

(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
(E)(1) The state has longstanding, strong legal authority to intervene in persistently lowest-achieving schools and in districts through its Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) process, District Improvement Plan process, and Distinguished Education program. Full points are awarded.				
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35	
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
(E)(2)(i) The applicant has already and will continue to identify its persistently lowest-achieving schools as well as the lowest-achieving secondary schools that are eligible for but do not receive Title I funds in the state. The state's methodology is approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Fifty-seven schools have been already identified, and the state plans to identify another 30-35 schools each year during the RTTT grant period, for a total of approximately 150 schools by the end of the grant period. Full points are awarded.				
(E)(2)(ii) The state has a long history of working to turn around struggling schools. Since the inception of SURR in 1989, 316 schools have been identified for registration review, of which 217 were removed from review because they improved their performance. Another 70 schools were phased out or closed. The state is reorganizing its state department of education to provide more focused and sustained support to LEAs with persistently lowest schools, and it provides detailed plans for dramatic school interventions using the four school intervention models. The plan is of high-quality and is awarded points in the "high" range.				
Total	50	50	50	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	9	9	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	4	4	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
(F)(1)(i)				

The state increased the level of its State budget support for elementary, secondary, and public higher education from 39.4 percent in 2007-2008 to 41.7 percent for 2008-2009, an increase of \$1.835 billion or 6 percent. High points are awarded.

(F)(1)(ii)

The state has a "foundation aid" education funding formula that ensures adequate funding across school districts, explicitly taking into account student need. Through district improvement plans for districts that fail to make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years on specified accountability measures, the state also addresses intra-district equity between high-poverty and other schools. Additionally, through the state's Contracts for Excellence Initiative, dozens of high-need districts are required to allocate the majority of their increases in operating aid to high-need schools. A "high" level of points is awarded for this subsection.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	34	34	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	5	5	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	7	7	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	6	6	

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

(F)(2)(i)

The State's new charter cap is 460 schools, which is 9.84 percent of the total schools in the state (using a denominator of 4,677, the total number of school included in the summary chart for (A)(1)(iii)). This qualifies as a "medium" cap under the Reviewer Guidance. There is no cap, however, on the ability of the state's public schools to convert to charter schools. Points at the top of the "medium" range are awarded.

(F)(2)(ii)

The state has a rigorous approval, monitoring, and reauthorization process for charter schools. The 2010 amendment to the state's charter school law increased public accountability and transparency and promotes the formation of charter schools that serve student populations similar to local district student populations. Educational soundness and student achievement are also required factors upon formation or renewal of the charter of a charter school, and poor academic performance is one of the grounds upon which a charter may be revoked. "High" points are awarded for this subsection.

(F)(2)(iii)

The state's charter school tuition formula is based upon the school district's operating expenditures rather than revenue source, and reflects expenditures supposed by both State aid and local taxes for public school students. Appendix F 2 iii 1 provides a detailed explanation of how equitable funding is achieved, on a roughly equal basis as public schools, although on a lagged basis. From the narrative, it appears that this lagged level of funding is greater than 90 percent of the level of funding provided each year to public schools. "High" points are awarded for this subsection.

(F)(2)(iv)

The applicant provides funding for facilities, assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, and other supports to its charter schools. The state's charter schools have authority to issue corporate

bonds, which are tax exempt. There are also situations in which a charter school may indirectly benefit from school district bonding for school construction. "High" points are awarded for this subsection.

(F)(2)(v)

In addition to charter schools, the state enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools, many of which are developed at the LEA level. A score in the "high" range is awarded.

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

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

(F)(3)

The state is focused on enhancing its P-20 policy alignment and making use of all available resources to enhance students' educational experience, and on strengthening its career/technical education programs to prepare students better for college and careers. Insufficient detail is provided to fully gauge the extent to which the reforms in this section have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes. A score in the "medium" range is awarded.

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The applicant provides a comprehensive focus on the STEM disciplines throughout the application. The state has established partnerships with numerous stakeholders in STEM education and has a wide array of federally and state-funded STEM initiatives that have already led to the integration of the STEM disciplines throughout the K-12 system. The state's plan for RTTT funding incorporates STEM elements into its plans for reforms in all four education reform areas promoted under the ARRA. Specifically under the RTTT proposal, projects would be funded to provide extended learning opportunities in STEM after school and during the summer for high-needs students, to enhance Advanced Placement training and professional development for teachers, to provide supplemental compensation for teachers of STEM disciplines to work in high-need schools, and to provide virtual STEM courses and related professional development to high-needs rural and urban areas. The applicant addresses all three components of the STEM competitive priority.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

This is an exceptional application—clear, well organized, comprehensive, and detailed in how the applicant will use RTTT funds to implement significant reforms across all four education reform areas of the ARRA, as well as the State Success Factors Criteria.

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The state panel presentation and the panel's responses to reviewer questions demonstrated that this state's top education leadership is keenly focused on and committed to the reforms included in its application. The panel's comments were strong and coherent, and they reinforced that this state is a superior candidate for using RTTT funds to reform the state's K-12 educational system and align it with college and career readiness expectations. Strong curriculum and aligned assessments, aided by significantly improved, data-driven professional development, will drive reform, not merely strong standards. The state's leadership is not waiting for RTTT funds to begin their reforms and is already proceeding with beginning implementation of its plans, but RTTT funding will allow this state to proceed with fully implementing its strong collection of reforms. The state is aware of and honest about where its previous attempts at reform have fallen short or been insufficient, and the state is ready to address those deficiencies head on. A RTTT grant will greatly help this state implement its high-quality application and the plans therein.

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

Grand Total	500	442	442	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--

New York has in place and describes in detail its approach to identifying its lowest-achieving schools and districts. New York is awarded full credit for this criterion based on its historical record of identifying and closing or turning around these low achieving schools and districts.

E 2 (ii)

New York has extensive experience in turning round schools through its Registration Review process, which has seen 216 schools out of 317 moved out of the lowest-achieving schools categories. These approaches include closing schools and/or establishing new schools, two of the four possible approaches endorsed in RTTT.

New York is building its intervention strategies on experience and research, beginning with "Context is critical."

Total	50	47	47	
-------	----	----	----	--

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
F 1 (i)				
New York increased funding for education funding by 6% during the years 2007-08 to 2008-09.				
F 1 (ii)				
In 2008-09 New York high need schools and charter schools received an average of almost three times more fiscal support than the low need schools received.				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	38	35	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	5	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	6	6	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8	8	

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

F 2 (i)

New York initiated charter schools in 1998 and extended their potential through legislation in 2010.

New York has established a new cap of 460 public charter schools that the proposal states exceeds 10 percent of the total number of public schools in the State, and therefore qualifies as a "high" cap for the purposes of Race to the Top,

particularly if the ability of New York's public schools to convert to charter schools, which are not subject to a cap, is factored in.

F 2 (ii)

NY education law establishes detailed application requirements for charter schools, including a required description of student achievement goals and the methods of evaluating whether students have achieved such goals. Under Education Law, a charter entity may only approve an application upon certain specified findings, which include whether the charter school is in compliance with law, whether the applicant can demonstrate the ability to operate the school in an educationally and fiscally sound manner, and whether granting the application is likely to improve student learning and achievement.

Under the new Education Law for the 260 new startup charter schools now authorized, a new, rigorous Request for Proposals process is required that will build upon New York's already rigorous application process.

F 2 iii

New York's primary funding mechanism for charter schools is through mandated tuition payments by school districts. Education Law requires that public school districts with resident students attending charter schools pay a per pupil tuition amount (the "charter school basic tuition") to the charter school for each of these students. That per-pupil amount is based on a computation designed to ensure that the district provides support for charter school pupils in an amount equivalent to the school district's per-pupil operating expenditures on instructionally related activities. The per-pupil tuition amount ranges from \$8,000 to \$24,700, based on the expenditures of the student's district of residence. The weighted average per-pupil tuition amount is approximately \$12,000 per pupil.

New York has provisions holding students in charter schools to positive academic performance.

While New York provides significant funds to charter school through funds that flow through local districts, the funds are reduced slightly based on the fact that charter schools have fewer required expenditures than public schools. This would be considered equitable funding.

F 2 (iv)

Education Law provides that charter schools may be located in part of an existing public school building, in space provided on a private worksite, in a public building, or in any other suitable location. Education Law provides that charter schools may contract with a school district or the governing body of a public college or university for the use of a school building and grounds. Any such contract must provide such services or facilities at cost. There are currently 65 charter schools located in space leased from public schools or public universities. The New York City School District, in which approximately 64 percent of the State's charter schools are located (99 of 140 charter schools), actively provides many charter schools with space in public school buildings and also provides help in obtaining facilities.

F 2 (v)

New York provides an extensive list of LEAs operating innovative, autonomous public schools.

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

F 2 i

The score was reduced from 8 to 5 based on the explanation from the panel that NY based its 10 percent total on the number of public schools not the total of public schools and charter schools as required in the definition accompanying the application.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

5

4

4

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

F 3

Examples of the Regents' determination to raise student achievement and graduation rates are the policy decisions in the past six months to adopt higher standards and improved assessments, adopt regulations to provide new teachers and school leaders with rich clinical experiences, build data links between Pre K-12 education and higher education institutions, and adopt regulations to align the State's accountability system with the new requirements for persistently low-achieving schools.

In addition, the Governor's Children's Cabinet (referred to as the Children's Cabinet) was established by Executive Order on June 12, 2007. The cabinet includes the Governor's Office, Board of Regents, Education Department, and 22 other state agencies. The mission of the Children's Cabinet is to advise and make recommendations to the Governor on the most effective policies and programs that promote the Governor's Birth to Five Agenda and other priorities, including but not limited to:

- Implementation of universal children's health insurance
- Implementation of universal pre-kindergarten throughout New York State
- Development of a legislative program focused on the Governor's Birth to Five Agenda
- Development of programs focused on disconnected youth.

Examples of a positive effect on student graduation rates are found in the state's Career and Technical (CTE) programs. The Regents' Policy on CTE created a process of program approval for career and technical education programs that grants increased flexibility for districts that improve graduation rates through implementation of CTE programs. The integration of technical and core subjects has resulted in an approach that accommodates many learning styles and provides students with learning opportunities that improve their chances of finishing high school studies. Once students are engaged, students are able to persist to graduation at higher rates than their peers who are not as traditionally engaged. For example, 83.19 percent of students with a concentration in CTE who entered ninth grade in 2005 graduated in four years, compared to 71.8 percent for their non-CTE peers. CTE is also helping close the achievement gap for minority students. The four year graduation rate was 77.5 percent for Black CTE students compared to 55.7 percent for their non-CTE peers; and 75.9 percent for Hispanic CTE students compared to 54.8 percent for their non-CTE peers. For those not graduating on time, more CTE students in the cohort were still enrolled in programs and fewer dropped out than non-CTE students.

Total	55	52	49	
-------	----	----	----	--

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

New York State will dramatically enhance STEM access and education using Race To The Top funds through working with some of the most prestigious STEM universities at New York's disposal (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Rochester Institute of Technology, Clarkson University, and the University at Albany College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering), with learning standards in Mathematics, Science, and Technology, and Career Development and Occupational Studies in place since 1996 and with a professional development network that can implement the necessary training,

NYSED's STEM strategy incorporates recommendations from such prestigious organizations as the Carnegie Institute for Advanced Study (The Opportunity Equation: Transforming Mathematics and Science Education for Citizenship and the Global Economy, 2009) and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (the Empire State STEM Education Initiative Inaugural Progressive Dialogue, 2009, which generated input from over 500 stakeholders from across state, including over 40 companies and professional organizations). Individual organizations such as the Science Teachers Association of New York State (the state's oldest professional organization of prekindergarten to university science educators) and the Association of Mathematics Teachers of New York State, as well as collaborative groups such the NYS STEM Education Collaborative are active partners in fostering STEM education.

NYSED's partnerships with these and other stakeholders in STEM education as well the effective use of federal and state funding and human resources have already led to the integration of STEM disciplines throughout the breadth of school districts' curricula.

These initiatives will result in expanded, rigorous courses of study for both boys and girls.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
New York receives a "Yes" evaluation on this criterion for the following reasons:				
New York provides extensive examples of work already underway in the major priority areas supported by RTTT. Timelines provided illustrate a commitment to move forward even if not funded. In many cases, New York is merging other state, federal or foundation funds to supplement RTTT. In addition, a major agency reorganization is proposed to administer and oversee RTTT efforts.				
Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	464	461	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	37	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	32	35	
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>(E) (2) (i): The State has historically been able to identify its persistently lowest performing lowest-achieving Title 1 schools in each stage: improvement, corrective action, and restructuring as well as the lowest-performing non Title schools that are eligible but not receive Title 1 funds in the State.</p> <p>(E) (2) (ii): The State has historically been attending to its lowest performing schools using a SURR process, however, it has fallen short of transforming these schools into models of excellence that prepare all students for college and careers. From its long experience NYSED has learned valuable lessons. The SURR 's process has focused on making small incremental changes to address the issues in each school. That has not been sufficient. The NYSED is now building a comprehensive system to support LEAs in implementing the four intervention models. With RTTT funding, the Board of Regents has approved the creation of the ETACIT which will provide expertise on the unique conditions and requirements that are needed by turnaround schools and charter school leaders as well as teachers and local communities. The State is requiring LEAs to choose an intervention model and implement a Quality intervention Plan for each persistently lowest-performing school. LEAs are to follow a process to ensure that quality interventions are being implemented in each school. Depending on the model chosen, specific assistance Intervention Partners are assigned. Schools that do not improve will be subject to increasingly aggressive interventions. Over the course of a three-year period and with the help of an evaluation partner, the NYSED will measure the overall progress and performance of NY's lowest-performing schools. Three schools have begun implementing a new structure but not any of the models identified in the criteria for this section. NY appears to have its own models, except how it may use public charter schools.</p> <p>According to information in Section F, public charter schools are a key element of the State's turnaround strategy. LEAs will be able to replace--the restart model--existing low-performing and failing schools with public charter schools.</p>				
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)				
(E)(2)(ii): Based on the feedback from panel members to the question about turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools, points have been added.				
Total	50	47	50	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
(F) (1) (i): The State has increased its share of the State budget for education from 2008 to 2009 by 5.8%.				
(F) (1) (ii):				

(a): The State revenues per pupil are greatest for high-need students (\$10,497), followed by average-need students (\$8,450), and lowest for low-need students (\$5,110).

(b): As part of a new initiative, the big 5 LEAs and other high-need districts are required by NYSED to allocate the majority of their increases in operating aid that resulted from a funding formula to high-need schools based on student poverty and other indicators of need. To ensure that funding is distributed equitably within LEAs, districts are required to allocate their funds to schools in accountability status in proportion to student need as defined by poverty, low achievement, ELL status, and disabilities.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	37	37	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	5	5	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8	8	

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

(F) (2) (i): There is a discrepancy in the information presented in the application. On the one hand, the state states that it has more than doubled its charter cap from 200 schools to 460 schools. As of 2009 NY has 140 operating charter schools. The cap has been raised incrementally each year and it is estimated that by 2013-14, the end of the grant period, there will be 460 charter schools. The concluding statement in this section is that the new cap exceeds 10% of the total number of public schools. However, in calculating the data presented where the numerator is 460 charters and the denominator is 4,680 schools (including charters), the percentage is 9.85%, not 10%.

(F) (2) (ii): NY has a rigorous approval, monitoring, and reauthorization process for its charter schools. Under its Charter Laws, there are detailed application requirements that include student achievement goals and methods for evaluating if students have met the goals, requirements for renewal as a charter entity, provisions for accountability, and a requirement that annual reports must be submitted that include measures of academic and fiscal performance of the school, graduation rates, dropout rates, student performance on standardized tests, and college entry rates. The Law authorizes the charter entity or Board of Regents to revoke or terminate the charter of specified grounds including student performance, violations of the law, fiscal mismanagement, repeated failure to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets for high-need groups of students. Ineffective charter schools have not had their license renewed. The Law also includes provisions that encourage the formation of charter schools that serve populations similar to those of the LEA. A major focus of the law is to provide equal access to charter schools for students with disabilities, ELLs, and children from families in poverty.

(F) (2) (iii): LEAs with resident students attending charter schools are required to pay a per pupil tuition amount that is based on a computation designed to ensure that the LEA provides support for charter school students in an amount equivalent to the school's per-pupil operating expenditures on instructionally related activities. LEAs per-pupil tuition amount ranges from \$8,000 to \$24,700, based on the expenditures of the student's district of residence. The weighted average per-pupil tuition amount is approximately \$12,000 per pupil.

(F) (2) (iv): NY supports charter schools in obtaining facilities in a variety of ways: basic tuition may be used to pay facilities costs; the Charter School Stimulus Fund provides grants for development, implementation, and operation of charter schools, including start-up costs and costs associated with the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.. Charter schools have authority to issue corporate

bonds. There are also situations where a charter school may indirectly benefit from school district bonding for school construction.

(F) (2) (v): The State encourages and supports LEAs in establishing and operating innovative, autonomous public schools. Effective March 2010, the State has an Office of Innovative School models. The Office will ensure that LEAs build on successful and innovative practices. The application showcases several examples of autonomous public schools: Tech Valley HS, The College Board School, and Early College HS. There is also a partnership zone model that leverages the power of a network to build capacity at both the school and district levels.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
(F) (3): The State has created through its laws, regulations, and policies conditions that are favorable and bode well for increasing student achievement and graduation rates, as well as narrowing its achievement gaps.				
Total	55	52	52	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
(i): The State currently offers a rigorous course of study in math, the sciences, technology and engineering through universities in the local area, standards in math, science, and technology, and career development and occupational studies, as well as a professional development network. The state will offer as part of RTTT extended learning opportunities in these areas through enrichment experiences that will include in-depth study.				
(ii) The State's STEM strategy incorporates recommendations from a diverse group of organizations and partners such as the Carnegie institute for Advanced Study, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, the science teachers association, and the association of Mathematics Teachers, as well as collaborative groups including the NYS STEM Education Collaborative. Through the STEM collaborative, partnerships with IHEs whose focus is on science will be strengthened. Several projects are planned to train teachers and school leaders in STEM areas. One of the planned projects will provide professional development for middle and high school teachers to develop curricula and instructional strategies for teaching AP or college-level courses in STEM areas.				
(iii) One of the projects planned is an Incentive Fund for STEM Certification and High Needs School Placement. These grants will provide for supplemental compensation for teachers of STEM/ELLs/SWDs to work in high need schools (which include underrepresented groups and women and girls in STEM fields) to prepare students to work in careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics.				
Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
--	-----------	--------	--------	------

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The State has demonstrated in its comprehensive reform package, specifically in the activities it has planned, that it is committed to achieving its goals. Each of the activities has been carefully planned and there is broad support for the reform agenda to be successful. However there are some concerns based on information in the application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The targeted growth outcomes are modest and not ambitious. Although students appear to do perform much better on the state assessments than on NAEP assessments, when the data are disaggregated there are sub-groups of students in high-need LEAs in particularly that are performing at low levels. The targeted growth for these students in particular need to be at a much higher level specially given the intense effort by the State in its planned activities to help these students. 2. There does not appear to be support by the teacher association in several high-need LEAs. This is of concern because a lack of support could thwart the reform activities planned. 3. Because several charter school models, e.g., KIPP, have been so successful, activities planned to increase student achievement in LEAs would benefit from modeling the practices of these schools. 4. The development and implementation timeline for many activities does not begin until years 2 and beyond in many reform areas. This will affect being able to make the type of needed improvements for students, especially students in high-need LEAs and schools. 				
Total		0	0	
Grand Total	500	454	463	

Total	50	47	47	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	

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

(F)(1) Making education funding a priority

(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education

REVIEWER'S SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY APPLICANT:

• New York increased the share of the state's budget devoted to elementary, secondary, and public higher education from 39.4 percent in the 2007–08 school year to 41.7 percent in the 2008–09 school year. This represents an increase of \$1.835 billion—or almost 6 percent—in a year that saw a decline in State revenues, thereby indicating the importance New York places on providing world-class education to its students.

(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools

REVIEWER'S SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY APPLICANT:

• In 2007–08, New York adopted and began phasing-in a new "foundation aid" education funding formula designed to ensure adequate funding across school districts, explicitly taking into account student need. The same year, the State made a historic \$1.87 billion—10.5 %—increase in education funding. The early results of these policies have been promising. The greatest increase in funding has gone to school districts whose previous funding levels were farthest below the formula amount, and in 2008–09 (the most recent year for which data are available) high-need school districts and charter schools received an average of almost three times as much state aid per student as low-need districts. High-need LEAs will continue to benefit from additional increases, as the foundation aid formula is phased in.

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

New York has provided a sufficient response to criteria F(1)(i) and F(1)(ii). Specifically satisfied were the requests for evidence to show: (a) that the percentage of the total revenues available to the state that were used to support elementary, secondary and higher education for FY 2009 were greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the state that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008 and (b) affirmation that the state's policies lead to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs, and within LEAs, between high-poverty schools and other schools.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	37	37	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	5	5	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8	8	

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

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools

(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"

REVIEWER'S SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY APPLICANT:

- New York's charter school law does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State. New York State has leveraged the resources and expertise of multiple stakeholders to support high-quality charter schools. Public/private partnerships work collaboratively to set a culture and expectation for quality and rigor in the choice options available to children and communities. Passage of Chapter 101 of the Laws of 2010 significantly increases the number of charter schools authorized in the State and enacts several accountability and oversight enhancements to ensure quality and integrity.
- New York has two statewide charter school authorizers: the New York State Board of Regents and the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (SUNY). Local boards of education and the Chancellor of the New York City School District may be charter authorizers for charter schools within their school districts. This authorizing structure is intended to foster innovation and support the establishment of charter schools with varied philosophical bases. The two statewide charter school authorizers work in partnership with the New York City Department of Education to ensure that only governing boards with the will, skill, and capacity to sustain quality schools are awarded charters. The authorizers rigorously monitor the academic and operational programs of the public charter schools in the State. Quality support organizations including the New York State Charter School Association and the New York City Charter School Center, provide high-quality technical assistance to the state's public charter schools, as well as advocacy and links to national policy and research resources for schools.
- New York more than doubled its charter cap from 200 schools to 460 schools on May 28, 2010, when Chapter 101 of the Laws of 2010 was enacted. New York's new cap of 460 public charter schools exceeds 10 percent of the total number of public schools in the State, and therefore qualifies as a "high" cap for the purposes of RTTT, particularly if the ability of New York's public schools to convert to charter schools, which are not subject to a cap, is factored in.

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

This reviewer concludes that, essentially, New York's charter school law does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high performing charter schools and that New York continues to leverage the resources and expertise of multiple stakeholders to support high-quality charter schools throughout the State. However, attention is called to the fact that New York failed to provide evidence in its application needed to satisfy that part of this criterion which asks for the

percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools (the 10% factor). The actual number for New York is 9.85%.

(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes

REVIEWER'S SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY APPLICANT:

- New York's Education Law §2851(2) establishes detailed charter school application requirements, including a required description of student achievement goals and the methods of evaluating whether students have achieved such goals. Under Education Law §2852(2), a charter entity may only approve an application upon certain specified findings, which include whether the charter school is in compliance with law, whether the applicant can demonstrate the ability to operate the school in an educationally and fiscally sound manner, and whether granting the application is likely to improve student learning and achievement.
- The Board of Regents and any other charter entity that approved the charter are required by Education Law §2853(2) to exercise oversight sufficient to ensure the charter school is in compliance with law and its charter, and both the Regents and the other charter entities are given authority to visit, examine and inspect each charter school. Education Law §2853(2-a) affords the school district in which the charter school is located the power to visit, examine and inspect the charter school.
- Education Law §2854 specifically requires charter schools to demonstrate good faith efforts to attract and retain a greater enrollment of students with disabilities and English language learners than the school district in which it is located. Education Law §2854(2)(a) authorizes the formation of charter schools designed to provide expanded learning opportunities to students at risk of academic failure, and thus the establishment of admissions criteria encouraging admission of at-risk students.

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

New York's Education Law §2851(2) establishes detailed charter school application requirements, including a required description of student achievement goals and the methods of evaluating whether students have achieved such goals. Under Education Law §2852(2), a charter entity may only approve an application upon certain specified findings, which include whether the charter school is in compliance with law, whether the applicant can demonstrate the ability to operate the school in an educationally and fiscally sound manner, and whether granting the application is likely to improve student learning and achievement. This reviewer concludes that the applicant has satisfactorily responded to the criterion.

(iii) Equitably funding charter schools

REVIEWER'S SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY APPLICANT:

- New York's primary funding mechanism for charter schools is through mandated tuition payments by school districts. Education Law §2856(1) requires that public school districts with resident students attending charter schools pay a per pupil tuition amount (the "charter school basic tuition") to the charter school for each of these students. That per-pupil amount is based on a computation designed to ensure that the district provides support for charter school pupils in an amount equivalent to the school district's per-pupil operating expenditures on instructionally related activities. The per-pupil tuition amount ranges from \$8,000 to \$24,700, based on the expenditures of the student's district of residence. The weighted average per-pupil tuition amount is approximately \$12,000 per pupil.
- Charter schools are considered local educational agencies (LEAs), as defined in 20 U.S.C. §7801(26), and apply as LEAs for awards under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) or other federal funding sources that use the ESEA definition and for the school lunch and school breakfast programs. Also, federal Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B funding attributable to students with disabilities (SWD) must be paid by the school district to a charter school that opts to provide special

education to such students. Since 1999, New York has been awarded \$56,161,991 from the Federal Charter Schools Program for grants to charter schools. Thus, New York charter schools are eligible to receive a commensurate share of federal funds.

- By linking charter school basic tuition to school district operating expenditures and requiring that a variety of services be provided to charter school students at school district expense, New York's charter school funding formula provides equitable funding as compared to traditional public schools.

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

New York's primary funding mechanism for charter schools is through mandated tuition payments by school districts. Education Law §2856(1) requires that public school districts with resident students attending charter schools pay a per pupil tuition amount (the "charter school basic tuition") to the charter school for each of these students and that the per-pupil amount is based on a computation designed to ensure that the district provides support for charter school pupils in an amount equivalent to the school district's per-pupil operating expenditures on instructionally related activities. This reviewer concludes that the applicant has satisfactorily responded to the criterion.

(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities

REVIEWER'S SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY APPLICANT:

- New York supports charter schools in obtaining facilities in a variety of ways and intends to augment existing avenues through exploration of credit enhancement programs. Charter school basic tuition may be used to pay facilities costs. In addition, the New York State Charter Schools Stimulus Fund provides grants for the development, implementation and operation of charter schools, including start-up costs and costs associated with the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities. Additionally, Education Law §2853(3)(a) provides that charter schools may be located in part of an existing public school building, in space provided on a private work site, in a public building, or in any other suitable location. Education Law §2853(4)(c) also provides that charter schools may contract with a school district or the governing body of a public college or university for the use of a school building and grounds. Any such contract must provide such services or facilities at cost.
- Pursuant to Education Law §2853(1)(d), charter schools have authority to issue corporate bonds, which are tax exempt. Charter schools have found it much easier to obtain permanent financing as more and more charter schools have had their initial charters renewed. As LEAs, they are eligible to apply to participate in Federal school bond programs, including Qualified Zone Academy Bonds and Qualified School Construction Bonds. These programs provide interest free borrowing to LEAs and result in a higher proportion of overall project funding to be devoted to actual brick-and-mortar construction instead of incidental costs. New York charter school applicants are ranked based on their student eligibility for the federal free and reduced-price lunch program. Charter schools that serve low-wealth, high-poverty populations will rank highly among applicants providing a greater opportunity to access interest-free bonding programs.

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

The New York State Charter Schools Stimulus Fund provides grants for the development, implementation and operation of charter schools, including start-up costs and costs associated with the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities. Additionally, Education Law §2853(3)(a) provides that charter schools may be located in part of an existing public school building, in space provided on a private work site, in a public building, or in any other suitable location. Education Law §2853(4)(c) also provides that charter schools may contract with a school district or the governing body of a public college or university for the use of a school building and grounds. Charter schools also have authority to issue corporate bonds, which are tax exempt.

Charter schools have found it much easier to obtain permanent financing as more and more charter schools have had their initial charters renewed. As LEAs, Charter school are eligible to apply to participate in Federal school bond programs, including Qualified Zone Academy Bonds and Qualified School Construction Bonds. This reviewer concludes that the applicant has satisfactorily responded to the criterion.

(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools

REVIEWER'S SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY APPLICANT:

- The NYSED Office of Innovative School Models (OISM) began operation in March 2010 with the mission of creating state-level policy and operating conditions to dramatically increase student achievement. This office will work with districts and schools statewide to identify and support approaches to academic and operational programs that are outside of the traditional district approach to public schooling. OISM will serve as a clearinghouse for innovative supporting partners, systems and structures that schools and districts can use to define school autonomies and hold individual schools and school networks accountable for those increased flexibilities.
- The OISM will be a resource for schools and districts as they define flexible school autonomies and linked school performance contracts for:
 - Under performing schools, implementing one of the four prescribed improvement models;
 - High-functioning schools seeking increased autonomy or flexibility from existing district structures;
 - Schools and districts acknowledging the need for increased site-based autonomies in order for schools to be more responsive to student needs and the needs of the professional teaching staff in the building;
 - Implementing the Board of Regents charge to strengthen the State Education Department's approach to charter authorizing which is a key component of the Department's strategy to help schools maximize student academic achievement, advance the education reform agenda of the Regents, and ensure full public accountability and transparency for the expenditure of public dollars.

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

The NYSED Office of Innovative School Models (OISM) began operation in March, 2010 with the mission of creating state-level policy and operating conditions to dramatically increase student achievement. This office will work with districts and schools statewide to identify and support approaches to academic and operational programs that are outside of the traditional district approach to public schooling. This reviewer concludes that the applicant has satisfactorily responded to the criterion.

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

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

REVIEWER'S SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY APPLICANT:

- New York cites a variety of evidence in response to this criterion which asks about other conditions—created through law, regulation, or policy—favorable to education reform or innovation. Among examples is the State's strong assertion

that it has a complete, interconnected network of educational services capable of being focused on educational reform areas addressed in the State's Race to the Top application—all under the guidance and direction of the Board of Regents. Also cited is the Regents' determination to raise student achievement and graduation rates reflected in their recent policy decisions to adopt higher standards and improved assessments; adopt regulations to provide new teachers and school leaders with rich clinical experiences; build data links between PreK–12 education and higher education institutions; and adopt regulations to align the State's accountability system with the new requirements to assist persistently low-achieving schools.

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

In this reviewer's judgment, of greatest significance in response to this criterion are the copious references within New York's RTTT application relative to legislation, commissions, initiatives, collaborative strategies, and other actions and activities—past and present—which now demonstrate a remarkable level of commitment in support of the robust reform agenda found in New York's RTTT application. What appears to this reviewer to have happened is a fundamental coalescence of will on the part of the major stakeholders—in effect a deep synergistic impact—which is now reshaping the future of education in New York—with RTTT as the catalyst—resulting in a remarkable proposal.

Total	55	52	52	
-------	----	----	----	--

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

The Competitive Preference Priority (STEM) asks for evidence of: (a) a high-quality plan to address provision of rigorous courses of study in the STEM disciplines; (b) cooperation with STEM-capable school and community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines; and (c) a plan to prepare more students for advanced study and careers in STEM fields—including addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls.

New York proposes to address STEM elements, as defined by the criterion, in the following manner:

(a) Enhanced Standards and Assessments

- Implement the new Common Core mathematics standards;
- Revise and strengthen the state's science standards and assessments;
- Upgrade and make more rigorous the mathematics, science and technology learning standards; create and implement learning standards and assessments for technology education and create learning standards and assessments for engineering education;
- Provide aligned, spiraled, sequenced, content-rich statewide curriculum models within and across each of the STEM disciplines to provide direction to the field for content and its integration across the STEM disciplines;
- Review and scale-up initiatives for all students, but particularly underrepresented groups, including minorities and women.

(b) Data Systems

- Use data systems to access, analyze and apply data to inform and differentiate instruction, to track students' STEM education through P-12 and into higher education and careers and to target students for additional coursework in STEM related subjects.

(c) Great Teachers and School Leaders

- Develop new and innovative human capital strategies that will: strengthen supports for recruitment, pre-service, induction and promotion of teachers and leaders in STEM disciplines, be strategically placed in geographic regions where shortages exist, and serve the highest poverty, lowest achieving schools;
- Provide financial incentives for teachers to be certified in STEM disciplines and to teach in high-need schools;
- Through the NYS STEM Collaborative, strengthen partnerships with institutions of higher education whose focus is science (such as those institutions mentioned above) to open new learning opportunities for educators who in turn can inspire students to pursue STEM professions.

- Promote professional development that trains school leaders and teachers to analyze data, identify the differentiated learning needs of students, and assess the need for interventions;
- Invest in sophisticated on-line professional development systems that facilitate learning communities and cyber-learning and use these systems to facilitate communication about STEM between faculty and administrators in the lowest performing schools and districts as well as the more successful ones;
- Collaborate with networks such as the Empire State STEM Education Progressive Dialogue, the statewide professional development network and with universities to provide professional development and support to school leaders and teachers in STEM disciplines;
- Train teachers from targeted LEAs (as determined by data analysis) to prepare them to implement AP programs within their respective schools;

(d) Address Low-Performing Schools

- Support innovation in low-performing schools to integrate STEM throughout the curriculum with a particular focus on underrepresented populations, including women, economically disadvantaged students, and minorities;
- Strengthen partnerships with institutions of higher education whose focus is science; coordinate effective design of online learning for STEM courses;
- Set targets and goals to increase achievement, particularly for historically underperforming groups in science and mathematics.

(e) Promote and facilitate partnerships between school districts, colleges and universities and the corporate sector to create STEM programs that feature best practices, including in-depth, creative problem-solving and cooperative learning.

(f) Increase students' access to career and technical education programming, focusing on mathematics and science;

(g) Increase utilization of the statewide professional development network already in place to support turnaround efforts in the lowest-performing schools through technical assistance, data analysis and targeted professional development;

(h) Provide access to high quality virtual STEM courses for students in low performing schools (Note Regents Action Item, December, 2009).

(i) Provide intensive professional development to teachers who will teach in an online environment.

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

In New York's response to the competitive performance priority, this reviewer found evidence of a high-quality plan which addresses each required element: (a) provision of rigorous courses of study in the STEM disciplines; (b) cooperation with STEM-capable school and community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students; and (c) a plan to prepare more students for advanced study and careers in STEM fields—including addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

REVIEWER'S SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY APPLICANT:

- Expectations

The Absolute Priority asks for evidence that the State's application comprehensively and coherently addresses the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to show that the State and participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The State must also have demonstrated in its application sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans; and it must have described how the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS:

This reviewer has intensely studied the New York RTTT application and believes that the conditions required to satisfy the Absolute Priority criterion have been fully met and substantially exceeded. The plan is uniformly characterized by creative and bold thinking, high quality exposition, evidence of professional integrity, inherent logic, evidence of a reasonable prospect of being achieved, and the highest kind of professional commitment to fully succeed during the implementation phase(s). In support of this judgment, the reviewer has provided synopses of the applicant's responses to each criterion together with summative evaluative comments which elaborate the previous observation. These are found in each section of this reviewer's Race to the Top Application Review for New York.

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

Grand Total	500	469	482	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>(i) The absolute increase in funds for education increased 5.8% from 2007-08 to 2008-09 from 39.4% to 41.7% of state funds.</p> <p>(ii) The state has taken notable steps to phase in a formula that ensures adequate funding across school districts, with the greatest increase in funding being allocated to school districts whose previous funding levels were farthest below the formula amount. In 2007-08 the state made a 10.5% increase in educational funding. In 2008-09 high-need school districts and charter schools received an average of almost 3 times as much state aid per student as low-need districts. New York's 204 high-need school districts include slightly over one-half of the state's average daily enrollment and now receive almost two-thirds of the state aid. The state also has a state-mandated procedure that requires districts in need of academic progress to consider redirecting resources to programs designed to improve student achievement.</p>				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	37	37	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	5	5	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8	8	
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>(i) New York has significantly increased its cap on charter schools from 200 to 460, which does not clearly exceed 10% of the total number of public schools in the state, depending on the methodology used to calculate the percentage. More information is needed to explain the methodology used to calculate the percentage articulated in this proposal. The state did not address having any restrictions that would evenly mildly impede the creation of high-quality charter schools.</p> <p>(ii) New York has a stringent process, delineated in state statute, for approving, monitoring, and reauthorizing its charter schools. This process has been recognized nationally as a rigorous process. If the Board of Regents approves a charter or it is approved by statute, the new charter school is formed for a term of up to 5 years, or in other instances for 5 years during which the entity provides instruction. Throughout this section of the proposal, New York describes its priorities for ensuring that charter schools of high quality are created, maintained, and monitored. The state's charter schools laws and oversight procedures are described in sufficient detail to ensure this emphasis on quality. The charter schools community, including authorizers, philanthropic partners, charter school associations, and</p>				

charter schools management organizations have collaborated to help ensure the success of the state's charter schools, particularly for students in the most need.

(iii) The state's primary funding for charter schools is through mandated tuition payments by school districts. Funding for the charter schools is equivalent to districts' per-pupil expenditure; therefore the funding is greater than 90% of that allocated to traditional public school students.

(iv) The state supports charter schools in obtaining facilities in a variety of ways. For example, charter school tuition can be used to pay costs for facilities. The states's stimulus fund provides grants for the development and operation of charter schools. Additionally, charter schools may be located in part of an existing public school building or any other suitable building. Facility-related requirements on charter schools are not more strict than those applied to traditional public schools, and, in fact, some requirements for charter schools are less strict than those applied to traditional public schools.

(v) New York supports the establishment of innovative and autonomous public schools. The state recently created the Office of Innovative School Models, whose mission is to work with school districts to support approaches to academic and operational programs outside of traditional approaches to public schooling and to serve as a clearinghouse for these innovative models. The proposal describes an array of programs that serve as successful model approaches to public education.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>The integration of public education in New York from P-20 in a realistic manner is laudable and speaks to the necessity of beginning to prepare students at an early age for success in college or the workforce. The coherent P-20 design for education, involving both the public and private sectors, will greatly enhance the state's ability to both serve its neediest students and provide to all of its students the readiness for higher education or the workforce. New York provides an array of educational services, all of which are under the guidance and direction of the Board of Regents. The Regents have created a process for career and technical education programs designed to improve high school graduation rates, sponsored an Innovation Lab as part of the Next Generation of Learners initiative, collaborated with the University of the State of New York to provide universal access to libraries, museums, and other cultural institutions, and partnered with New York Institutions of Higher Education to provide middle and high school students with the opportunity to take dual credit courses.</p>				
Total	55	52	52	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>New York has integrated its focus on STEM into its overall education reform plan by targeting instruction and enhancing student performance in the STEM areas to foster success in higher education or a career. Throughout the proposal New York describes its plans and current initiatives to provide a rigorous course of study in the STEM areas by partnering with appropriate industry experts, universities, and other STEM-focused entities to assist educators in the STEM areas. New York's plan especially emphasizes integrating STEM content across</p>				

the curriculum and providing a cohesive pathway to prepare more students in the STEM areas, especially targeting currently underrepresented groups.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

New York has presented a well-developed and integrated plan for systemic education reform. The state has described in detail a coherent system for addressing education reform P-16 and has established reasonable priorities for attaining the goals of ensuring that all New York students leave school prepared for higher education and/or the workplace. New York's proposal has successfully and effectively addressed all elements of this priority.

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

Grand Total	500	465	476	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--