, the state has made some progress in increasing student performance in 4th grade mathematics since 2003 – although white students increased at almost twice the rate of other ethnicities and American Indian students declined from their 2007 performance. Since 2003, 4th grade reading increased initially, but dropped back to 2005 levels by the 2009 assessment year – wherein all ethnic groups declined, though white students declined almost twice as much as other ethnicities. 8th grade mathematics showed initial decline in 2005, but has increased since that point. It is important to note that the decline in 2005 was entirely explained by the performance of white students, as black students showed no improvement since 2005. Finally, 8th grade reading performance showed steady decline from 2003-2007 with a sharp increase in 2009 – wherein all ethnic groups increased from 2007-2009, though white students increased almost twice as much as students of other ethnicities.

NMSBA: In terms of the state assessment, the results are somewhat more promising than the NAEP, but the state continues to struggle with making significant gains in performance from year to year. From 2004-2005 to 2008-2009 (the applicant did not provide any 2003 data), the percentage of students at or above proficient increased from 50% to 55% in reading, 40% to 46% in science, and 30% to 41% in mathematics. In terms of ethnicity/race subgroups at 4th and 8th grades, the state has struggled with achieving desired growth from 2004 to 2009. The percentage of 4th graders at or above proficient in mathematics increased only 4% for Hispanic, African American, and American Indian subgroups, 3% for Caucasian, and decreased 3% for Asian students. The percentage of 4th graders at or above proficient in reading decreased among both Caucasian (-1%) and Asian students (-5%), saw no change among African American students (0%), and had slight increases among American Indian (3%) and Hispanic students (1%). The gains in mathematics among 8th graders by ethnicity has been more steady and consistent across all ethnic

subgroups, though the differences in 8th grade reading shows an increasing gap among ethnicity subgroups from 2007-2008.

The applicant also reports evidence in the charts referenced above of closing the racial/ethnic achievement gaps, though the actual narrowing has been limited to only 1-3 percentage points of students at or above proficient. [The applicant mentions earlier in the application that New Mexico has struggled with closing its achievement gaps.] There is no data provided on subgroups other than ethnicity or the impact the state has had on achievement gaps for these other subgroups. The applicant provides some information on graduation rates, but limits the discussion to most recent rates rather than demonstrating progress over the past several years. While they explain that the transition to a new 5-year rate makes it difficult to compare to past years, it seems that information could be provided for past success until the 2008 implementation. As it stands, there is no evidence that any gains in graduation have occurred in New Mexico. This section, given that concerns listed above, receives point in the higher end of the low range.

Total	125	80
-------	-----	----

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	35
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	15
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>B(1)(i)</p> <p>New Mexico is among the 48 states that worked towards creation of the Common Core Standards for language arts and mathematics in grades K-12. Full points are awarded for this category.</p> <p>B(1)(ii)</p> <p>The applicant indicates the state will adopt the Common Core Standards no later than August 2, 2010, followed by a 30-day posting period for public comment and review and a public hearing. This timeline is not consistent with the statement that these standards will be adopted by August 2nd. Instead, the narrative indicates that the actual adoption of the standards is anticipated for no later than November 2010. The state has already been educating instructional leaders statewide about the new standards, and the reported consensus is that the standards are similar to current standards (particularly following revision due to New Mexico's participation in the American Diploma Project in 2009). The Web-EPSS and Monitoring Tool appears to be an impressive tool for tracking the actual implementation of the Common Core Standards. As allowed by the scoring process for RTTT, the Tier 1 score for this section is in the low-high range because it is not clear whether the standards will be officially adopted by August 2, 2010.</p> <p>General Comment:</p> <p>The applicant dedicates \$155,380 to implementing the Common Core Standards and proposes paying 0.10 FTE of a manager to oversee the process. However, the proposal also includes the full cost of a laptop and projector for the manager, which does not appear reasonable to this reviewer given that the manager is only 10% funded through RTTT.</p>		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5

(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>B(2)(i)</p> <p>The applicant reports participating with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and the National Center on Education and the Economy States Consortium to develop assessments aligned with the Common Core Standards. The applicant also provides information about other aspects of its proposed assessment system. Although information about this assessment system is not scored in this section, it impacts the score on future sections of this grant. This section receives full points.</p> <p>B(2)(ii)</p> <p>The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium was a merging of three consortia in January 2010, and comprises 45 states. The National Center on Education and the Economy States Consortium is comprised of only eight states. This section receives full points.</p>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	17
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>B(3)</p> <p>The applicant provides a plan that includes all elements of an RTTT "high quality plan." The applicant proposes three goals for transitioning to the Common Core Standards and new assessments: deliver professional development; partner with Career and College Readiness Policy Institute and America Diploma Project; and continue to administer, score, and report the standards-based assessment/high school graduation assessment until the year prior to full implementation of Board examinations. The applicant establishes its credibility to implement a high-quality plan for transitioning to the new standards and assessments by reporting on the state's work with the Career and College Readiness Policy Institute and the America Diploma Project. The state will provide substantial technical assistance to aid in the transition to the new standards. The plan to move into the new common assessments will require the state to address technology needs of the state, as the current paper-and-pencil tests will be replaced with computer-based assessments. The state plans to implement the new national assessments in 2014-2015, and \$2,250,000 has been earmarked in year three of the RTTT budget to provide 65 "mobile computer labs" with 32 laptops per cart. The state also provides information on other efforts to develop and implement a high quality assessment process in line with the Common Core Standards. A time frame and activities table is provided, which gives good detail on the anticipated process towards adoption of the standards and assessments. The timeline includes aligning curriculum to the new standards, adjusting the state-mandated assessments, developing professional development, and developing a monitoring system (though an earlier section stated that there was already a monitoring system in place). The applicant does not provide strong justification for why the assessments will not be implemented until the 2014-2015 school year, and there are no items on the timeline from 2012-2013. This section receives moderate-high points.</p>		
Total	70	62

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	20
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The applicant reports having a robust K-12 data system with plans to expand the system into a P-20 system. The statewide initiative (New Mexico Achieving Collaborative Heights in Education Via e-Systems</p>		

(NM-ACHIEVeS) will be designed to enhance the use of education and economic data to guide educational policy and instruction, and will include data from multiple state agencies (i.e., NMPED; Higher Education Department; Children, Youth and Families Department; and Department of Workforce Solutions). Such an integrated statewide longitudinal data system will be impressive and beyond the basic requirements of RTTT. The applicant reports that they have nine of ten essential elements established by the 2009 Data Quality Campaign report and is working towards collecting data for the final element. In terms of America COMPETES, the state is working towards meeting or enhancing all 12 of the specified elements, and provides a table that lists the current status and remaining work for each of the elements. However, the information provided makes it difficult to determine if the applicant has a data system that fully meets the 12 elements of America COMPETES. The table provided (starting on D-65) suggests that many elements have been fully met, but the application does not provide a definitive statement that can be used to determine whether each element meets the requirements of 6402(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act. The information provided in the table is vague and does not indicate full completion except for one element (i.e., information on students not tested by grade and subject). The information provided in the "current status" column suggests that many elements are completed, while two have additional work required before the element can be fully implemented (i.e., capacity to communicate with higher education systems is currently done manually; student level transcript information is only operational at the secondary level). This section receives 20 points for having ten elements clearly reported as completed.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3
--	----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The applicant provides a seven-point plan for achieving its broad goal of ensuring that data from the state longitudinal data system meets the criterion for this sub-section (the goals actually just rephrase the RTTT Criteria). The applicant focuses attention on the STARS reporting system, but the previous section mentioned that STARS would be consolidated into the new NM-ACHIEVeS database and reporting system. It seems that this consolidation will take considerable effort, yet this is not a significant part of the proposed plan (it is mentioned briefly in point 2 of the plan). Regardless, the proposed EUI component of STARS will reportedly allow access to educational data by all stakeholders, which is planned for release in June 2011. The seven-point plan has efforts extending only until June 2011, but the performance measures express the goal that the data available will address 100% of questions by 2014. As there is no further development planned for the system (as per the plan) after 2011, it is not clear why the 100% level would not be achievable by the end of the 2011-2012 school year. In addition to the timeline and performance goals, the plan does not reflect any efforts to confer with students, parents, educators, researchers, policy makers, and community members on questions they would like answered or the types of data that would be helpful for their needs. The plan is also lacking any detailed discussion as to how the state will ensure that data from the SDLS will be "used to inform and engage" key stakeholders, particularly in reference to parents, students, unions, and policymakers (teachers and principals are addressed elsewhere in the application). The applicant proposes a significant contract for Section C but provides only the following as a description for this item: "Professional Development contract services to implement system with approximate cost of \$1,200,000 over four years." This is in addition to over \$1.6M in personnel and fringe to work on improving and implementing the longitudinal data system. In addition, given that this budget section is about programming and developing an enhanced online system, the need for a copier (\$10,500) is questionable. Further, the need for over \$400k in other equipment (including \$20,000 in cabling) is questionable and not elaborated upon in the narrative. Also in the budget for C(2) there is \$75,000 for the second through fourth years for "software licensing," though the state is expending several million dollars (in C(1) and C(2)) to develop its own system, such that this cost for software licensing is questionable (no other justification or explanation was provided in the narrative). In the budget for C(2), the state has included \$900,000 for training stipends during the second through fourth years. This section receives moderate points.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	8
---	-----------	----------

(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	2
---	---	---

(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	3
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	3

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

C(3)(i)

The applicant proposes to expand the use of IISs currently implemented by Albuquerque Public Schools and Las Cruces Public Schools – both of which are reported by the applicant to be comprehensive systems for use at the school and classroom levels. To achieve this goal, the applicant proposes to develop an IIS consortium of LEAs and Charter Schools without an IIS in place to create an RFP that will, in turn, develop the system for use starting in 2011. The applicant also proposes a Data Warehouse Council P-20 Educators' Advisory Group to advise NMPED on IIS policies and practices that impact LEAs and Charters. Several concerns and questions of this reviewer are not addressed by this plan. First, it seems like the IIS consortium should also include LEAs and Charters that currently have an IIS system to learn from their experiences and ensure the system also meets their needs. Second, the bulleted statements in this section and the statement that the two model IISs are in districts serving 34.1% of the state's students suggests that the only systems in new Mexico are in Albuquerque and Las Cruces. This concern is increased as the budget proposes funds for assistance with creation of local instructional improvement systems (IISs), but only 20 LEAs will receive the assistance with system creation (\$10,000 each) and 100 will receive assistance with training on the systems created (\$2,000 each). With 89 participating LEAs, two of which have an IIS, it seems that more funds may be needed to successfully implement this component. The ideas presented are insufficient to qualify as a "high quality plan" as per RTTT guidance. This section receives a moderate score.

C(3)(ii)

The applicant states that professional development on the use of data has relied on the Office of Education Accountability in the Department of Finance and Administration. This past professional development has been provided to both principals and teachers and, as per the applicant, has been successful. In addition, the applicant provided information on the New Mexico Leadership Institute for principals and superintendents, IDEAL-NM online professional development system, the electronic professional online learning community, and a proposed research and legal advisory group. However, the applicant does not provide a clear plan that specifies how the state will provide professional development to all educational users of the IISs (i.e., teachers, principals, and administrators). No timeline is provided, and the goal is very general. In addition, the goal indicates that the state will only support LEAs and Charter Schools that are using IISs to provide professional development to their teachers, principals, and administrators – it does not say that the state will provide any of the development, nor does it state that the professional development will address helping ALL participating LEAs in implementing these systems (including those without IISs). The budget for this section does not provide funds to LEAs to provide these trainings, so it is unclear how the state will support their efforts. While the C(3) budget includes \$1M in contracted services for "professional development," this is not mentioned in the grant narrative and the applicant provides no further explanation in the detailed budget as to what this will entail, how it will be monitored, or how the figure was established/estimated. In addition, there is \$1,200,000 for software licensing over the course of four years without justification as to why this is needed (given that the budget already has substantial costs in programming and development throughout the Section C budget). Finally, there is a single printer/copier for this component at \$5,000, although this is a largely online and computer-based component and the need for a \$5,000 copier/printer is not justified in the budget. This section receives moderate points.

C(3)(iii)

The applicant proposes a new model for New Mexico to make data more available for researchers, as well as three specific activities to achieve this model: building data marts allowing access on three different levels; establishing a credentialing system for researchers; and enhancing outlets for distributing research

findings. While these are three very good ideas, the applicant does not provide a plan in accordance with RTTT guidelines and does not provide a timeline for when these efforts will be completed. This section received moderate-high points.

Total	47	31
-------	----	----

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	9
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	2
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	3
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D(1)(i)

The applicant provides little information in the grant narrative in support of this criterion, instead referring the reviewer to summaries of several statues and regulations in Appendix D-1-1 and Appendix D-1-2 (Teachers: 22-10A-8, 22-10A-11.1 NMSA 1978, 6.60.3 NMAC; Principals: 22-10A-11.1, 22-10A-11.3 NMSA 1978, 6.60.3.9 and 6.62.2 NMAC). For teachers, three alternative routes are provided. The first two are for individuals with at least five years post-secondary teaching experience, while the third applies to those with less than 5 years experience and includes three potential avenues: a "fast-track alternative licensure program," an "alternative licensure portfolio pathway," and completing a post-bachelor's license program. The alternative license portfolio pathway is not well described in the application. For principals, the law allows teachers or counselors to obtain a Provisional Leader License through one of four alternative routes based on past experience and/or qualifications as a teacher or counselor. A third option (alternative leader license) is for individuals with post-secondary teaching experience, and the fourth option is "district-based leadership programs" permitted under NM statues and regulations, though the applicant does not provide substantial information about this fourth option. From the information provided, legal, statutory, and regulatory provisions in the state have limited alternative routes to certification that cannot be provided by various providers (they are only provided by universities and colleges); there is no indication of selectiveness in admissions; they have no requirement for supervised/school-based experiences; they do not have provisions to limit the coursework; and they may not provide the same certificate as traditional programs. This section receives low points.

D(1)(ii)

The applicant reports having three alternative licensure programs for teachers who meet state requirements (which are presumably those provided in Appendix D-1-1). These are Elementary (K-8), Secondary (7-12), and Special Education (SpEd) programs. The applicant also reports that *Teach for America* currently has 120 teachers predominantly in high-need academic areas in schools that are over 90% Native American. The majority of the applicant's budget for D(1) is dedicated to expand Teach for America – providing \$20,000 per teacher for 150 teachers (or about 35 per year). The applicant states that all programs except the Online Portfolio Alternative Licensure (OPAL) are offered through IHEs, but it is not clear how the portfolio program is operated. The applicant also reports implementing the Transition to Teaching program for those eligible for or who have already obtained an internship license. Appendix D-1-3 shows that, in 2008-2009, 216 new teacher licenses were provided to those from alternative route programs (19% of total) – 48 of which were through OPAL and 92 from community colleges without traditional pathway programs. There is little discussion of alternative principal routes or data to indicate whether they are utilized in the state. This section receives moderate points.

D(1)(iii)

The applicant reports having a current process for monitoring, evaluation, and identifying areas of shortage in schools and for preparing to fill these areas of shortage. Although the applicant states that the current system allows for such identification, it is not sufficiently explained how these systems work or how the data is analyzed to determine teacher shortages. Regardless, in response to teacher shortages, the state has engaged in several activities to address the shortages, including: increasing the number of teachers trained in math, science and technology; creating the New Mexico Leadership Institute; developing two Transition to Teaching programs, recruiting math and science teacher with NSF fellowships, developing online bilingual and TESOL licensure programs, and creating a "Return to Work Program" allowing retired teachers to resume teaching after a 12 month hiatus (an impressive 9% of teachers are in this program). These represent strong methods to address teacher shortages, however, there is no clear understanding of what the magnitude of teacher shortages is in New Mexico or whether any of these attempts to reduce the shortages have been effective (aside from the Return to Work Program). In addition, there is some question about the monitoring and evaluation system used in the state, as the applicant states that in 2009-2010, 99.44% of all classes were taught by "highly qualified teachers." However, given the data provided in Section A regarding history of scores on the NAEP and NMSBA, it is difficult to understand how such a high percentage of teachers could be highly qualified when such a low percentage of the students in the state are at or above proficient. Overall, due to the lack of detail regarding the process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying shortages among both teachers and principals, this section receives moderate points.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	34
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	8
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	5
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	18

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D(2)(i)

The applicant indicates that the state intends to incorporate student growth into the three-tiered licensure system, the teacher evaluation system, and the principal evaluation system by July 2014, which is inconsistent with the goals provided at the beginning of section D(2). Regardless of which timeline is accurate, both provide dates that are three to four years away – yet the applicant states that the current system allows for measuring student achievement and should be capable of measuring student growth by comparing annual growth for each student. The applicant provides additional information on the three-tiered licensure system, but that is not part of this criterion. In relation to this criterion, the state does not provide sufficient details about its plan and timeline for actually developing and/or implementing a system for measuring student growth for each individual student. There is also no mention of what the state will use to measure student growth, particularly in relation to rigorous methods to measure student growth for those teachers that are not reading, math, or science teachers. This section receives moderate points.

D(2)(ii)

The applicant proposes to strengthen the existing statewide evaluation system to incorporate student growth as a significant factor in determining overall effectiveness of both teachers and principals. The applicant proposes other measures for teachers (e.g., classroom observations, Professional Development Plans, portfolios, administrator judgment, student evaluations, and parent interviews) and principals (e.g., teacher feedback). However, all these additional factors are only possibilities and there is no commitment by the applicant to include these additional points of data in any evaluation. The revisions to the state evaluation system will be guided by the PPSC, which is composed of representatives of several types of groups and agencies, though it is not clear whether state unions or principal associations will be included in

these discussions. The letter from one of the major teacher unions in the state indicates that specific provisions were agreed upon by the state in writing the Phase II RTTT application, but those are not indicated when discussing how the evaluation system will be revised (which leaves reviewers to wonder how those provisions might negatively impact the plan to create a rigorous, transparent, and fair system of evaluation). In terms of a high-quality plan, the deadline for implementing these revisions is July, 2013, yet no other information was provided as to the timeline building up to the new evaluation systems, the activities necessary to get to the final product, or who (besides PPSC) will be responsible for the various elements of the plan. There is a timeline at the end of section D(2), but it does not provide any more information than is included in the brief narrative for this sub-section. The applicant does not discuss using multiple rating categories to differentiate effectiveness of both principals and teachers. This section receives moderate points.

D(2)(iii)

The applicant indicates that each LEA in the state must conduct annual teacher evaluations, provide training for teachers and supervisors assigned evaluation duties, and provide timely feedback. The applicant intends, through RTTT funding, to provide training to ensure evaluators of teachers and principals are effective in this task. There is no indication that principals will require annual evaluations, nor is there any indication that the applicant will require annual principal evaluations if RTTT funds are provided. There is also no indication that data on student growth for the students, classes, and schools will be provided as part of the teacher and principal evaluations. In terms of the budget for this section, the state proposes to use \$660,000 over the second through fourth years to provide substitute teachers so that teachers and principals can receive training (which, from the budget narrative, appear to be trainings on how to use the IISs); the state intends to pay stipends that total \$900,000 over the course of the RTTT grant. Section C, however, had \$1,000,000 for professional development contracts for IISs and \$900,000 in stipends for training teachers and administrators in the use of data, while D(3) has \$800,000 in stipends for training teachers and administrators on the state's Teacher and Principal Evaluation System. It appears there is professional development and stipends in multiple areas that are closely related and it is not clear the need for the differentiation or whether there will be entirely different trainings supported within these different categories. More justification would be needed to understand these costs and determine whether they are reasonable and necessary. This section receives moderate points, as the current system meets part of the criterion requirements but lacks detail on principals and use of student growth data.

D(2)(iv)

Throughout the application and budget, the applicant shows a commitment to professional development and has committed substantial resources from RTTT, as well as other federal, state, and private funding to provide professional development to teachers and principals. The applicant proposes expanding the mentoring component for new teachers to include new principals and superintendents. The applicant also reiterates other professional development initiatives, including the New Mexico Leadership Initiative, the use of Professional Development Plans, and the Transition to Teaching grant program. Additional detail could have been provided about how the state will use data (such as data on student growth) to inform and direct the increased professional development services proposed in the RTTT budget and narrative. Within D(2)(iv)(b), the state mentions plans to use evaluations to provide highly effective teachers and principals with added compensation, but the state previously indicated that nearly all the classes are taught by highly qualified teachers – as such, the state needs to define what it means by “highly qualified teachers.” It is not clear how the state will compensate and retain Level III teachers who are highly effective (by RTTT definition). The applicant states there is no tenure in New Mexico and that teachers can advance from Level I to II to III, however, there is no discussion about how principals are promoted or placed in levels according to experience and effectiveness. Although the state reports no tenure for teachers, sub-section D(2)(iv)(d) indicates that state law only allows a teacher to be removed if employed by the district for less than three years (which is effectively tenure), Level I teachers have five years to progress to Level II, and Level III teachers must have substantial professional development and peer intervention before being suspended. There is no discussion about Level II teachers and how they are removed, how long Level II and III teachers have to address ineffective practices or a below average evaluation, and there is little discussion about principal evaluations and how they can be removed if found ineffective. Overall, the

applicant provided some information on each of the four sections of this criterion, but did not provide sufficient information for a high score. This section receives a moderate score.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	14
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	8
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	6

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D(3)(i)

The applicant states that New Mexico has made dramatic progress in increasing the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers and again introduced the three-tiered teacher licensure system an evaluation system. The applicant proposes to have the RTTT application build on the 1998 Title II grant for teacher quality enhancement – with RTTT strengthening recruitment, preparation, induction, and professional development of teachers and principals. Specific to this criterion, the state’s plan for ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools is to use the new comprehensive Teacher and Principal Evaluation System to create a dashboard that summarizes key information and posting the results on the NMPED website. It is not clear how this will ensure equitable distribution. In addition, given that RTTT is intended to implement swift and effective reform initiatives, there is concern that the applicant indicates it will not demonstrate any progress towards addressing equitable distribution in high minority and high poverty schools until the end of the 2013-2014 program year. Tthis concern continues from previous sections, where the state indicated it will not collect data on student growth until the 2013-2014 school year. Moreover, while the state reports that 99.4% of all classes are provided by “highly qualified teachers” according to its current definition, this table suggests that only a small portion of teachers will be considered “highly effective” by the RTTT definition using student growth. In addition, the table shows that in four years, the state expects that there will be significant discrepancies in the distribution of highly effective and ineffective teachers and principals – meaning high poverty and/or high minority schools will have fewer highly effective teachers/principals and more ineffective teachers/principals. This is particularly concerning given the amount of funds and the focus that this RTTT application gives to these higher-risk schools. In addition, there is some confusing data provided in the Performance Measures table, which shows that there are 206 schools in each category, but 302 principals in high-minority, high-poverty schools and 330 principals in low-minority, low-poverty schools. Ultimately, the applicant does not provide a clear plan for how the state will ensure equitable distribution of teachers and principals. This section receives moderate points.

D(3)(ii)

The applicant commits to aligning federal and state resources to increase the supply of effective teachers. The applicant provides several proposed methods to increase the supply: build upon past work of the IED, IEAC, and Indian Education Act; build upon the New Mexico Project 2012 and Strategic Action Plan for math and science education; recruit STEM professionals “into the teaching ranks;” develop “grow your own” programs, provide incentives to teachers and principals working in persistently lowest-achieving schools; and expand Teachers-Teachers.com partnership to all LEAs and schools. While the applicant provided activities for addressing the needs for the hard-to-staff subjects of science and math, the applicant did not address special education or teaching in language instruction educational programs. This section receives a moderate score.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	9
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	5
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	4

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D(4)(i)

The goal for D(4) appears out of place, it fits in the previous section (D(3)(ii)). Regardless, the applicant indicates a commitment to linking the three-tier teacher licensure and principal evaluation systems to the in-state programs where teachers and principals received their preparation and completed their licensure requirements. The final deadline for having this data linked is during the 2014-2015 school year. The applicant introduces the EARS (Educator Accountability Reporting System), which they reported was discussed in section C (though it has only been mentioned in various sections and has not been fully or clearly explained in any other section of the application). The state reports that data on student growth will be one of the initial items on EARS for public consumption. The applicant also reports that IHEs will implement ways for this information to interface with work of the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education reporting requirements. The applicant indicates data on student performance will be linked to individual teachers and principals so IHEs and licensure preparation programs can have a preliminary indication of their effectiveness (it is not clear whether this information will be provided to the public). The portfolio method should also be assessed, but the applicant does not make it clear that this system (which is not a "program" in the language used by the applicant in this section) will be linked to data on student achievement and growth on those teachers that were licensed via that alternative route. This section receives the lower end of the high point range.

D(4)(ii)

The applicant indicates that the Professional Practices and Standards Council (PPSC) will provide up to \$100,000 to highly effective IHE educator preparation programs. The applicant also reports evaluating programs in partnership with NCATE and provides for a four stage model for closing an ineffective program. However, the applicant did not define an ineffective program and did not specify the expectation or requirements for being considered a "highly effective" or successful preparation program. There is concern that the applicant will allow the IHE program to use the funds as they choose, rather than requiring the program to indicate specifically how they will use the funds and ensuring the funds are used to support the RTTT reform initiatives. In addition, there is concern that the RTTT budget only includes \$400,000 for incentives under this reform effort, meaning as few as four (4) effective programs could receive such funding. This situation was not addressed in the narrative or budget. This section receives moderate points.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	14
(i) Providing effective support	10	8
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	6

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D(5)(i)

The applicant proposes to provide data-informed professional development that improves teachers' knowledge; is aligned to standards, assessments, and interventions; is supported by instructional coaches, mentors, and principals; is effective, sustained, intensive, and focused on needs of classroom teachers; and is developed and evaluated regularly. The actions to implement these goals are geared towards aligning the revised evaluation systems to professional development already provided; expanding the state's mentoring system; expanding IDEAL-NM through state funds; and expanding the NMLI through state and private funds. The applicant also reiterated the use of the Educational Plans for Student Success, Professional Development Plans, and the trainings provided by the OEA on evaluation. The budget for D(5) provides funds for professional development to be consistent with the Educational Plans for Student Success (EPSS) and the individual teacher's Professional Development Plan. The budget indicates that major emphasis will be on developing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and RTTT funds will provide \$100,000 per LEA for five (5) LEAs per year for the final two years in order to "align the revised evaluation systems." The budget also includes \$200,000 per year for IDEAL training in the first two years (though this is also supported by an \$11M state appropriation) and \$250,000 for "mentoring services."

While the sub-goals provided at the beginning of this sub-section are good, the applicant provides no goals for principals. There are trainings for principals worked into several of the activities, but the purpose of training these principals under RTTT is not clear. Also, there is concern that simply building on the current professional development system may not be enough to address the needs of teachers and principals in New Mexico, particularly given the mixed student performance results provided in Section A and elsewhere in the application. If the current system and trainings are high quality, then it is possible that the difficulties in engaging the teachers and principals to engage in these trainings – which raises the question as to how the state will increase this engagement and participation. This section receives a moderate-high score.

D(5)(ii)

The applicant states that all trainings and professional development opportunities (for both teachers and principals) will be evaluated as to the immediate effectiveness and quality of the training (via surveys) and follow-up surveys 4-6 weeks after the training (and periodically thereafter) to assess whether the teachers and/or principals are still using the skills and knowledge they gained at the training. This is a strong method for determining self-reported quality of the training. However, there are elements of training evaluation that are not proposed by the applicant. First, there is no discussion as to whether student achievement and student growth data will be compared to the trainings (as all this information is contained in the STARS system). Second, there is no discussion about whether the state will evaluate the interest in the trainings provided, the extent to which different subgroups of teachers/principals participate in the trainings, etc. An effective training will have less impact if the right teachers and principals are not partaking in the opportunity. This section receives moderate points.

Total	138	80
-------	-----	----

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The applicant indicates they have "strong legal, statutory, and regulatory authority" to intervene in the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools. Referencing the state's Assessment and Accountability Act (NMSA, 1978, 22-2C-7), the applicants states the NMPED has the authority to convert such a school into a state charter school (which serve as independent LEAs in New Mexico), replace all or most of the staff, turn the school over to a non-private entity, and/or make other governance changes. The state reports authority to engage in all four school intervention models of RTTT, although they cannot contract with a private entity to manage a public school. In addition, the state indicates that Title 6 Primary and Secondary Education Act, Chapter 29- Chapter 34 of the New Mexico Administrative Code explains what is required of the NMPED, LEAs, and charter schools when a school enters improvement status. The applicant also states that the NMPED has legal authority to intervene in low-performing districts (Article 2, Chapter 22, NM Statutes). The applicant, however, does not make it clear (nor is it clear in the law) what would constitute a district that has "failed to meet requirements of law or department rules or standards," or whether being persistently low achieving on state assessments is grounds for taking over control of the district. In fact, looking at the framework provided in Appendix E-1-1, it appears that the NMPED may not have the option of direct intervention or "take over" of a school district. However, the applicant is taken at its word that they have authority to intervene in low performing districts and, as such, this section receives full points.</p>		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	32
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	27

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

E(2)(i)

The applicant defines persistently lowest-achieving schools in two tiers – with Tier I including any Title I school in the lowest achieving 5% or a high school with cohort graduation rate less than 60%, and Tier 2 including Title I Eligible schools in the lowest-achieving 5-percent or a high school with cohort graduation rate less than 60%. This definition meets the minimum expectations of RTTT and is consistent with the definition approved by the USED in the state’s School Improvement Grant. This section earned full points.

E(2)(ii)

The applicant proposes to turn around 29 of the lowest achieving schools in the next four years. The applicant proposed to improve the conditions in schools by removing barriers to improvement, innovation, and transformation; delivering incentives to students and staff; improving the capacity of the turnaround schools; and organizing turnaround strategies by partnering with stakeholders. The applicant provides several strong examples of activities in which the state will participate to assist these schools, including implementing the School Success Alliance when necessary; expanding the Regional System for Schools in Need of Improvement to create Community Collaboratives; hiring additional turnaround specialists (in addition to those already funded by the state); implementing a common Instructional Delivery System for all schools in turnaround or transformation; formalizing the Professional Learning Community System and updating e-PLCNM.com; rewarding schools, students, and staff that make dramatic improvement and make AYP for two consecutive years; and contracting with an educational research center to benchmark progress and performance of the turnaround efforts. According to the submitted budget, the majority of LEA funding from RTTT will be provided to turn around lowest performing schools (\$36M). Within this initiative, the state proposed to provide \$500,000 per school per year (for a total of 20 schools over the four years). As such, these 20 schools (out of 689 participating schools in RTTT) will receive nearly 50% of the total RTTT funding across four years. There is no indication in the budget or the narrative as to how the amount of funding per school was (or will be) determined, whether the number of students in the school influences the funding amount, nor how the funds will be used at each school. The applicant also indicates that two schools have been required to implement major restructuring in 2008-2009, but does not have any information about the progress of these schools at this time. The state also reports that 39 schools have come out of NCLB status, but it is not clear how many schools have been in “NCLB status” since 2004-2005. Among schools that previously have met the definition of “persistently lowest achieving,” it is not clear how many have been involved in, nor the success of, state intervention efforts. Finally, the results and lessons learned regarding the restructuring of the 39 schools do not list most of the activities proposed throughout this section for turning around the lowest achieving schools and, vice versa, the proposed activities do not include all the factors that have proven successful in these schools. This section received moderate-high points.

Total	50	42
-------	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

F(1)(i)

As per the application, the state of New Mexico has increased total dollars dedication to education despite declines in total state budget from 2008 to 2009. The total percentage of state revenue dedicated to public K-12 education increased from 37.8% to 44.4%, and percentage dedicated to higher education increased from 11.0% to 12.6%. This section receives full points.

F(1)(ii)

The applicant has an impressive and clear method for ensuring LEAs and schools receive equitable funding, including ensuring high-need LEAs receive equitable funding as other LEAs and that high-poverty schools receive equitable funding as other schools within LEAs. In essence, the NM public school formula "guarantees 100% of program cost or a minimum amount of funding in order to provide instructional services to students." The formula uses a three step process, the second of which is a multiplier that results in additional funding for LEAs and Charter with high percentages of Title I students, ELL students, and students with high mobility. According to the applicant, this can also result in additional funding for programs with at-risk students, high enrollment growth, new district adjustments, or certain special education students. State law also requires local school boards to determine the priorities for distributing funds from this formula (i.e. the LEA receives funds by formula, but then has discretion to distribute as deemed appropriate). The NMPED requires LEAs to have transparency in their budgeting and the LEA must submit the final budget to the SEA for approval before implementation. This section receives full points.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	38
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	7
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	7

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

F(2)(i)

The state has a long-standing charter school law (1993), and has seen a growth in charter schools from five in 1993 to 81 authorized for the 2010-2011 school year. Of these schools, 21 are state charter schools and 60 are authorized by local school districts. The applicant notes that there is a "high cap" for charter schools in New Mexico, though there is no strict overall cap. This criterion requires that the state not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools. In that regard, the state limits the number of charter schools that can be approved in any one year to 15 and would hold a lottery if more than 15 were eligible for approval. Although this has not been an issue for the state, it could limit the number of charter schools and could have a negative impact on reform efforts (particularly if a number of low performing schools are converted to charter schools). There is also a limitation on the percentage of students a charter school can serve in a small district, though the explanation for that restriction is logical and appropriate. This section receives high points.

F(2)(ii)

The applicant discusses the New Mexico Charter School Act, which provides the legal requirements for charter school applicant, authorization, reauthorization (renewal), and closure. Charter schools are approved for an initial six-year term. State-authorized charter schools are given greater autonomy and greater responsibility for their programs, management, and budgets – as they are not part of the districts in which they reside (they are independent LEA). State laws govern the decisions about whether a charter school is authorized and renewed, or if necessary, whether a charter is suspended, revoked or not renewed for failure to make substantial progress towards achievement of the department's minimum educational

standards or student performance standards. The applicant provides data on state charter applications since 2007, but districts are not required to report the number of charter applications received. The overall approval rate is adequate and reflective of a careful selection process. There have been limited closures of charter schools since 2005, but the reasoning for the closure shows the state is committed to closing those schools that mismanage fiscal resources and/or do not show adequate progress. This section receives full points.

F(2)(iii)

The applicant reports that charter schools are funded on the same per-pupil basis as traditional schools, and notes that state law requires that funding allocated to a charter school shall not be less than 98% of the school-generated program cost. This section receives full points.

F(2)(iv)

The applicant reports that the state provides funding (in addition to the per pupil allocation) to charter schools in the amount of \$700 per student based on prior year enrollment. In addition, districts and charter schools can enter into a lease-purchase agreement for facilities, and charter schools can also receive local bond funding. The facility-related requirements for charter schools are the same as that for traditional public schools (the E-Occupancy certification). This section receives full points.

F(2)(v)

The applicant reports that the state allows local school districts to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools, such as magnet schools and special focus schools. The applicant indicates that the state will clarify regulations regarding the process for establishing magnet schools as another route for creating innovative schools. The applicant provides examples of magnet schools, but it is not clear whether these are autonomous schools, nor whether there are any autonomous schools in the state. This section receives moderate-high points.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The applicant provides four examples of state efforts to create conditions favorable to education reform or innovation. Namely, the state provides information on "Kindergarten Three Plus," pre-kindergarten programs, bilingual and multicultural education act (focus on bilingual programs), and IDEAL-NM (discussed in other sections of the grant). This section receives full points.</p>		
Total	55	53

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The applicant has provided mention of STEM throughout the application and provides additional detail in the STEM section of its grant application. It is clear from the whole of the application that the state is committed to providing reform geared towards implementing a strong STEM initiative. As demonstrated by other sections of the application, some STEM initiatives are already in place at the state and district levels (e.g., Math and Science Bureau in NMPED, Project 2012, STEM-C, STEM Matters!, etc.). Overall, given the information in the application and the synopsis provided by the STEM section, the applicant has demonstrated the requirements for these priority points. The budget for RTTT includes \$100,000 per year to develop STEM-related courses for IDEAL-NM, the New Mexico Online Education System (\$50,000 in years one and two and \$25,000 in years three and four), and \$490,000 in professional development</p>		

stipends for training teachers in STEM. These funds will create, update, and roll out a public awareness campaign of the STEM Program. The applicant reports that the \$100,000 per year for IDEAL-NM will be matched in-kind by Innovate Educate New Mexico.

Total	15	15
-------	----	----

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The applicant has provided an application that addresses all four education reform areas, providing a coherent and comprehensive plan for reform at the state level and within the participating LEAs.

Total		0
-------	--	---

Grand Total	500	363
--------------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Mexico Application #3600NM-4



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	53
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	2
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	40
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	11
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The proposal presents a plan that addresses all four areas of educational reform that are required. However, the performance goals that are stated are not adequate to present an ambitious reform agenda. For example, the performance goals based on the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment only cover two grade levels; do not include science; seem to represent a decrease from present levels of achievement for grade 8 mathematics; and are only for 2010-2011 with no longer term goals stated. Additionally, the graduation goals are not sufficiently ambitious.</p> <p>While the state did not use the sample MOU provided, the MOU that it developed appears to satisfactorily cover all of the critical elements and constitutes a binding agreement. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) were provided with the MOU accompanied by Exhibit 1 which clearly indicated the elements that they were agreeing to implement. All participating LEAs agreed to implement all project elements that are applicable to them. The MOU did not include separate signature lines for superintendents, school board presidents and local teachers' union leaders. Thus, it is not clear how the state determined the data that are presented in the summary table for (A)(1)(ii)(c).</p> <p>The participating schools represent 83% of the schools in the state, 89% of K-12 students in the state; and 88% of the students in poverty in the state. However, Exhibit 1 that accompanied the MOU only asked that districts agree to support and participate in the Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Task Force rather than agree to implement the recommendations of the Task Force. Additionally, the proposal contained a letter of support from the state affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers but not from the state affiliate of the National Education Association. Both of these latter two items will negatively impact the proposed project's ability to achieve statewide impact.</p>		
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	22
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Nearly 75 legislative and education leaders, business and community members and other key stakeholders were involved in the decision to submit a Phase 2 RTTT grant application. The Appendices contain strong letters of support from many of these leaders. Impressively many, if not, all of these letters were written specifically for Phase 2; they were not carried over from the Phase 1 application. The Governor has</p>		

specifically established the School Improvement Task Force to oversee the coordination of all aspects of the RTTT Project. The State Education Agency (SEA) is reorganizing to maximize its resources to accomplish the reform agenda established in the RTTT application. No letters of support were included from principal's associations or from tribal leaders. These are key groups whose support will be critical to the success of the project. There was also no plan to involve colleges and universities in support of the project.

The state will work closely with the Southwest Comprehensive Center and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning to identify promising practices and to cease use of ineffective practices. The state will also contract for independent evaluations that will provide information to help keep the project on track and to help identify which initiatives are successful and should be sustained after the grant ends.

The SEA will establish an office specifically to coordinate RTTT activities. This office will be headed by a full time director. Also, the proposal indicates that three staff members will be designated to take the leadership role in the SEA to successfully integrate all the parts of the RTTT plan in the work of the SEA. However, the budget does not indicate that any portion of their salaries will be funded from the grant, nor does it indicate how they will be relieved of all or part of their present duties so that they may accomplish the RTTT integration.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	21
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	16

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

External reviews have shown the state to have a strong system of standards and assessments. The state plans to adopt the Common Core Standards and to participate in 2 RTTT Assessment consortia.

The state uses a unique student identifier that has recently been mandated for use in higher education as well. The comprehensive student, staff and course information data warehouse provides a standard data set for each student served by the public education system. In 2009 the governor created the Data Warehouse Council to improve K-20 student success. The three-tiered teacher licensure system ensures teacher quality through accountability and support. It further encourages and supports ongoing professional development in nine teaching competency areas. School improvement initiatives are grounded in scientific research and driven by student performance data.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data show some improvement in mathematics for both grades 4 and 8 . For reading, the results are inconclusive with significant variation from test administration to test administration. For both grades 4 and 8, the gaps in achievement between racial/ethnic groups have widened. State assessment results generally showed some improvement over time in both reading and mathematics at grades 4 and 8. There was little change in racial/ethnic gaps in grade 4, some narrowing in grade 8 mathematics and the grade 8 reading results were inconclusive. No disaggregated data were provided regarding achievement gaps for students in poverty, for English Language Learners or for students with disabilities..

The state concludes that the small incremental gains that have been achieved are due to initiatives such as:

- Implementation of full-day kindergarten;
- Implementation of a pre-K program;
- Implementation of the Three-Tier Teacher Licensure System;
- Focus on STEM and other math/science initiatives;
- Reading First; and
- A comprehensive school improvement framework.

Because the state has recently adopted the 4-year cohort graduation rate required by NCLB, it does not have comprehensive longitudinal data. However, data for the most recent year show large racial/ethnic gaps in graduation rate, with the rate for Hispanic students standing at 56.2% and that of white students at 71.3%. Overall, it appears that the state has made little progress in improving graduation rates for all students.

Total	125	96
-------	-----	----

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	38
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	18
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The state has executed a Memorandum of Understanding to participate in the Common Core Standards Consortium which includes 50 states and territories. The Consortium has used exemplar state standards to inform the writing process and has convened a strong group of experts to draft, revise and validate the Common Core Standards in Mathematics and English Language Arts. International benchmarking was also used in the development of the Common Core Standards.</p> <p>The state is following the rule making process which requires that the standards be posted for public comment for 30 days, and expects to formally adopt the standards on or before August 2, 2010. The state indicates that it will establish two committees to review existing state standards and determine which, if any, should be retained within the newly adopted common set of K-12 standards. There is no indication of being bound by the requirement that no more than 15% of the standards may be changed or added.</p>		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The state is a governing state in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium which is developing high-quality assessments for grades 3-8 that are aligned to the common core standards. This consortium includes 33 states. The state is also a member of the National Center on Education and the Economy Consortium (PARC) of 11 states, which is developing a system of assessments based on international best practice designed to greatly raise the proportion of high school students who leave high school ready to do college-level work.</p>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	20
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>In preparation for the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments, the state previously participated in the College and Career Readiness Policy Institute and formulated a comprehensive policy framework to improve college and career preparedness for students. In addition, the State Department of Education partnered with the state Higher Education Department to establish the P-20 Alignment Task Force to address the alignment of college placement and high school exit requirements. As the transition to the new standards proceeds, the state will offer to schools technical assistance in the form</p>		

of guidelines, preliminary alignment cross-walks and professional development via on-site and distance learning.

The state will also continue working with assessment vendors and schools to improve the quality of formative assessments as it prepares to transition to the new generation of state assessments that will include a formative dimension. RTTT funding will be used to purchase computer equipment that will help support the transition to the new computer adaptive assessments. Training programs for assessment coordinators, superintendents and school administrators will be expanded to begin providing information about the new assessment programs.

Total	70	68
-------	----	----

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	20
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The state currently has operational 10 of the 12 elements required by the America COMPETES Act. There is no state law or regulation that prohibits matching K-12 data with that from Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), but currently any matching must be done by hand which leaves this requirement not fully accomplished. The data audits also appear to be accomplished manually with plans in place to automate that process. The state is continuing to work on enhancements to the system, especially in the areas of accessibility and reporting, and implementation of a fully robust data warehouse. The timeline calls for the data warehouse to be operational in FY2013.</p>		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The current P-12 data warehouse and reporting system is capable of tying student performance to teachers/staff, courses, and financial data. However, access is currently provided to only about 1600 users. Plans are in place to increase availability to over 300,000 users through an education portal. As this expansion is accomplished the state will develop the necessary security to enable users to access only the data appropriate to their role. Plans are also underway to expand the data warehouse to become P-20. This will require the development of new and coordinated data dictionaries, data maps, user manuals, etc. The data warehouse system has the capability to generate customized data sets, reports and files, and a data dashboard is to be available in summer 2010.</p> <p>The state has provided a goal accompanied by a list of activities and a timeline with aggressive performance measures. However, the state did not specify a responsible party for each activity. While the state indicates that it will expand its two annual data conferences to include training on how to use data to inform education policy, there is not sufficient detail as to the reports and training that will support decision makers in improving instruction, policy, operations, management, resource allocation and overall effectiveness.</p>		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	10
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	3
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	3
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has provided 3 broad goals accompanied by a list of activities. However, the state provided neither a timeline nor an indication of the party responsible for each activity. Additionally, the activities do not clearly delineate a plan that will accomplish high-quality use of the data to improve instruction.

The state indicates a plan to expand the use of two different instructional improvement systems that already serve 34% of the students in the state's two largest districts. The proposal, however, then states that a Request for Proposals (RFP) will be issued in February. These two statements in the application appear to conflict. The application neither addresses how the instructional improvement systems will include information from formative/interim assessments nor how the system will support such critical improvement strategies as looking at student work.

The state will implement a number of professional development programs to support the use of instructional improvement systems. Part of the Leadership Institute training will focus on effective use of data. Two different on-line learning systems will provide professional development for administrators and teachers in data use. One of these will be a "workshop"-based approach while the other will be an "on-demand" system. The latter will also provide a repository of best practices. The proposal is not clear on how this professional development will assist the users to take the next step once the data have identified an instructional need; that is, what instructional interventions would be appropriate. No plan was provided to include training of a school-based resource person. It is unlikely that an effort that does not provide a local support person will be successful.

The state currently has extract, transform, load and validate tools that are used to extract data from the P-12 data warehouse into a different system that is used for state and federal reporting. This system can be expanded to produce data files for use by external researchers. Internal researchers can access and analyze much data within the instructional information systems. The proposal also indicates that individualized student instruction and performance can be integrated into the system. A "data mart" can also provide cross agency data structured into customized data sets.

Total	47	33
-------	----	----

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	13
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	2
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	7

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

All of the current alternative routes for teachers require some involvement of an IHE: at a minimum, taking one course in the teaching of reading. Additionally, the alternative paths meet only 2 of the 5 criteria listed in the application definition. Alternative paths for principals can operate outside of an IHE but only for individuals who are licensed as counselors or have significant post-secondary teaching experience.

216 (19%) of teachers granted an initial license in 2008-2009 had completed a alternative pathway program. Seven (3%) of 252 administrator licenses granted that year were through an alternative pathway. The state indicates that it intends to expand its contract with Teach for America but it is not clear whether TFA operates totally independently from IHEs.

The state annually provides reports on licensure discrepancy. A recent statute also requires an annual report that examines the supply and demand of educators. The state has put into place many programs to address shortages:

- Requiring preparation programs to develop plans with measurable objectives for increasing numbers of teachers in core academic areas;
- Creating a Leadership Institute to address administrator supply and demand;
- Developing two transition to teaching programs that include financial and mentoring support;
- Using NSF funds to recruit math and science teachers;
- Developing online bilingual and TESOL licensure programs;
- Providing funding to support candidates to complete alternative licenses with bilingual or TESOL endorsements; and
- Creating a program to allow retired teachers to return to work without income restrictions.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	30
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	11
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	4
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	13

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has provided 5 goals accompanied by a list of activities, a timeline and a responsible party. The proposed activities do not sufficiently specify a comprehensive plan with an aggressive timeline to improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance.

The state indicates that it will convene a representative group to develop a model to measure individual student growth in a valid and reliable manner. The proposal also references the state's standards-based assessments and the state's participation in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium. The assessment information provided through either of these two avenues will cover only a limited range of subject areas and, thus, teachers. There was no discussion of measures to be considered for teachers in other grades/subjects or for principals. There was also no discussion of what potential growth measurement models might be considered by the group.

The state currently has a set of 9 competencies that teachers must meet. The state plans to implement student growth as a significant factor by July 2013. The Race to the Top Workgroup developed a list of assurances that will guide this work as well as the broad range of key stakeholders who will be involved in the development of the plan.

The state currently requires annual teacher performance evaluations. The state will use RTTT funds to train principals and superintendents on how to evaluate the performance of school employees. The proposal neither addressed annual evaluations of principals nor did it address how annual evaluations will provide teachers and principals with timely and effective feedback, especially data on student growth for their students, classes and schools.

The state currently provides mentoring for beginning teachers and will expand the mentoring program to include principal and superintendent mentoring. However, the proposal contained no information specific to how the annual evaluations will be utilized to inform this mentoring. The state will provide signing or retention bonuses to highly effective teachers and principals that continue to demonstrate effectiveness in high-need schools. Additionally, as teachers move through the Three-Tier Licensure system, they become eligible for increased levels of minimum compensation. The state does not have tenure, but the annual evaluations are used as teachers move from Level-I in the licensure system to Level-II. If a teacher does not move to Level-II within the first five years, then he/she may not continue to teach. LEAs and charters have the authority to remove ineffective teachers, but the proposal provided no clear plan to use data from

the annual evaluations to inform these decisions. Also, the proposal provided no information related to principal dismissal.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	9
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	4
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state provided a goal accompanied by a list of activities, a timeline and a responsible party. The activities and performance measures do not provide sufficient strategies to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals.

The state did not provide definitions of high minority or high poverty schools as required. The state also did not indicate how the data included in the STARS data warehouse will include information about a teacher's or principal's effectiveness; that is, achieving at least one and one-half year's student growth in order to be considered highly effective. Posting reports that show distributions of teachers and principals designated as highly effective will not ensure that inequitable distributions are addressed.

The state plans a number of programs principally focused on recruiting. These programs are focused heavily in the math and science areas with no specific attention to special education or language instruction education programs. The proposal offered no information how any of these efforts were directed at increasing the number of effective teachers as defined in the application notice. The state seemed to focus more on increasing the number of teachers rather than on improving teacher effectiveness.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	8
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	5
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	3

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state provided a goal accompanied by a list of activities, a timeline and a responsible party. The proposed activities, however, do not clearly address all the comprehensive strategies that will be required to improve the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs.

Beginning this year (FY2011), teacher preparation programs will receive results of student performance on the state assessments linked to individual teachers and principals who completed licensure programs at their institution. Once the student growth measure is implemented, it will be reported, as well. There is no indication that Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) have been involved in formulating the plans for this section, or that data will be reported for non-IHE teacher preparation programs such as Teach for America or the portfolio alternate pathway.

The state plans to offer incentives of up to \$100,000 to effective IHE educator preparation programs. The programs will choose how to use the funds and could use the funds to expand recruiting and marketing. It is not likely that this amount will be sufficient to serve as a catalyst to drive change. There is also no discussion or activity relative to expanding non-IHE based programs or to expanding existing preparation programs beyond recruiting more students into the program.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	10
(i) Providing effective support	10	5
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	5

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The goal and list of activities, timeline and responsible party provided in the proposal do not clearly specify a comprehensive plan that ensures teachers and principals receive effective, data-informed professional development.

The state plans to align the revised evaluation system which includes student growth, with the system of professional development. However, it only references using this alignment to inform professional development for effective and highly effective teachers and principals. Beyond that, the proposal includes plans for some significant professional development activities but lacks a clear link to data-assessed needs. There is also no discussion of job-embedded professional development, of collaboration time for teachers and principals, or of how the standards from the National Staff Development Council will be used to help ensure the professional development is of high quality.

The plans for evaluating the professional development efforts rely solely on teacher self-reported survey information with no measure of changes in teacher behaviors--such as through observations or examination of unit plans--or student achievement/growth. There is no comprehensive plan as to how even this survey data will be used to continuously improve the professional development supports.

Total	138	70
-------	-----	----

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has statutory and regulatory authority to intervene directly in the persistently lowest-achieving schools and LEAs. With the exception of not being able to turn over school operation to a private contractor, this legal authority includes all four of the school intervention models.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	27
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	22

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The application appendix presented the method for identifying Tier 1 and Tier 2 persistently lowest-performing schools. Twenty Tier 1 schools were listed and 9 Tier 2 schools. The proposal indicated that Appendix E-2-3 listed the model that each school plans to implement but this reviewer was unable to locate that information. The proposal indicates that 9 schools have been selected for School Improvement Grants and at least 20 more will be supported by RTTT funds--10 in year 1 and an additional 10 in year 2.

The principal strategies that the state proposes to implement in the persistently lowest-achieving schools are:

- Hiring a turnaround leader;
- Engaging teachers in the strategies;
- Involving parents, students and community;
- Aligning the instruction to standards and student data; and
- Leveraging resources to support the strategies.

These are all strategies that are important to a successful effort, however, they fall short of presenting a coherent plan for the aggressive, comprehensive change that will be required to turn around these persistently lowest-achieving schools.

The state will assign a regional support specialist to partner with each of the schools. It is unlikely, however, that visiting a minimum of once every three weeks will be sufficient assistance from the specialist. The state has also laid out three stages of progressively increasing direct intervention when schools are identified as not having the political will and/or capacity to successfully implement the intervention model. The state will also formalize a statewide Professional Learning Community System to serve these schools, as well as all other state schools. Particular attention in the system will be to expand resources to assist an existing cadre of approximately 200 instructional coaches. The state will issue an RFP to select a contractor to benchmark progress and performance to evaluate the success of the turnaround efforts.

The state has had very limited past experience in school turnaround. Only two schools are cited as having implemented most of the components of the transformational model. Those efforts began in 2008-2009 so student learning evidence is not yet available. The state does indicate that the principal is the most important factor in determining a turnaround effort's success.

The state has provided a list of activities but lacks a timeline and responsible party. Additionally, the activities and performance measures for years 1 and 2 fall short of the aggressive, comprehensive change that will be required to turn around these persistently lowest-achieving schools. No performance measures were provided for years 3 and 4.

Total	50	37
-------	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	9
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	4
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The proportion of the state's total recurring revenue that was allocated to elementary, secondary and public higher education increased from approximately 49% in FY08 to 57% in FY09.</p> <p>The state distributes funds to LEAs on a formula basis. Some additional funds are allocated for educational reform. The formula guarantees 100% of program costs or a minimum amount of funding in order to provide instructional services to students and day-to-day operations to LEAs regardless of the LEA's wealth. No state control is exercised over the allocations among schools in a district once the funds are distributed to the LEA; thus, there is no mechanism to ensure that high need schools are funded equitably.</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	36
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	7
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	7
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8

(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	6
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>While the state does restrict the number of new charters that can be authorized in any one year, that "cap" has never come into play. Even if it were to come into play now, the number of charters would still exceed 10% of the total public schools in the state. For small districts under 1300 students, there is a restriction whereby a charter school cannot serve more that 10% of the students in the district in the initial start-up year. Charters are not restricted by geographic region, or to serving students of a particular demographic. Charters are also not restricted to providing any type of program such as only for gifted students or only for dropouts.</p> <p>Charters may be authorized either by an LEA or by the state. The state's Charter Schools Act provides the legal requirements for charter school application, authorization, reauthorization, and closure. Applicants must define clear, challenging student achievement goals, and charter schools seeking renewal must demonstrate student achievement through reports of student scores on the state assessments. The state has no authorization criterion that would encourage charters to serve student populations that are similar to the district population. From 2007-2009, twenty charter applications to the state were denied due to inadequacy of educational, financial and/or governance plans in the application. Three district-authorized charters were closed from 2005-2007 due to findings of fiscal mismanagement and one district charter school was closed in 2008 for a combined lack of academic progress, fiscal mismanagement and governance issues. In 2009, the state denied renewal to one charter due to lack of academic progress.</p> <p>Funds are allocated to charter schools using the exact same formula that is used for all other public schools. LEAs may withhold 2% of those funds to cover its administrative support of a charter school.</p> <p>The state provides charter schools with capital funding for lease payments in the amount of \$700 per student/per year. The state also has authorizing legislation that permits LEAs and charter schools to enter into lease-purchase agreements for facilities. LEAs that request voters to approve a capital outlay levy are required to include charter schools in that levy proposal.</p> <p>The state allows for thee creation of magnet schools and several other non-traditional programs, generally through waivers. The examples given in the application included both elementary and secondary schools, however, it is not clear that the waiver would allow all of the elements included in the RTTT definition of innovative, autonomous schools.</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The state has implemented several other educational reform initiatives and evaluation results for three of these have shown some promise. Two of the initiatives focus on early childhood; one on bilingual education, especially for Hispanic and American Indian students, and one expanding the statewide cyber academy which serves state employees, teachers, administrators and school support staff as well as students. The state has recently used ARRA funds to establish a program to bring back 10,000 dropouts, address the achievement gap and improve graduation rates.</p>		
Total	55	49

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The state's STEM efforts propose to prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the STEM fields, focusing on underrepresented groups, schools in need of improvement and female students. The STEM efforts will focus on the following areas of reform:</p>		

- Teacher quality in STEM fields;
- Development and/or adoption of STEM curricula aligned to national and international standards;
- Expansion of online, dual-credit and AP STEM courses;
- Employing a full time STEM specialist at the state level;
- Recruiting more students, especially minorities and females into computational sciences; and
- Conducting a five-year public awareness campaign for STEM education.

Total	15	15
-------	----	----

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The proposal provides a plan for reform that builds directly on previous state efforts. All four required areas are addressed and the numbers of schools and students participating are well beyond what would be required to achieve significant statewide impact. The goals and plans for implementation are sufficient to help ensure that the project is completed.		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	368
--------------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Mexico Application #3600NM-5



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	53
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	40
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

In this section of the application, the State proposes a reform agenda that articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and for improving student outcomes statewide, and establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals.

In 2003, New Mexico enacted HB 212 *Public School Reforms*. This legislation addressed attracting and retaining quality teachers and principals; holding students, teachers, schools, LEAs, charters, and the State accountable for student performance; providing a culturally diverse curriculum with high expectations for all students; and providing better support for students, educators, families, and schools. The State reported that in spite of this legislation, educational performance in New Mexico has only seen incremental gains and large achievement gaps continue to separate low-income students and students of color from others. The State reports that the current application builds on the education reforms of the past seven years and establishes State initiatives to prepare students for success in college and the workplace through the adoption of internationally benchmarked standards and assessments; builds data systems that measure student success and informs teachers and principals about how they can improve their practices; increases teacher effectiveness and achieving equity in teacher distribution; and turns around persistently lowest-achieving schools.

In this section, the State verified that it proposes a reform agenda in which the State commits to adopting, by August 2, 2010, a common set of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards and signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association. Additionally, the State signed an MOU with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and with the National Center on Education and the Economy to develop and implement high-quality assessments that are aligned with the common core. The State also commits to fully implementing a Statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements and will collaborate with LEAs and charters to increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems.

The State also proposes to build on the existing alternative routes to certification for teachers and school leaders and to implement a process for monitoring, evaluating, identifying, and filling areas of shortages in schools and for revising and strengthening the State's Three-Tier Licensure and Teacher Evaluation System and the Principal Evaluation System to include student growth data as a significant factor in determining overall effectiveness of teachers and principals. Additionally, New Mexico will use its legal, statutory, and regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools and identified schools will use the School Success Alliance, a new governance framework that gives

autonomy coupled with local community and State partnerships to accomplish long-lasting improvement. The State also proposes to use recurring revenue to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education, and implement a MOU regarding the goals, activities, and annual targets for key performance measures.

(ii)

New Mexico has 89 LEAs, 33 State-authorized LEA charter schools and 59 district authorized charter schools, for a total of 122 LEAs in the State. The 87 LEAs that have signed an MOU enroll 89% of the State's K-12 student population and represent 83% of the State's schools and 88% of the State's students living in poverty. In the application, the State notes that all 87 participating LEAs have MOUs with all the applicable signatures, and 32 (71%) of the 45 LEAs with collective bargaining agreements signed the MOU. The State notes in the application that only 44 of the State's 89 school LEAs and charters have collective bargaining agreements and one of the State's 28 State-chartered charter schools has a bargaining agreement.

In the current proposal, participating LEAs committed to implementing the goals, activities, and annual targets in the proposed reform plan and agreed to implement the eight requirements specified in the MOU: 1) participate in implementation of the common core standards; 2) provide data requested; 3) fully participate in implementation of a Statewide longitudinal data system; 4) fully participate in local instructional improvement systems; 5) fully participate in the inclusion of student growth in the revised and strengthened Three-Tier Licensure and Teacher Evaluation System and the Principal Evaluation System; 6) fully participate in the mentoring system for beginning teachers and principal and superintendent mentorship; 7) use evaluations to provide opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals to obtain additional compensation and provide substantial financial incentives; 8) use the standards and revised evaluation systems to inform decisions regarding tenure and licensure; and, 9) fully participate in providing effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are ongoing and job embedded.

The number of points awarded in this section is due to the concern that while all participating LEAs have an MOU in place, the MOUs do not contain signatures from unions which may impact the level of commitment needed to effectively implement the proposed reforms.

(iii)

In New Mexico, 77% of the LEAs and 54% of the State-chartered schools committed to participating in the reform agenda proposed in this application. The participating LEAs represent 89% of the State's K-12 student population, 83% of the State's schools, and 88% of the State's students living in poverty. As a result, the participating LEAs should translate into broad Statewide impact and give the State the critical participation level needed to reach its established goals.

The State established the following student achievement goals for 2010-11 on the NMSBA: 65% of fourth-grade students who achieve proficiency or above on standards-based assessments in reading; 50% of fourth-grade students who achieve proficiency or above on the standards-based assessments in mathematics; 65% of eighth-grade students who achieve proficiency or above on the standards-based assessments in reading; and, 40% of eighth-grade students who achieve proficiency or above on the standards-based assessments in mathematics. On NAEP, the State plans to attain 30% proficiency for all students in 8th grade math (up from 20% in 2009) and 32% proficiency for all students in 8th grade reading (up from 22% in 2009) by 2013. Additionally the State set goals for closing the achievement gaps. Using the NMSBA, the State will strive for 100% proficiency in reading and mathematics for all students in grades 3-8 and high school, with no gaps in achievement, and using the NAEP, the State plans for steady and significant decrease in the achievement gaps on the 8th grade reading and math assessments. The State acknowledges that it has a persistent achievement gap in graduation rates and established a 2% annual graduation rate increase from 63% in 2009 to 85% by 2021. The State also plans to decrease the remediation rate by approximately 8% per year until remediation is no longer needed and to increase the college enrollment rate from 63% in 2009 to 85%.

The State established improvement targets in each of the four required grant areas and established attainable goals in each area. However, the achievement targets seem to be inconsistent. For example, the State established a target at 65% for students in reading on the State assessment and a 32% target in reading on NAEP. Additionally, the State does not provide specific targets for achievement gaps on NAEP and the targets established for graduation and college enrollment do not appear to be sufficiently rigorous at a 2% annual rate as after 12 years (2009-2021) the State will still only be at 85% for graduation and college enrollment. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the lack of consistency and rigor in the reported targets.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	23
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

In this section of the application, the State demonstrated that it has the capacity to implement a RttT grant. In New Mexico, the Public Education Department (NMPED) is an Executive Agency with a Governor-appointed Secretary and the NMPED collaborates with a wide range of stakeholders to implement a PreK-20 education system. The State noted that it is proud of the strong partnerships that it has with 22 tribes, pueblos, and Indian nations, and reports that it has been able to create a public education system that is both embraced by and embracing of Native American students. In April 2010, New Mexico's Secretary of Education convened a group of legislative, education, business, and community leaders to discuss the need to undertake ongoing education reform.

In the current application, the State plans to implement the proposed education reform goals and activities through strong leadership at the State level, including leaders at the NMPED, other State agencies and State-level councils, commissions and institutes, tribal entities, and LEAs. In addition, a School Improvement Task Force, created by the Governor, will oversee and coordinate the proposed reform agenda. The State plans to work with key stakeholders and partners to maximize the State's human and financial resources to accomplish the reform agenda. Three NMPED staff members will serve in a leadership role to integrate all the parts of the plan, and a project management team will focus on grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, fund distribution, tracking and reporting progress on performance measures, and will work with partners to ensure that all necessary data gathering and reporting requirements are built into New Mexico's P-20 Statewide longitudinal data system and provide timely and useful reports. NMPED will support participating LEAs and charters and hold them accountable for progress and performance on the goals and activities. The State will also use the New Mexico Office of Recovery and Reinvestment (NMORR) to ensure that the funds are expended appropriately and will oversee New Mexico's implementation of all elements in the ARRA. The State plans to work closely with its Comprehensive Center and Regional Educational Laboratory to strengthen its capacity to implement, monitor, and support LEAs and charters in the reform initiatives, identify promising practices, and eliminate ineffective practices. Additionally, these organizations will provide technical assistance, evaluate programs and practices, and help the State benchmark progress.

The Office of Education Accountability (OEA) in the New Mexico Department of Finance and Administration will issue RFPs for external reviews and evaluations of the RttT initiatives and use the evidence to determine which initiatives are successful and should be sustained with State resources after funding has ended. The reports from the independent evaluations will be provided to the Governor, Legislature and other interested parties on a timely basis. Additionally, the State intends to coordinate or repurpose education funds from other sources so that they align with the State's proposed goals and will align the reforms with initiatives funded by the State's federal School Improvement Grant, and integrate the work with the initiatives established by the Governor.

The number of points awarded in this section of the application is due to the concern that the State does not indicate how the external partners will build LEA and SEA capacity to implement and sustain the reform agenda.

(ii)

New Mexico indicated that it received letters of support from a broad group of stakeholders, including teachers' unions, Indian/tribal leaders, education organizations, the New Mexico Coalition of Charter Schools, business leaders, colleges and universities, government officials, community-based organizations, parent-teacher associations, LEAs, district charters, and state-chartered schools, nonprofits, and National Laboratories. However, the letters submitted with the application do not include letters of support from Indian/tribal leaders, raising the question as to whether the State has support from this critical stakeholder group, especially since the State plans to leverage the support generated by various groups and leaders to develop and implement the strategies in the proposed reform agenda.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	20
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	16

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

In this section of the application, the State described the initiatives that have been implemented in each of the four education reform areas. The State indicated that the current application builds on the State's education reforms and is designed to prepare students for success in college and the workplace, adopt internationally benchmarked standards and assessments, build data systems that measure student success, and inform teachers and principals on how they can improve their practices, increase teacher effectiveness and achieve equity in teacher distribution, and turn around persistently lowest-achieving schools.

New Mexico revised State policies to ensure that its schools are using a system of standards and assessments and an editorial published in *Quality Counts*, placed New Mexico second in the nation for States with the most comprehensive alignment initiatives; in addition, a report released by the National Center for Educational Statistics indicated that the State's assessments were mapped to the NAEP and ranked New Mexico as 9th in the nation in NAEP fourth grade reading and math, 6th in eighth grade math, and 14th in eighth grade reading.

On April 13, 2010, New Mexico joined Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and joined the National Center on Education and the Economy to collaborate with a consortium of States to develop a system of formative and summative assessments, organized around the common set of K-12 standards. In addition, the State joined the National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers to establish common core standards. Those standards will be adopted by the New Mexico Public Education Department by August 2, 2010. Also, the State is a member of the Teacher-City-State Collaboration that will test the new Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics and participates in the ADP Network, an alliance of 35 States organized by Achieve, Inc.

The State has a four-phased plan for developing a P-20 Statewide longitudinal data system. The Student and Teacher Accountability Reporting System (STARS) is a comprehensive student, staff, and course information system and data warehouse that provides a standard data set for each student in the public education system. The Governor created the Data Warehouse Council to improve P-20 student success through educational and workforce systems and provide timely data to teachers, principals, parents, and policymakers. Additionally, NMPED, NMHED, Department of Workforce Solutions, and the College Success Network developed an electronic student management system to help New Mexico prepare students for college and career readiness.

The State has a Three-Tiered Teacher Licensure System that ensures teacher quality through accountability and support, encourages retention of teachers, and links teachers' licensure levels and salaries to classroom work. The State provides funding for the three-tier licensure through the State's State Equalization Guarantee and data on the program shows that in 2009-2010, 99.44% of core classes in all schools were taught by High Quality Teachers. The State also conducts a New Mexico Leadership Institute that consists of five programs: licensure for aspiring principals; mentoring for new principals; intensive support for principals in the lowest achieving schools; professional development for aspiring superintendents; and mentoring for new superintendents. In addition, the State has a Principal Support Network that has trained 500 leaders in 82 of 89 school LEAs and in Bureau of Indian Education schools on how to use standards-based data to improve student achievement and assessment literacy.

New Mexico uses state and federal funds to support a School Improvement Framework which is design to implement systemic reform in schools that are in need of improvement and provides targeted assistance, intensive classroom assistance, and systems for increasing achievement in schools and LEAs and charters not meeting proficiency as measured by the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment. The Framework implements educational practices which represent the most current research on school improvement and provides schools with strategies on how to increase student achievement, and accountability. Additionally, the State implemented Project 2012, a plan for transformational change in K-12 math and science education, and designed a model for turning around schools called the School Success Alliance.

(ii)

The State reports that student performance on the NAEP showed a steady, incremental increase from 2003 -2009 and student performance on the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA) also increased incrementally. However, data on the NAEP show that student performance is more than 10 points below the national average. Test scores for New Mexico students have increased for 4th grade math and reading, student performance on the NMSBA increased in math, reading, and science, and in the last five years, the percentage of students attaining proficiency or above has increased 11% overall in math, 5% overall in reading and 6% overall in science. Student proficiency in math increased in grades 3-8 in 2009, with 3rd grade attaining a 10% increase over 2008. Over the last five years, 8th grade students improved the most with a gain of 18%, and the percentage of students proficient or above in reading increased in every grade except 8th. In the application, the State described several Statewide interventions that have been implemented to increase student achievement and decrease achievement gaps. The interventions include the implementation of full-day kindergarten, a pre-kindergarten program, the Three-Tiered Teacher Licensure System and a Statewide focus on STEM.

The State reports that NAEP data show that some achievement gaps have closed incrementally since 2003. However, the White /Hispanic achievement gap has not closed. The State has a 25-point gap between White and Hispanic and African American students and a 37-point gap between White and Native American students who are proficient or above in reading. There is a 24-point gap between White and Hispanic students, a 27-point gap between White and African American students, and a 31-point gap between White and Native American students scoring proficient or above in 4th grade math. In 2009, each gap had closed by 1 percentage point. In 2005, the State had a 23-point gap between White and Hispanic and African American students, and a 29-point gap between White and Native American 8th grade students proficient or above in math. In 2009, the gap between White and Hispanic students increased by 1 point, the African American gap increased by 3 points, and the Native American gap increased by 4 points. In 8th grade reading, the State had a 21-point gap between White and Hispanic and African American students, and a 32-point gap between White and African American students. In 2009, the gap between White and Hispanic students closed by 1 point but the gap between White and African American students increased by 3 points, while the gap between White and Native American students closed by 2 points.

The State reported that it calculated a cohort graduation rate in 2009 but prior to that time, the State used a senior completion method. The State also explained that the State's longitudinal data system did not contain the necessary data to inform a 5-year rate and as a result, the State used a transitional 4-year rate for all students, including students that are given extra time to graduate, such as English language learners and students with disabilities. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets were adjusted to account for the inclusion of these students in the 2009 baseline year and in order to capture the outcomes of students

continuing to fulfill graduation requirements during the summer following the senior year, the State reporting of graduation is lagged by one year and the State sought permission from the U.S. Department of Education for New Mexico to duplicate the graduation rates from 2007 in 2008. In 2010, New Mexico published the first 5-year cohort graduation rate of 60.3% which was nearly ten percent below the national average of 70%. The State reported that like the achievement gaps, the State has persistent graduation gaps. Caucasian students had a graduation rate of 71.3 percent; Asian students had a rate of 80.1 percent, Hispanic students had a graduation rate of 56.2 percent, African American students had a rate of 60.9 percent, American Indian students had a graduation rate of 49.8 percent, Economically Disadvantaged students had a rate of 64.8 percent; and English language learners had a graduation rate of 61.1 percent.

New Mexico reported that it has been able to increase student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; however, student achievement data is still at least 10 points below the national average on NAEP. State data show that the State still has a large gap in subgroup performance and in some cases, the gap has increased over time. In addition, the State reports persistent gaps in the graduation rate across subgroups. As a result, the number of points awarded to this section is due to the concern that the State's selected improvement efforts have been insufficient to realize the levels of achievement needed for a RttT reform agenda.

Total	125	96
-------	-----	----

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	35
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	15

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

In this section of the application, the State demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards and to participate in a consortium that includes a significant number of States.

New Mexico reported that it signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association (NGA) to develop and adopt common core high-quality standards. Through this initiative, 49 States formed a consortium to develop a common set of internationally benchmarked standards in English language arts and mathematics for grades K-12.

(ii)

In this section of the application, the State demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of standards and reported that it will officially adopt the common core standards no later than August 2, 2010. The adoption process follows the State's Administrative Code requirements that require a 30-day posting period for public comment and review, and a public hearing. The State plans to release the standards in July 2010, revise and publish the Final Rule August 2, 2010, and adopt benchmarks and performance standards no later than November 2010. As part of the review process for the draft standards, the State held several on-line conferences with instructional leaders Statewide to introduce and build awareness about the draft standards and to encourage comments/feedback. In addition, the State participated in the American Diploma Project which involved the development and adoption of new standards aligned to the draft common core standards, and developed an electronic tracking system to monitor the implementation and use of the common standards in LEAs and charters. SEA staff have been trained in its use and once the common core standards are adopted, the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) will offer training and technical assistance to implement the standards, and two Statewide committees will review

existing New Mexico language arts and mathematics content standards and determine which, if any, should be retained within the newly adopted common set of K-12 standards.

While the State intends to adopt the standards by August 2 and accompanying benchmarks and performance standards by November, the number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for information on a well-planned process to implement the standards and the companion question of how the State plans to use an electronic tracking system to monitor the implementation and use of the common core standards.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	9
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	4
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

In this section of the application, the State demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, by participating in a consortium of States that are working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments. In the application, the State reports that it is in the process of developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments that are aligned to the common core standards and that the State is a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and the National Center on Education and the Economy States (NCEE) Consortium to develop and implement high-quality assessments that are aligned with the common core standards and support a growth-based accountability model. The State will to use its membership in the working groups to develop the kinds of exams that will support and empower students who wish to “test out” of the core courses, be awarded high school credit and either graduate early, or participate in extended learning through dual credit and distance education or accepted in IHE credit-bearing courses. When completed, the State will have an assessment system that has multiple components: a variety of item types to measure the full range of the standards, including those that address higher-order cognitive skills and abilities; a plan to incorporate curriculum-embedded performance and complex computer-based simulations; online adaptive solutions for summative and formative assessments; support for the transition to online adaptive assessments; a systematic solution to informed decision-making; high-quality curriculum and instructional supports for teachers; inclusion of teachers in the design, development, and implementation of the system; adherence to professional standards for assessment.

The State also plans to use the aligned assessments as a bridge to the next generation of assessments that will monitor student growth, and plans to use its Statewide database to monitor student growth, and generate academic growth reports on an individual, school and district level. By August 1, 2010, the NMPED will implement a new system for collecting and reporting data on teacher and principal effectiveness, will re-design the database during the pilot phase for the next generation assessments and prepare for full State implementation of the assessments and reporting of student growth in school year 2014-2015.

(ii)

In this section of the application, the State verified that it participates in an assessment consortium that includes one-half of the States in the country. New Mexico reports that it participates in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium which was formed from a merger of the Balanced Assessment, MOSAIC, and SMARTER consortiums, resulting in a consortium of 45 States. The State also participates in the National Center on Education and the Economy's Board Examination Pilot Project with a consortium of eight States: Connecticut, Kentucky, Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	15
--	-----------	-----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

In this section of the application, the State outlined an extensive plan for transitioning to and implementing common core standards and high-quality assessments. To supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments, New Mexico proposes to implement a plan that is guided by three overarching goals: 1) deliver effective professional development to practitioners in LEAs and charters to build the State's capacity to make and support the transition to the new standards and assessments; 2) continue its partnership with the Career and College Readiness Policy Institute and the America Diploma Project to support the transition to new high school assessments; and 3) continue to administer, score, and report the standards-based assessment/high school graduation assessment until the year prior to full implementation of Board examinations to ensure a smooth transition.

The State indicated that a *Quality Counts* report ranked New Mexico second in the nation for States with the most comprehensive alignment initiatives. The State reports that this work is linked to participation in the internationally benchmarked common standards and its efforts to ensuring that students are college and career ready upon graduation from high school. In its transition plan, the State will provide technical assistance through the provision of guidelines, preliminary alignment cross-walks, and high-quality professional development.

New Mexico reported that the State's summative standards-based assessment is administered with paper and pencil in reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and 11, and in science in grades 4, 7, and 11. The State is currently reviewing the formative assessments administered in grades 9 and 10 and will publish the first list of approved grade 9 and 10 formative assessments and allow LEAs and charters to use any listed assessments. Since the State does not currently have a Statewide formative assessment in grades 3 through 8, LEAs and charters decide which formative assessment they will use. The new assessments developed through the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium will be administered Statewide as computer adaptive tests (CATs) no later than the 2014-2015 school year and the State acknowledges that technology resources will need to be improved to successfully implement CATs. In the current plan, the State proposes to use RttT funding to purchase computer equipment, primarily mobile computer labs, to be used at participating/LEAs and charters. In addition to the mobile computer lab, the State proposes to use longer test administration windows to facilitate the transition to CATs. The NMPED will continue to administer, score, and report the current summative assessment until the year prior to the implementation of the new summative assessment or 2013-2014, whichever is sooner. Operational costs associated with administration, scoring, and reporting of the new summative/formative assessments will be paid from an annual legislative appropriation allocated for student assessments.

New Mexico will implement a High School End-of-Course Assessment in at least one course by 2013-2014 and in all courses by 2014-2015, and will continue to administer, score, and report the standards-based assessment/high school graduation assessment until the year prior to full implementation of Board Examinations or 2013-2014, whichever is sooner. The State will approve up to five Board Examination programs for use in approximately 20 pilot high schools across the State beginning in fall 2010 and in 2011-2012, students will volunteer to take the exams at the end of 10th grade and will be given a high school diploma and an opportunity to enroll the next fall as a full-time student at any two-or four-year open admissions post-secondary institution in New Mexico without having to take remedial courses, or they may also choose to remain in high school and take a program of study designed to prepare them for college entry, as well as a dual credit option. Any student who does not pass the lower division high school exams on their first try will be offered a customized program designed to help them succeed on their next attempt. The NMPED will continue to administer, score, and report the standards-based assessment/high school graduation assessment until the year prior to full implementation of Board Examinations or 2013-2014, whichever is sooner. To accomplish the assessment transition, the State outlined a detailed timeline and activities that will be implemented between August 2010 and the end of 2015; however, the number of points awarded in this section is due to the concern that the State does not plan to complete the transition to the new assessment until 2015, limiting the ability to use the assessment data to accomplish the

proposed reforms for using a data driven instructional management system and for using student growth data in evaluations and related decisions.

Total	70	59
-------	----	----

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State reports that the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED), Higher Education Department (NMHED), Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD), and Department of Workforce Solutions (DWS) currently have data systems that collect information from constituent groups including pre-schools, schools, universities, workforce centers, and others. NM-ACHIEVES will consolidate portions of these data into a common data collecting and reporting system to produce an integrated Statewide longitudinal data system. The State reports that according to the 2009 Data Quality Campaign report, New Mexico had nine of ten essential elements of preparation for college success. New Mexico has since begun to collect college preparation assessments, which will be completed the coming school year.

In the current application, the State reports that it has 9 of the 12 required America COMPETES element in place: a unique student identifier; student-level enrollment, demographics, and participation information; student-level information about points at which a student exits, transfers in/out, drops out, or completes PreK-16; yearly State assessment records of individual students; information on students not tested by grade and subject; teacher identifier system with ability to match individual teachers to individual students; student-level transcript information including course completion and grade earned; student-level college readiness test scores; and data on student transition from secondary to post-secondary, including remedial coursework enrollment. The State indicated that the three elements that are currently not in operation include: data necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in post-secondary; capacity to communicate with higher education systems; and a State data audit to assess data quality, validity, and reliability. In the application, the State established a timeframe and activities for implementing and refining the required elements.

The number of points awarded for this section of the application is calculated by multiplying the number of elements in place by 2 points each.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4
--	----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

In this section of the application, the State described its plan to ensure that data from the State's statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage key stakeholders, and that the data supports decision makers in continuously improving efforts in policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness. In the application, New Mexico stated that it plans to use the STARS P-12 data warehouse and reporting system as the foundation for all State and federal reporting, and to make the data available to stakeholders in a meaningful way, the State plans to implement a multi-part plan. In the first part of the plan, the State plans to complete development of the EUI, the main education portal through which all user groups can access education data systems, data warehouses, programs, applications, and tools. Secondly, the State plans to expand and enhance protocols to secure data sharing among numerous user groups with clearly delineated roles and purposes, and transition from an existing STARS user base to a system that provides data to over 300,000 users. Third, the State plans to install a Statewide Data Dashboard that will produce a high-level, easy to read, graphically rendered presentation layer of relevant data. The fourth part of the plan is to generate customized data sets and reports. In the fifth part of the plan, the State plans to generate customized data

files for specific user groups, provide researchers needing large data files with access to such files, ensure compliance with FERPA, and tailor information so that external groups can use to data to make informed education policy decisions. In the sixth part of the plan, the State will expand training to all stakeholders and use its two annual data conferences for STARS users to focus not only on data quality needs, but also on newly legislated data elements and data reporting requirements. Along with specific steps of the plan, the State established performance measures and timelines for each activity to be accomplished.

While the State plans to make data available to key stakeholders and decision-makers, the number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for information on who the State plans to designate as the responsible party to implement the proposed reforms.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	11
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	3
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	4
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

In this section of the application, the State described its plan to increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness. To accomplish this goal, the State plans to expand the systems already implemented by two of the State's largest LEAs. One district uses SchoolNet and the second district uses the Cognos software platform. The State also plans to expand the use of instructional improvement systems by creating an Instructional Improvement System Consortium comprised of LEAs and charters that currently do not have a comprehensive student information system and use RttT funds to purchase student instructional information systems for the districts currently without a system. Additionally, the State plans to assemble a Data Warehouse Council P-20 Educators' Advisory Group to advise the New Mexico Public Education Department on policies and practices related to instructional improvement systems (IISs) that impact LEAs and charters, and develop statewide standards for information systems. The State plans to extend the use of one of two instructional improvement systems currently in place and has a two part plan to accomplish the expansion. However, the application does not describe the effectiveness of either system or explain how the systems will be used differently to achieve higher student performance than has been previously accomplished in the State.

(ii)

In this section of the application, the State describes how it plans to support LEAs and schools in using instructional systems. The State indicates that in the past, the New Mexico Public Education Department, as well as the Office of Education Accountability in the Department of Finance and Administration provided professional development on data utilization. The training has been designed to give principals a more thorough understanding of their students' performance, what the data can and cannot tell them about that student's performance, the ability to begin root cause analyses, and a understanding of how to develop school improvement and individual student achievement plans. In this application, the State plans to build the capacity of LEAs and charters by providing effective professional development to their schools and to build the capacity of NMPED to deliver a quality system of support for using data to inform instruction. Specifically, the New Mexico Public Education Department will increase its capacity to take the lead role in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals, and other administrators on how to use instructional improvement systems and how to use these systems and data to support continuous improvement, and the New Mexico Leadership Institute will provide principal and superintendent training on how to effectively use data. The State plans to use both synchronous and asynchronous online delivery

systems, conduct Electronic Professional Online Learning Communities, and establish a teaching and administrator resource system that provides access to best practices, information, replicable successes, and technology resources. Finally, the State plans to form a Research Advisory Group to ensure that reports appropriately use data and meet various statutory requirements governing privacy rights.

The number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for implementation timelines and the designation of responsible parties to complete the proposed reform activities.

(iii)

The New Mexico P-12 STARS data warehouse uses data validation tools to extract and load relevant data sets into a State-level warehouse, and the State plans to use the existing system to expand its existing P-12 capabilities to higher education and State agencies. In its plan, the State proposes to build several data marts that will provide customized data sets to facilitate the work and analyses of teachers, principals, administrators, and researchers working in various capacities across the State. In the proposed State plan, researchers can analyze practices and performance by working with data sets inside their instructional information systems, and researchers working for State agencies, the Legislature, and/or the executive branch can analyze and compare practices and performances across the State through the State agency data warehouses, the respective data marts, and the expanded instructional information system. Additionally, independent researchers can have access to customized data sets such as cubes or files to conduct research on existing and proposed practices. The proposed plan will also establish a system for researchers to present their credentials for gaining access to the data and ensure compliance with LEAs, charters, and IHEs Investigative Review Boards (IRB). The State's P-20 Data Governance Council will appoint members from respective agencies to serve on a panel responsible for authorizing access and use of data, allowing integration at the end user, agency and data mart levels. The proposed plan also will allow for the distribution of research findings beyond traditional dissemination methods of meetings and conferences.

In this section of the application, the State plans to make the data from instructional improvement systems and the Statewide longitudinal data system available and accessible to researchers. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for additional information on how the State plans to ensure that researchers have sufficiently detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students.

Total	47	33
-------	----	----

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	14
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	4
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	5
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	5

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

The State reports that it has both statutes (22-10A-8 and 22-10A-11.1 NMSA 1978) and regulations (6.60.3 NMAC) that allow the development and implementation of high-quality, alternative paths to a teaching license, and reports that it has statutes (22-10A-11.1 and 22-10A-11.3 NMSA 1978) and regulations (6.60.3.9 and 6.62.2 NMAC) that provide alternative and provisional pathways for teachers and counselors to become licensed school principals. Additionally, the State has four alternative licensure options for principals.

While the appendix lists the four alternative licensure options for principals, the narrative does not provide sufficient information to determine if the alternative routes for both teachers and principals allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education. As a result, the number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for additional information regarding allowable providers.

(ii)

The State reports that it has alternative licensure programs for teachers who meet the State requirements and has 120 Teach for America teachers in high-need academic areas in schools that are over 90% Native American. At the present time, all of the State's alternative licensure programs except the Online Portfolio Alternative Licensure (OPAL) are offered through institutions of higher education in collaboration with LEAs. The State also implemented the Transition to Teaching program that allows individuals who are eligible for or have an Internship license to complete the program or portfolio route to alternative licensure with financial support from the grant. In addition, schools and preparation programs work together to identify qualified participants who can attend free workshops in best teaching practices. A free portfolio camp is offered by the University of New Mexico, and online-modules are available through Vanderbilt University.

The State provided data on the number of teachers and principals who completed each alternative program, each traditional program, and the total number of candidates who were certified in the last academic year. It also provided information on which alternative licensure programs are available at each institution. The number of points awarded in this section of the application is due to the fact that all but one of the State's alternative licensure routes are modifications of the traditional pathway, and the need for additional information to verify that the online option meets the criterion for an alternative route.

(iii)

New Mexico verified that it currently has a process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of shortage in schools, as well as plans to fill the shortage areas. The State reported that in 2009-10, 99.44% of classes in New Mexico were taught by highly qualified teachers. The NMPED produces reports on licensure discrepancy and highly qualified teachers and uses the data to identify teacher shortages by subject and level. State statute (22-10A-19.2 NMSA 1978) requires the State to operate an annual Educator Accountability Reporting System that examines the supply and demand of educators and evaluates the productivity and accountability of the New Mexico educator workforce. In addition, the Assistant Secretary for Educator Quality evaluates the reports and identifies the LEAs and charters that have shortages in teacher quality.

When shortages are identified, the State requires department and preparation program providers to develop plans with measurable objectives for increasing the number of teachers trained in the identified academic areas. Also, the State created the New Mexico Leadership Institute (NMLI) to track demand and increase the needed supply. The State developed two Transition to Teaching (NMT2T) programs that offer financial and mentoring support to 230 alternative licensure candidates working in high-needs schools, and recruits math and science teachers with National Science Foundation-funded fellowships. Additionally, the State developed online bilingual education and TESOL licensure programs at New Mexico State University because of shortages in those areas, provides external funding to Northern New Mexico College to support candidates to complete alternative licenses with bilingual and TESOL endorsements, and created a Return to Work Program that allows retired members of the Educational Retirement Fund to resume working for an Educational Retirement Board employer after completing a layout of 12 consecutive months.

The number of points awarded in this section of the application is due to the need for information on how the proposed activities will be sufficient to ensure that preparation programs train an adequate number of teachers and principals to fill the identified shortage areas.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	40
--	-----------	-----------

(i) Measuring student growth	5	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	11
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	18

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

In this section of the application, the State described its plan to measure growth for each individual student and proposed goals, activities, and timelines for establishing the State's approach. In the first goal, the State plans to implement a model for measuring individual student growth that will be a significant factor in the performance evaluation process currently included in the State's Three-Tiered Licensure and Teacher Evaluation System and the Principal Evaluation System. The State's second goal is to fully implement the revised teacher and principal evaluation system, and the third goal is to use the results from the Professional Practices and Standards Commission (PPSC) to strengthen the programs currently aimed at improving the recruitment, preparation, and support of principals and other school leaders. The State's fourth goal is to fully implement the New Mexico mentoring system for beginning teachers, and the fifth and final goal is to provide professional development on the use of teacher and principal evaluation data to inform key decisions related to effectiveness, compensation, promotion, retention, and dismissal.

In order to revise and strengthen the Three-Tiered Licensure and Teacher Evaluation System and the Principal Evaluation System to include student growth data, the State plans to adopt revised regulations to allow student growth to be measured by October 2010 and to have the PPSC convene representatives of educator groups to develop a model that measures individual student growth. When a draft model is agreed upon, PPSC will hold focus groups to ensure broad input into the re-design of the teacher and principal evaluation systems and plans to conclude the PPSC's work on July 1, 2014, when the system to measure and determine the weight student growth will be finalized and the evaluation systems will be revised.

The State indicates that it is well poised to measure individual student performance on the State's Standards-Based Assessment (SBA) and to link individual student performance to individual teachers through its existing and proposed data system. The system currently links teachers' licensure levels and salaries to evaluations of performance demonstrated in the classroom and can be designed to link the State's three tiers of licensure (Level I-beginning, Level II-professional, and Level III-master-level) to evaluations and state salary levels for teachers at different licensure levels.

In the application, the State described its approach to developing a system to measure growth as part of the new evaluation and established clear goals and timelines to complete the work. While data is currently available in the data system to incorporate student growth into teacher evaluations, the State does not discuss how the current system will be used to apply existing or new student growth data to principal evaluations.

(ii)

New Mexico plans to strengthen its existing statewide evaluation system and use student growth as a significant factor in determining overall effectiveness of teachers and principals. The State plans to consider other measures such as classroom observations, professional development plans, portfolios, administrator judgment, student evaluations, and parent interviews in the revised evaluation system. Additionally, the State plans to have the PPSC work with PED to modify and enhance the existing evaluation system and identify the data that will be used to determine teacher and principal effectiveness in each of the existing competencies. The State expects to use the work of the Smarter Balanced Consortium to transition to high, quality multiple measures of student growth and teacher impact, and expects to include assessments conducted at multiple points in time such as formative assessments, summative assessments, and evidence of student work. The PPSC will make the final recommendation to the Secretary of Education on which measures the State will use to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers and principals and how each should be weighted in the evaluation system.

New Mexico reports that it plans to include key stakeholder groups such as licensed teachers, instructional support providers, school administrators, professional educators from higher education, Indian educators, business owners, tribal representatives, and assessment experts in the design and development of the revised teacher and principal evaluation systems. Additionally, the State's RttT work group developed a list of assurances to guide the development of the new evaluation system. While the State proposes to implement a statewide evaluation system and use student growth as a significant factor in determining overall effectiveness of teachers and principals, the timeline established for this portion of the application is insufficient to develop and apply a student growth model to teacher and principal evaluations within the timeframe of the RttT grant.

(iii)

In the current proposal, the State indicated that each school district in New Mexico is required to submit a written teacher performance evaluation plan that meets regulatory requirements of the department and includes annual teacher performance evaluations, training for all teachers and administrative or supervisory personnel who are assigned teacher performance evaluation duties, and timely feedback. NMPED will develop and implement a system to train all teacher and principal evaluators, as well as superintendents, on how to evaluate the performance of school employees, develop a supervisor training model and delivery system that is aligned with the revised evaluation system, and certify principals and superintendents who participate in the training. The State indicated that individuals who are not fully trained and certified will not be permitted to conduct teacher and administrator evaluations.

The State proposes strong fidelity to the new evaluation system by training and certifying individuals who will be permitted to conduct teacher and administrator evaluations and plans to include feedback as part of the new evaluation system; however, the narrative in the current proposal does not identify or discuss the parameters for timely and constructive feedback. The number of points awarded in this section of the application is due to the need for additional information on what the State proposes regarding timely and constructive evaluation feedback.

(iv)

In this section of the application, the State verified that it plans to use the evaluations to inform decisions regarding compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, and that it plans to provide opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals to obtain additional compensation. The State plans to ensure that participating LEAs and charters use evaluations to provide financial incentives to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the lowest-performing schools. The State plans to offer signing bonuses and/or retention bonuses to highly effective teachers and principals who continue to demonstrate effectiveness in high-need schools, and will offer stipends to support transportation, housing, and extra responsibility pay. However, the State plans to make all incentives contingent upon continuing to teach in the same or a similar high-need school and maintaining a highly effective rating.

The State reports that it does not have tenure. As a result, the State proposes to implement several initiatives to ensure that participating LEAs and charters use the rigorous standards and the revised evaluation system to inform personnel decisions. The State plans to develop a training component for teachers and administrators that is tied to the new supervisor training and plans to revise the Professional Development Dossier system which is the cornerstone of advancement for teachers in New Mexico's Three-Tiered Licensure and Teacher Evaluation System. In New Mexico, teachers must complete the dossier in order to advance from Level I to Level II and to advance from Level II to Level III. Beginning teachers are required to successfully pass a year of mentoring and all strands of the dossier in order to advance to Level II, and are given up to five years to demonstrate their competency or they must leave the profession in New Mexico. The dossier documentation, which is submitted to independent reviewers, is tied to the rigorous teacher competencies and is a collection of classroom data such as lesson descriptions, handouts, student work, and video and audio recordings, along with explanations about the data and is accompanied by verification and recommendation by the district superintendent. The State indicated that no one part of the dossier serves to fully represent a teacher's work, rather, the entire dossier is intended to provide evidence to determine when a teacher is qualified to advance.

The State plans to ensure that participating LEAs and charters use the evaluation systems to inform decisions regarding dismissal of ineffective teachers and principals who have had ample opportunities to improve by developing an improved system to accurately track and report data on the dismissals of teachers and principals, analyzing data on the correlation of dismissals to student achievement, and training teacher and principal evaluators to use the improved system effectively. Once ineffective teachers have had ample opportunities to improve, the State is permitted to not renew a licensed school employee if the individual has been employed by the district for fewer than three years. Additionally, the evaluation process can directly influence decisions to remove ineffective teachers and principals. The State indicated that linking student growth to teacher and principal evaluations, improving and monitoring, and analyzing results of the evaluations will strengthen the system and increase the likelihood that ineffective teachers and principals will be removed. In addition, the State established activities and specific time frames to adopt regulations and revise the Professional Development Dossier system.

Once the system is in place, the State plans to develop and implement a method to analyze, monitor, and report the impact of the incentives on student achievement. In addition, the State indicated a particular interest in determining if a progressive career path that requires teachers to demonstrate increased competencies and take on increased responsibilities in return for increased levels of compensation is effective. In New Mexico, Level I teachers are assessed annually through their Professional Development Plans, and to continue teaching, the teacher must be able to move to Level II. Level I teachers that do not advance to Level II are ineligible to apply for a teaching license for three years. Effective teachers who choose to move to Level III, must have been at Level II licensure for at least three years, demonstrate that they meet Level II competencies, and earn a master's degree or National Board of Professional Teaching Standards certification. Once the compensation, promotion and retention plans are in place, the State plans to collect data to inform decisions and evaluate the impact of the program on the State's lowest achieving schools.

The State proposes to refine and revitalize the State's mentoring system for beginning teachers and expand it to include principal and superintendent mentorship. The State's Leadership Institute offers five programs that can be used to train aspiring principals and administrators: licensure for aspiring principals, mentoring for new principals, intensive support for principals in the lowest-achieving schools, professional development for aspiring superintendents, and mentoring for new superintendents. Additionally, the State plans to support mentor training and offer regional training for mentors, and the department developed a new District-Level Mentorship Plan that clarified minimal expectations for district mentor programs and program support. The State reported that the State's current economic crisis suspended funding in the current fiscal year for the Beginning Teacher Mentorship Program. As a result, the State proposes to use RttT funds to revive the teacher mentoring program and expand the mentoring program to include principals and superintendents.

In this section of the application, the State proposes to use the evaluations to inform decisions regarding removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensure that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures. The State discussed its intention to revive and expand the State's mentoring program; however, the application narrative does not describe how the State plans to use evaluation to inform decisions or how it plans to provide direct support other than through mentoring programs. The number of points awarded in this section of the application is due to the need for additional information on what the State proposes for the new evaluation system, how student growth will be measured and used in the evaluation, and what supports, other than mentoring, will be utilized.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	20
--	-----------	-----------

(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	12
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	8
<p>(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>(i)</p> <p>The State reports that in the past 12 years, it has increased the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers and reports a percentage of 99.44 for the most recent year. The State used a Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant to strengthen the recruitment, preparation, induction, and professional development of teachers and implemented several changes such as a Statewide mentoring program and the Three-Tiered Teacher Licensure and Evaluation System. Also, the State worked with a broad cross-section of stakeholders to develop a "written equity plan" that includes collecting data on licensure, education, years of experience, and salaries in order to accurately measure where inequities in teacher assignments may exist.</p> <p>New Mexico indicated that it plans to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals by using the new Teacher and Principal Evaluation System to collect data for the STARS data warehouse. Additionally, the State plans to create a data dashboard on the distribution of effective teachers and principals in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools. The State will use the dashboard data to identify gaps, forecast needs, and study the successes of schools with similar demographics. In addition, the State plans to post the results of the effective teacher and principal distribution on the NMPED website.</p> <p>In this section of the application, the State indicated that it has increased the percentage of highly qualified teachers and developed an equity plan to measure inequities in teacher assignment.</p> <p>(ii)</p> <p>In this section of the application, the State indicated that it plans to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, special education, and language instruction programs by using federal and State funding to increase the supply of effective teachers. To accomplish this goal, the State plans to build on the work of the Division of Indian Education, the Indian Education Advisory Council, and the Indian Education Act to develop and train a stronger and larger pool of educators who can effectively address the cultural and educational needs of minority students in persistently lowest-achieving, high-poverty and/or high-minority schools. In addition, the State plans to use federal funds to deliver training to the teachers and principals in 200 of the lowest-achieving schools. The State also plans to increase the number of teachers in math and science and implement a "Grow Your Own" program with the goal of adding a significant number of new teachers to the pipeline by 2020. The State also plans to partner with the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) to hold teacher recruitment fairs, provide incentives to teachers and principals working in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools, require the persistently lowest-achieving schools to submit a recruitment plan, and expand the Teachers-Teachers initiative to all LEAs, schools, and charters. The State included specific activities, timelines, and performance measures for each aspect of the proposed plan.</p> <p>In sections i and ii, the State indicates that it plans to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals and that it plans to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. However, the proposed plan relies on training and recruitment to gain access to highly effective staff but does not describe how it will use the proposed activities to ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals across schools.</p>		
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	10
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	6

(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	4
<p>(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>(i)</p> <p>The State reported that it plans to link the revised Three-Tier Teacher Licensure and Principal Evaluation systems to the in-State programs where teacher and principals received their preparation and completed their licensure requirements. The State then plans to make program-level results publicly available and to link results from the revised evaluation systems to all of New Mexico's teacher and principal preparation programs, publicly report the teacher and principal effectiveness data for each of New Mexico's licensure preparation programs on the NMPED website, provide incentives for teacher and principal licensure programs that have demonstrated effectiveness, and take steps to improve or close programs that are shown to be ineffective.</p> <p>To accomplish this goal, the State plans to work with NMPED, the Secretary of Education, and stakeholder groups to identify and structure the components of the revised teacher and principal evaluation systems. The State plans to have student growth measures from the revised evaluation systems to be the first item in EARS and will be available on the NMPED website for all preparation programs. The group will then develop a methodology that will include the kind of license the teacher has received and whether or not the individual college of education is classified as "high need."</p> <p>(ii)</p> <p>In the current application, the State indicated that once the measures of teacher and principal effectiveness are available, the Professional Practices and Standards Council will offer incentives of up to \$100,000 to highly effective IHE educator preparation programs and will request special funding for such programs from appropriate legislative committees. The State reported that in the past, New Mexico has had credentialing programs that failed to receive full accreditation through the State's process. Under the new system, teacher and principal effectiveness measures will provide the link to student achievement and determine program effectiveness. Under the proposed system, if a particular program is ineffective, the State will initiate a four-stage closure process. Along with a description of the proposed plan, the State provided a listing of activities and timelines for developing criteria and identifying effective and ineffective licensure programs.</p> <p>The State indicates that it plans to expand preparation and credentialing programs; however, the number of points awarded in the current application is due to the need for information regarding how the State proposes to classify preparation programs and what criteria the State will use to determine program effectiveness.</p>		
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	12
(i) Providing effective support	10	7
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	5

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

New Mexico proposes to provide support to teachers and principals through data-informed professional development offerings and focus the professional development opportunities for teachers and principals in the lowest-performing schools. In the proposed plan, the State will offer support and training to improve teacher subject and pedagogical knowledge and the ability to use data to inform instruction. The professional development will be aligned to standards, assessments, and interventions, supported by instructional coaches, mentors, and principals, and will be sustained, intensive, and focused on the needs of classroom teachers. The State intends to evaluate the professional development of teachers and principals on a regular basis to ensure that effective and highly effective teachers and principals have the knowledge and skills to turn around persistently low-achieving schools and close achievement gaps. In the

proposed plan, the State will expand and improve the State’s mentoring system for beginning teachers, expand the State’s Innovative Digital Education and Learning in New Mexico, and provide on-line learning opportunities for New Mexico’s students, particularly those in rural areas who lack highly qualified teachers, and conduct Cyber academies to train master teacher leaders and rural educators. Finally, the State plans to continue its professional development work in continuous improvement and data driven decision-making.

The State’s plan, while comprehensive, does not address the use of common planning and collaboration or discuss the use of job embedded professional development. As a result, the number of points awarded in this section of the application is due to the need for additional information on these portions of the specified criterion.

(ii)

The State reported that it plans to use the STARS Data Warehouse to collect data on the professional development provided for each teacher and principal. In the current plan, the State proposes to develop a standard protocol for evaluating the effectiveness of professional development and proposes to use surveys to determine the quality of the professional development. In the plan, the State plans to survey participants immediately after their professional development, four to six weeks after the initial training, and periodically thereafter to determine if and how they continue to implement the skills and knowledge they were taught. The State also plans to ask participants what, if any, follow up and support they have received from the trainers and will use this information to determine which professional development offerings will be continued and which ones will no longer be supported. In the application narrative, the State provided activities, timelines and expected accomplishments for each portion of the proposed plan.

In this section of the application, the State provided information on how it intends to evaluate the professional development provided to teachers and principals; however, the narrative does not discuss what other supports it plans to provide to improve student achievement and how those supports will be evaluated and continuously improved. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for additional information about the range of support and how they will be evaluated and improved.

Total	138	96
-------	-----	----

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State reports that it has the statutory and regulatory authority to intervene directly in persistently low achieving schools. This authority comes from the Assessment and Accountability Act (NMSA, 1978, 22-2C-7) which gives districts and the Public Education Department the authority to close and reopen the public school as a State-authorized charter school, replace all or most of the staff, turn over the management of the public school to a non-private entity, and make other governance changes. Under this law, the State has the statutory authority to engage in all four school intervention models. However, the State reports that NMSA, 1978 Section 22-2C-7 L does not permit the State, district, or charter school to enter into management contracts with private entities for the management of a public school or a school district subject to corrective action. In these cases, the State indicated that the district and the Public Education Department can close a persistently low-achieving school and reopen it under a State-charter school operator; or enter into a contract with another organization with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as long as the contracted organization is not a private entity.

New Mexico also reported that it has a regulatory framework for identifying and supporting low-achieving schools. The New Mexico Administrative Code (NMAC). Title 6 Primary and Secondary Education Act, Chapter 29- Chapter 34 contains Standards of Excellence and explains what is required of the NMPED, LEAs, and charters when a school enters improvement status. Article 2 of Chapter 22 of New Mexico

Statutes Annotated gives the New Mexico Public Education Department the legal authority and responsibility for intervening in low-performing districts.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	25
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	20

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

New Mexico identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools using the definition and processes approved by the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) in New Mexico's School Improvement Grant (SIG) application. In addition to the nine schools that have already been selected, the State plans to serve ten additional low-achieving schools in the first and in the second year of the grant. In this plan, the State will turn around 29 of its lowest achieving schools in the next four years. The 29 schools represent almost 6% of the schools with NCLB status.

(ii)

New Mexico outlined a plan to turn around persistently low-achieving schools by implementing rigorous standards and assessments, investing in better data systems, linking student growth to teacher and principal effectiveness, and requiring districts to effectively implement one of the four intervention models. The State plans to remove barriers to improvement, innovation, and transformation and delivering incentives to students and staff, and to improve the capacity of the turnaround schools by hiring a turnaround leader, engaging teachers in the strategies, involving the parents, students, and community, aligning the instruction to standards and student data, and leveraging resources to support the strategies. The State plans to give the school the support and autonomy to make decisions about time, human resources, instruction, and fiscal resources.

When districts lack the capacity or will to implement dramatic reforms in the persistently low-performing schools, the State will provide direct intervention. In the application, the State explained how the NMPED worked directly with the districts that applied for the School Improvement Grant to ensure that schools and districts used appropriate interventions and approaches to improve the schools by assigning one of its regional support specialists to partner with them. In addition, the PED provided a series of webinars on acceptable dramatic reform initiatives.

In this application, each of the identified lowest-achieving schools eligible for RttT funding will implement a turnaround plan and demonstrate the political will and capacity to successfully implement the intervention model. If the LEA does not demonstrate the political will and/or capacity to be successful, the SEA may direct the LEA to use a School Success Alliance as its alternative governance structure in lieu of a State takeover. NMPED's Turnaround Office will meet with the district leadership and make a recommendation to the Secretary of Education for approval to implement the SSA option after a thorough analysis of the LEA's political will and capacity. If the SEA determines that the school is not meeting the performance measures and the results of an external review of the school concludes that the school is not making enough progress, the SEA will take over a school or a district budget and program authority and select a service provider to be the instructional coach or leadership coach for the principal.

The State explained that NMPED is partnering with Elev8 and the Regional Education Centers to build community support for the intervention models in the schools and will use Elev8 partners and organizations to increase learning time, engage families, strengthen community and school connections, and coordinate resources. In addition, the State plans to provide three full-time Turnaround Specialists who will be assigned to the lowest achieving districts and schools and will monitor progress and provide targeted technical assistance. The specialists will be in each school a minimum of once every three weeks and will monitor progress via the online WebEPSS. The State will also employ a Turnaround Coordinator who will monitor and support all the State's activities for turning around the lowest-performing schools and oversee

the work of the Turnaround Specialists. Each of the schools identified for turnaround or transformation will be required to use a common Instructional Delivery System that aligns standards, curriculum, instruction, interventions, and assessments. The NMPED will hire and train outside evaluators to assess strengths and weaknesses of New Mexico's lowest achieving schools using the Collaboration, Leadership, and Accountability for Student Success (CLASS), the State's system of support for school improvement. The State also proposes to use a trained team of experts to use the CLASS tools to assess each school's strengths and weaknesses, develop recommendations for improvement that align with the intervention model that the school has selected, and help the school write a detailed implementation plan. Schools will be required to submit quarterly progress reports to the local school board and/or local school governing councils and the PED.

The State plans to formalize a Statewide Professional Learning Community System to build capacity within classrooms, schools, and districts. The State proposes to use the New Mexico e-PLCNM.com online professional development resource to disseminate lessons learned from the schools in New Mexico that have implemented education reforms and have come out of restructuring, and to share successes, improvement strategies, and data in order to maximize effectiveness. The site will be used to house sample lesson plans, continuing education resources, discussion boards, and tools.

In the current proposal, the State plans to reward schools that demonstrate dramatic improvement in student achievement. In the past, the State awarded \$4,000 to schools for their exemplary accomplishments and plans to expand the award to \$10,000 for each "high-improving" school. Additionally, the State plans to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for work by an educational research center that will benchmark progress and performance to evaluate the success of these turnaround efforts. The research center will provide data and anecdotal information on lessons learned and the data will be used to develop models and methods that can be used in all schools. Performance measures will be tracked via the WebEPSS system and data will be collected on student proficiency, highly qualified and effective teachers, English language learners' proficiency in English, Safe and drug free schools, attendance rates and graduation rates, parent and family involvement, and number of students in AP courses and dual credit enrollment.

In this section of the application, the State provided information on its historical efforts to improve schools and outlined performance measures for each of the initiatives proposed in the current plan. In the application, the State identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools, explained how it proposes to support the LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models, and provided activities and timelines for the proposed initiatives. However, the application does not contain verification that the State will ensure that the criterion regarding the number of schools using the turnaround model will be implemented. Additionally, the application contained information on the State's historic performance on school turnaround but the State did not describe how the current proposal has been designed to implement qualitatively different strategies that will improve student achievement more effectively than the interventions previously used in the identified schools. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for additional information on the effectiveness of the proposed strategies in the current plan.

Total	50	35
-------	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

In this section of the application, the State verified that the percentage of the total revenues that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008. The State reported that NM funds public elementary and secondary education from the State general fund through the State Equalization Guarantee (SEG) and explained that in Fiscal Year 2008, total SEG funding for public elementary and secondary education was approximately \$2.3 billion or 37.8% of the total recurring dollars in the State's general fund. In Fiscal Year 2009, the SEG funding was approximately \$2.4 billion or 44.4% of the total recurring dollars in the State's general fund. When the total funding for education in New Mexico is considered, the State reported that spending for education is actually closer to 46% of the total State budget.

The State indicated that the New Mexico Public School Finance Act established a formula to objectively distribute operational funds to school districts. School districts have the latitude to spend the formula funds according to local priorities provided the district meets statutory and program requirements. The State also reported that NM funds public higher education from the State's general fund using a formula entitled Instruction and General Operations (I&G). The State also provides additional funding to support public higher education through the Land and Permanent Fund Revenue.

(ii)

In this portion of the application, the State verified that NM's public school funding formula is both equitable and equalized. The State indicated that the formula guarantees 100% of program cost or a minimum amount of funding in order to provide instructional services to students and day-to-day operations to each LEA regardless of the LEA's wealth, and that no LEA in New Mexico relies on its property tax base to support its operational needs. As a result, the State said that the New Mexico formula not only removes the inequity caused by local wealth, it also distributes funding by student need so that students who are younger, at risk of dropping out, or are in other special needs categories all draw more money through the formula. The State also explained the purpose and requirements in four of the NM statutes that govern the distribution and use of State funds for education.

The State explained that under New Mexico's public school funding formula, each LEA's program cost is calculated using a three-step process. In step 1, student membership is counted by category of students and multiplied by statutory weighting factors. In step 2, LEA program units are multiplied by an instructional staff training and experience index, then added to other program units that are not adjusted by the index. In step 3, the total amount is multiplied by a dollar figure established by the Secretary of Education, as directed by the Legislature, to derive the LEA's total program cost and funding from the State. In New Mexico, the formula guarantees that each LEA receives 100% of its calculated program costs.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	32
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	6
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	7
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	7
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	7
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i)

In the current application, the State verified that it has a charter school law that does not limit the operation of various types of charter schools. State law, however, does limit the number of students that can be enrolled in a small school district and caps the number of new charter schools to 15 per year, although the annual limit can be expanded by carrying over the number of unfilled slots provided the cumulative total does not exceed 75.

New Mexico defines a charter school as a public school developed by one or more parents, teachers, or community members authorized by the local school board or the New Mexico Public Education Commission to provide an alternative educational setting to parents and students in the public school system. The New Mexico Charter Schools Act has multiple provisions and enables individual schools to structure their educational curriculum to encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods that are based on reliable research and effective practices, or have been replicated successfully in schools with diverse characteristics. The Act allows the development of different and innovative forms of measuring student learning and achievement, expects schools to address the needs of all students, including those determined to be at risk, and encourages schools to create new professional opportunities for teachers, including the opportunity to be responsible for the learning program at the school site. The Act also expects schools to improve student achievement, enables schools to provide parents and students with an educational alternative to create new, innovative, and more flexible ways of educating children within the public school system, and encourages parental involvement in the public school system. The charter school Act also allows the school to develop and use site-based budgeting, and holds charter schools accountable for meeting the Department's educational standards and fiscal requirements.

The State reports that since 1993, the Public School Code has allowed charter schools to operate in New Mexico. Over time, the number of charter school has grown from 5 to 73 in 2009-2010 with another 8 authorized to open for 2010-2011. Of the 81 charter schools, the State reports that 21 have been either authorized or renewed as State-chartered charter schools, and the rest were authorized by local school boards. In the application, the State indicated that the largest concentration of charter schools and students is in the Albuquerque metropolitan area, but noted that charter schools exist in 23 of New Mexico's 89 school districts and in urban, suburban, and rural areas. The State also noted that the number of students enrolled in charter schools has grown from 2,000 in 2001 to over 12,000 students in 2009-10, representing 4% of the State's public school enrollment. The State also reported that charter schools enroll a higher percentage of special education students than traditional public schools and have a higher percentage of students who are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch. In the application, the State also noted that half of New Mexico's charter schools are middle and high schools and 18 have been established to serve the needs of students classified as "at risk for failure."

New Mexico reported that the State's Charter Schools Act permits 15 new charter schools to be authorized annually with a maximum of 75 new charters within any five-year period, translating to a "high cap" in the RttT criteria since the cap would allow 10% or more of the total schools in the State to be charter schools. The State reported that New Mexico currently has a total of 874 public schools: 793 traditional public schools, and 81 charter schools that constitute 9.3% of all public schools. In the application, the State indicated that if more than 15 new charter schools are authorized in any year, State regulation provides that a lottery will determine which 15 of those schools will be approved to begin operation in the fiscal year following the lottery. The remaining newly authorized schools are automatically approved to begin operations in the second fiscal year following the lottery. In addition, if the 15-school limit is not reached in any year, the unfilled charter school slots remaining for that year are transferred to succeeding years up to a maximum of 75 schools in any five-year period.

New Mexico State law does not restrict student enrollment in charter schools; however, the initial application for a charter school in a district with an enrollment of 1,300 students or less may not propose an enrollment that exceeds 10% of the district enrollment. In larger districts, charter schools are free to set unlimited enrollment goals, with class sizes and student-teacher ratios subject to the same requirements of State law as traditional schools and State law has no restrictions on charter school operations in certain

geographic areas, and no limits on the number, or percent or demographics of students that may enroll in charter schools.

The State indicated that the Charter Schools Act encourages many types of charter schools, including those that serve high-need student populations. In the examples provided, the State approved a charter school to operate as an International Baccalaureate World School, another was approved as a residential State-chartered charter high school, and another was approved to serve students who are deaf or hard of hearing. Other charter schools in New Mexico are focused on meeting the educational needs of Native Americans and students with disabilities.

The number of points awarded in this section is due to the fact that New Mexico law limits the number of students that can be enrolled in a small school district during the first year of operation and caps the number of new charter schools to 15 per year with a carry over provision.

(ii)

In this section of the application, the State verified that it has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools and verified that student achievement is a significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal. The State verified that it encourages charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students; however, the state verified that it has closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools.

The State indicated that the New Mexico Charter Schools Act establishes the legal requirements for charter school application, authorization, reauthorization (renewal), and closure. From 1999 until 2007, only local school districts were empowered to authorize charter schools, but in 2006, State law was amended to allow for an additional State authorization of charter schools by the Public Education Commission. The State reported that charter schools are approved for an initial six-year term, with the first year designated as a planning year, and renewals lasting for five years. In New Mexico, State-chartered schools are LEAs and are exempt from any requirements of the districts in which they are located. The schools have greater autonomy and therefore greater responsibility for their programs, management, and budgets. State-chartered schools are monitored by the Charter Schools Division of the Public Education Department and their progress is reported to the Commission.

New Mexico's requirements for a new charter school application include a commitment from the founder(s) to adhere to the requirements specified in the charter school statute. The State's requirements for charter renewal allow a charter to be suspended, revoked, or not renewed if the charter school fails to meet or make substantial progress toward achievement of the minimum educational standards or student performance standards identified in the charter application, or if the school commits a material violation of the charter, fiscal mismanagement, or other violation of law.

The State reported that since 2005, 73 charter school applications were submitted and 53 have been approved. In 2005, 21 charter schools were authorized by school districts and in 2006, 15 new charters were approved by districts. In 2007, the first year of State authorizing, 9 applications were received by the Public Education Commission and 2 were authorized. One application was received by a district that was also authorized, for a total of 3 new charters in 2007. In 2008, 11 applications were received by the Commission with 6 authorized, and in 2009, the Commission received 16 applications of which 8 were authorized. No new charter authorizations were made by school districts in 2008 or 2009. Since 2007, a total of 37 applications were made and 17 were approved. The State also noted that from 2007 to 2009, 20 charter applications were denied by the Commission due to the inadequacy of the educational, financial and/or governance plans in the applications. Three district-chartered schools were closed from 2005 to 2007 due to findings of fiscal mismanagement. In 2008, one district charter was closed by the district for a combination of lack of academic progress, fiscal mismanagement and governance issues. In 2009, the Commission denied renewal to one charter school due to lack of academic progress.

(iii)

The State reported that New Mexico charter schools are funded on the same per-pupil basis as are traditional schools and districts, and listed the State statutes that govern the funding of charter schools. The State noted that under NM law, the amount of funding allocated to a charter school cannot be less than ninety-eight percent of the school-generated program cost. In 2010-2011, the State reported that it will distribute \$3,712.45 per pupil for both traditional public schools, as well as charter schools.

(iv)

The State demonstrated that it provides charter schools with funding for facilities and the ability to share in bonds and mill levies or other supports, and that the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools.

New Mexico provides charter schools with funding for lease payments in the amount of \$700 per student based on prior-year enrollment. The State allows districts and charter schools to enter into lease-purchase agreements for facilities and permits charter schools to receive local bond funding. Charters must have EOccupancy certification and meet the same standards of safety, size, and accessibility as other public schools. The State indicated that a National Alliance for Public Charter Schools article reported New Mexico and four other States as leaders in having policies that support charter school facilities. Once a charter school has been renewed at least once, it can be evaluated, prioritized, and eligible for grants in the same manner as all other public schools in the State; provided that for charter school facilities in leased facilities, grants may be used to provide additional lease payments for leasehold improvements made by the lesser. The State also reports that the NM appropriated \$4,500,000 for charter school facilities.

(v)

The State verified that it enables LEAs and charters to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools; however, State regulations have not yet been amended to officially entitle magnet schools and alternative schools as innovative schools.

In the application, the State indicated that it enables local school districts to operate innovative, autonomous public schools, other than charter schools, such as magnet schools or special focus schools. Permission is given to operate the schools through waivers, and districts seeking to reorganize a school or institute collaborative school improvement must outline the expected educational benefits from the waiver requests.

While it is not yet amended, the State is expected to clarify the process for establishing magnet schools as another route to creating innovative schools. If the regulations are amended, the existing magnet schools will be considered as innovative schools. Examples of current magnet schools include an elementary school that emphasizes dual language and fine arts, a career enrichment center which graduates students with associates degrees, a school for pregnant and parenting teens and a career based alternative school. The State noted that in the fall of 2010, one district will open Nex+Gen Academy, which will emphasize technology and 21st century skills, and another district operates the SER/Career Academy for students who had difficulties in traditional comprehensive high schools.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4
---	----------	----------

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State reported that it has added funding for education reform initiatives that are designed to increase student achievement or graduation rates, and narrow the achievement gap. Examples provided by the

State included a Kindergarten Three Plus program that increases the length of the school year by 25 days for struggling high-poverty schools, a PreK program for four-year-old children in areas where schools have the highest percentages of children who are not meeting Adequate Yearly Progress in math and reading, and a Bilingual Education program for Hispanic and Native American English language learner students. Additionally, the State discussed a program, IDEAL-NM, designed to provide coursework electronically to students, State employees, teachers, instructional support providers and school administrators. For each of these programs, the State presented student and program achievement results.

The Kindergarten Three Plus is an example of an innovative program that is designed to increase student achievement and address the unique needs of the State. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the fact that bilingual, distance learning, and PreK programs have been in operation for some time and are generally not seen as innovative.

Total	55	46
-------	----	----

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

In the current application, the State addressed STEM issues throughout various components of the proposed reform agenda. The State discussed the implementation of a rigorous course of standards but not a rigorous course of study. In the application, the State discussed the development and/or adoption of STEM curricula aligned to national and international standards, but did not discuss how it will develop and implement a curriculum that will operationalize the standards. The State discussed the formation of the Math and Science Bureau and its interest in enhancing the State's competitiveness but does not discuss how this Bureau intends to cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other STEM-capable community partners to offer a STEM program. The State expressed interest in offering applied learning opportunities for students and discussed the expansion of online, dual credit, and AP STEM courses that are currently available. Additionally, the State reported that it is interested in preparing more students for advanced study and STEM careers, including addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. While the State has a plan to implement a STEM program, it states in the application that the proposed activities will be implemented only if grant funds are awarded. The points awarded to this section of the application are due to the concern that the plan does not appear address all the criteria specified in the competitive preference priority section of RttT.

Total	15	0
-------	----	---

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State's application addressed all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria. The State demonstrated that it is taking a systemic approach to education reform, has sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans, and plans to use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement,

decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total		0
Grand Total	500	365



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

New Mexico Application #3600NM-8



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	55
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	38
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The New Mexico (NM) plan begins by offering a very nice executive summary of the state's reform agenda, with that agenda being both comprehensive and coherent (and nicely covering the strategies for each of the 4 educational areas).

(ii) 69 LEA's and 18 state-chartered charter schools are participating, which represents 81% of all such entities, and including 89% of all students in the state and 88% of all students in poverty. These are strong statewide numbers. In addition, for these 87 participating entities, all agreed to implement every element of the plan, and each included signatures from both the LEA superintendent and local board president (or equivalents as applicable).

However, the local teacher union leader of only 32 of the 45 entities (71%) with such unions signed the MOU (which is high, but it does weaken the support within those entities). The application does not summarize the percent of students or students in poverty these 13 entities cover, nor could it be calculated readily from the individual entity data offered. Indeed, the detailed tables for participating entities were confusing since it included 9 entities for which there were no signatures at all (but they were marked as participating in only criterion E(2)). Also, the 13 participating entities that did not have a teacher union leader signature could not be find (only 12 were marked that way).

The MOU language itself appears fairly strong, except for the language within section D on Great Teachers and Leaders. Here participating entities are generally agreeing to support and participate in a Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Task Force which will develop and determine the details for all items within this section, yet it is not clear within this MOU that this Task Force has any legal authority to require implementation for any ideas they produce. Subsequent narrative within section D of the plan on Great Teachers and Principals never refers to such a Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Task Force, but instead indicates that an existing Professional Practices and Standards Council (PPSC) (which has statutory authority to recommend revisions to the state's Three-Tiered Licensure and Teacher Evaluation System) will be expanded to include various teacher groups. This enhanced PPSC will develop the details for an improved educator evaluation system that includes student growth as a significant factor. If the Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Task Force is indeed the enhanced PPSC group with policy authority, then the MOU language does carry more weight.

A score in the middle high range is given.

(iii) As noted, the participating entities cover 89% of the students in the state, and 88% of those in poverty. In reference to offering ambitious yet achievable goals, the plan provides information for each of the 4 areas noted in the application, yet the information offered for each within the summary narrative is

inconsistent. In reference to increasing student achievement using state tests, there is a goal listed for only one year (2010-11), and no baseline data (although baseline data is available on multiple charts within the appendix). For NAEP data, both baseline and multi-year growth targets are offered. For graduation rates

and college enrollment rates, baseline and multi-year targets are offered, but no subgroup breakdowns for the college enrollment data. Overall, a score in the low high range is offered.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	24
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	16
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) The plan convincingly explains that the state has already been engaged in significant reforms activities since 2003, and that the RTTT reforms would build upon, and further jump start, many previous efforts. The plan calls for 3 dedicated state departmental staff to oversee the implementation of the grant, and contracts with several of their existing educational reform partners (e.g., regional educational lab, and the federal technical assistance center). In addition, the state would use an existing NM Office of Recovery and Reinvestment to ensure the RTTT funds were expended efficiently and appropriately. Building upon such existing external partners and grants management infrastructures makes sense. Details for the coordination of other reform funds are offered, and how they plan to sustain such efforts post grant is generally. There is some confusion in the budget section in that the introductory language is repeated multiple times. But overall this section offers good detail and points in the high range are given.</p> <p>(ii) A significant number of support letters were included, covering many key constituents (e.g., educational, business, community and political leaders). A strong letter of support is included from the President of the American Federation of Teachers for NM, as well as one from the Albuquerque Teachers Federation (an AFT affiliate, and the largest district in NM, serving about 1/3rd of the students in the state). Clearly efforts to include a broad group of individuals to develop the plan for phase II occurred (as evidenced by the Albuquerque Teachers Federation letter whereby it was noted that they did not support the phase I application, but based upon joint efforts, they now support Phase II). Absent was a letter of support from the state NEA Union President (although he was listed as attending the RTTT Work Group), nor any tribal leaders. Despite these pieces of missing support, points in the high range are given.</p>		
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	22
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	17
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) The state has clearly implemented many significant policy changes during the past few years in each of the four RTTT target areas, and utilized various funding sources to support such efforts. Points in the high range are given.</p> <p>(ii) The plan's narrative summary nicely summarizes performance gains and trends for each requested item in the application, and explains the connections between the data and the action that may have contributed to them. A few notable reforms and gains are evident (although mixed). Points in the medium range are given.</p>		
Total	125	101

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	38
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	18
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) New Mexico is a member of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CSSO) and the National Governors Association (NGA) Common Core Initiative in their effort to adopt Common Core Standards. Copies of the MOU and draft standards are included in the application, and the consortium involves 49 states and territories. Full points are given for having fulfilled these criteria.</p> <p>(ii) Plans call for the initial adoption by no later than August 2, 2010 (although rule-making procedures will delay the official adoption until November 2010). Once the new standards are adopted, the state department of education will offer training and technical assistance through their statewide distance education network, webinars and regional meetings and conferences. Two statewide committees will review existing state standards to determine which, if any, should be retained within the newly adopted common core. This is a wise step since the state had previously participated in the American Diploma Project in 2009, which had already involved the development and adoption of new standards aligned to the drafted common core standards. The budget for implementing these new core standards appears low (\$155,380 spent during the first 2 years), but this may be due to the previous work already completed in the state and the ability to use an existing statewide distance learning network (e.g., on-line training course development (\$50,000), support for the two statewide committees (\$20,000), as well as some support from one of the newly hired department of education staff). Points in the high range are given.</p>		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) and (ii) The state has joined with the Smarter Balanced Consortium (involving 45 states) and the National Center for Education and the Economy (involving 8 states) to develop and implement high-quality assessment. Points in the high range are given.</p>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	19
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The plan offers three activity-based goals, and covers a coherent list of strategies for the next four years to accomplish those goals. Clear timelines and responsible parties are identified. The budget for this section makes sense in that about \$3.8 million will be used to develop common high quality assessment (in addition to other funding sources), and about \$6.2 in RTTT funding would be used for the implementation plan (including \$2.25 million in technology support for LEAs to ensure adequate computers for computer-based assessments).</p> <p>One notable assessment-related item within their plan is that by 2011-12, high school students will be able to take the new exams at the end of 10th grade, and if they pass they receive a high school diploma and an opportunity to enroll the next fall as a full-student at any two- or four-year open admissions post-secondary institution in NM without having to take remedial course (or choose to remain in high school and take a</p>		

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	21
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	7
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	7
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) and (ii) The plan includes a summary of existing state statute/regulations which allow several alternative certification pathways for teachers and school administrators. For three of the teacher alternative programs, the only higher education component is the requirement to take one 3 credit reading course (with the other requirements being getting a teaching job, completing one year of successful teaching, passing 3 NM Teacher Assessments, and demonstrating department-approved competencies). These requirements are in the spirit of a "real" alternative certification program. In a similar vein, two school administrator alternative certification options exist which have no specific university-based requirements, with one option being a complete district-based leadership program. The numbers of teachers and administrators actually certified under these existing options is still small, with 48 teachers (using the online portfolio option) and 7 administrators (using the post-secondary administrator option), but this is evidence that these alternative options do indeed exist and are viable. Points in the high range are given.</p> <p>(iii) The plan indicates that state statute already exists which requires an annual Educator Accountability Reporting System that examines the supply and demand of educators in the state. The plan also summarizes a number of initiatives in place to address areas of current teacher and administrator shortages. \$3 million is budgeted to increase the reach of Teach for America (with 120 of such teachers currently teaching predominantly high-need academic areas in schools with larger populations of Native Americans). This aspect of the plan appears sound and points in the high range are given.</p>		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	40
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	10
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	19
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) and (ii) The plan indicates that since 2003, the state has had in place a Three-Tiered Licensure and Teacher Evaluation System which already links teachers' licensure levels and salaries to evaluations of classroom performance. The plan calls for an existing Professional Practices and Standards Council (PPSC) structure to work with various educator groups to modify existing requirements to include student growth as a significant factor. The plan includes a press release listing various assurances regarding this provision (and the state teacher and other educator groups engaged in creating such assurances) indicating that student growth will indeed be included. These same provisions are listed in the MOU signed by 87 entities, including 32 of 45 local teacher union leaders. However, there is no existing policy or statutory authority which requires the state to revise their regulations to allow student growth to be measured. In addition, there is inconsistent information as to when the PPSC will complete their work (on page D-82 and D-85 the plan indicates 2013, while on page D-83 the plans mentions 2014, and the press release in the appendix indicates 18 - 36 months). If indeed, it is 2014 date, then it is in conflict with their stated goal of having implementing a model for measuring individual student growth and a fully revised teacher and principal evaluation system by 2013. Points in the medium range are given.</p>		

(iii) The plan indicates that existing state regulations require districts to submit a teacher performance evaluation plan that includes annual teacher evaluations, training for all teachers and administrators who are assigned teacher evaluation performance duties, and timely feedback to those being evaluated. The plan indicates that the state department will develop and implement a system to better train all evaluators by January 2012, with those not being fully trained prohibited from conducting any future teacher or administrator evaluations. \$2.1 million is budgeted for such training efforts, and this amount and these plans appear sound. Points in the high range are given.

(iv a) The plan calls for reviving and expanding a previously state-funded mentorship program for beginning teachers. It also mentions an existing Leadership Institute which provides professional development for some groups of principals and superintendents (e.g., new and those in the lowest-performing schools). Yet the detail provided in the narrative (and appendix) is not convincing that all such training will really drive the use of data to develop teachers and principals within participating entities, including the provision of coaching, induction and/or professional development.

(iv b) The plan notes that the existing Three-Tiered Licensure and Teacher Evaluation System already provides a progressive career path including increased responsibilities and compensation. This system will be enhanced as educator performance is judged in part on student growth. In addition, starting year 3, plans call for substantial financial incentives (e.g., signing and/or retention bonuses) to recruit, place and retain high quality staff in the lowest-performing schools (once the teacher and principal evaluation systems have been revised to link such evaluations to student growth). Although there is limited detail, \$2 million is budgeted for such efforts and the concept is sound.

(iv c) and (iv d) The plan notes that New Mexico does not have tenure, and advancement on the Three-Tiered Licensure and Teacher Evaluation System is already contingent on performance, and those who do not advance to the 2nd level within 5 years cannot remain a teacher in NM. The plan calls for additional data collection and monitoring to accurately track the Professional Development Dossier aspect of this system, as well as tracking the teacher and principal dismissals under the new enhanced evaluation system (as tied to student growth). This concept, in conjunction with all elements in this section, is sound.

Overall points in the medium range are given for subsection (iv).

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	20
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	12
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	8
(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) The plan describes using the new teacher and principal evaluation system to create a public data dashboard of the distribution of effective teachers and principals in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (to help identify gaps, forecast needs and study the successes of schools with similar demographics). Training of superintendents to effectively use such data is planned. The narrative for section (D) (2) (iv b) describes that RTTT funds will be used for substantial signing and/or retention bonuses. The projected performance targets seem responsible. Points in the low high range are given.</p> <p>(ii) A number of activities are proposed to increase the pipeline and distribution of teachers for hard-to-staff subjects and speciality areas. All of these activities appear sound, especially the "grow-your-own" programs to tap into expertise within those in the community more likely committed to remaining in that area. Surprisingly no RTTT funds are to be used for these efforts, but instead a realignment of existing other funds. The projected performance targets seem responsible. However, nothing about special education and language instruction were addressed. Points in the high range are given.</p>		
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	10
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	6

(ii) The plan details an approach of intensive support from the state, coupled with the hiring of turnaround leaders within each school, and the use of data to help drive change. The state goal is to turn around 29 of their lowest - achieving schools within 4 years, which is ambitious but achievable. The state also has the authority and the plans to take over a school or district if adequate progress is not made. The plan summarizes lessons learned from past efforts in the state, highlighting that a turnaround principal leader is key to success. The budget of \$35 million in direct support for the schools, in addition to about \$6 million for state support, training, and ,represents a significant portion of their overall RTTT request. This demonstrates that these activities are high priorities, and their plan appears sound. However, the plan is lacking some details, with information in a referenced appendix not included. Points in the medium range are given.

Total	50	40
-------	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	9
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	4

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The plan indicates that the percentage of total revenues available to the state that were used to support public education increased from FY2008 to FY2009. Points in the high range are given.

(ii) The state's funding formula contains a specific weight for "at risk" students, which provides additional per pupil funds to those districts with such students. However, although the application did not specifically request it, no specific data was provided which showed any overall per pupil averages within and among districts, charters, and individual schools. Thus it is not possible to determine the extent to which the state's policies actually lead to equitable funding. Points in the lower high range are given.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	36
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	7
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The plan describes the state's charter law, along with detail which reveals there is a "high cap" in place whereby no more than 15 charter schools may be approved per year, and no more than 75 in any given 5 year period. The state has 81 charter schools, and the plan notes that these caps have never prevented a school from being approved. The more troublesome cap is that within smaller districts (less than 1,300 students), a charter school may propose an initial enrollment of no more than 10% of that district's enrollment. While the application indicates that this has never really been a factor, it is a restriction for groups in smaller districts. Points in the high range are given.

(ii) The plan includes excerpts from state statute which requires proposed student performance standards to be included in the application, and that a school may be closed if they failed to make substantial progress toward those proposed performance standards. Data was also offered to reveal that a portion of all charter school proposals are not approved, and that to date 2 schools have been closed in part because of academic progress concerns. No information was provided indicating that their law encourages charter schools to serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students, yet summary data provided indicates their charter schools overall serve more free/reduced lunch (62%) and special education students (21%) students than traditional public schools (55% and 19% respectively). So clearly their charter law and policy environment has resulted in high-need students being served in these schools. Points in the high range are given.

(iii) The state's funding formula is structured to provide equitable per pupil operational funding to charter schools, and there is a provision which requires that they receive at least 98% of the school-generated funds. Points in the high range are given.

(iv) The plan describes a number of ways the state provides facility funding to its charter schools, and notes that a recent external national review of charter laws found NM to be among the leaders in facilities support policies for charter schools. The plan also notes that the state's charter law requires charter school facilities to meet the same standards as other public school facilities. Points in the high range are given.

(v) The plan indicates that districts are able to (and do) operate innovative autonomous schools such as magnet and special focus schools via waivers allowed under state regulation. However, no information was given to determine whether any such schools meet the definition for "innovative, autonomous public schools" as offered in the RTTT application (especially whether the schools can select and replace their staff and control their own budgets). Points in the medium range are given.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
A number of other significant school reform efforts and support (e.g., early childhood programs, dropout retrieval, cultural competency teacher training) were described in the plan. For several of these efforts, the plan offers information from external evaluations which revealed improved student outcomes. Points in the high range are given.		
Total	55	50

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The state plan does indeed include activities which would result in the offering of a rigorous course of study in STEM content (in cooperation with university and other partners), and if implemented should prepare more students for STEM-based careers. Information on the state's efforts are summarized in this section and throughout the overall application (to help support all four education reform areas).		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
--	------------------	---------------

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Although the plan has weaknesses, overall New Mexico has positioned itself well during the past years to continue to implement major educational reforms. This plan does comprehensively and coherently address all four education reform areas specified in the ARRA.</p>		
Total		0
Grand Total	500	415