THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK / ALBANY, NY 12234

To: Higher Education Committee

From: Valerie Grey

Subject: Modification of Program Design and Evaluation Process for the Graduate Level Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Pilot Program Request for Proposals

Date: July 15, 2011

Authorizations:

SUMMARY

Issue for Decision

Should the Board of Regents adopt the following proposed modifications relating to the design of and evaluation process for the Graduate Level Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Pilot Program Request for Proposals?

- Improve the proposal review process
- Revise the definition of high need school for the purposes of the clinical experience component of the program to mean an "achieving high need school"
- Clarify regulatory language regarding the recommendation for certification upon completion of the program

Reason(s) for Consideration

Review of Policy.

Proposed Handling

The proposed amendment is submitted to the Higher Education Committee for action at its July 2011 meeting.

Procedural History

At the November and December 2009 meetings, the Board of Regents approved actions to transform school leadership in New York State and to recruit skilled leaders in New York's high need schools, including approving the conceptual framework for Graduate Level Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Pilot Programs. This framework was included in New York's Race to the Top proposal.

At their May 2010 meeting, the Board of Regents adopted as an emergency measure proposed regulations relating to the establishment of Graduate Level Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Pilot Programs.

Section 52.21(c)(7) as adopted in May 2010 establishes the general program registration standards for the pilot program and it requires candidates to meet the general requirements for the school building leader certificate as prescribed in the current program registration requirements for traditional leadership preparation programs.

At their February 2011 meeting, the Board of Regents reviewed policy issues and proposed scoring rubrics for the Graduate Level Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Pilot Program.

Background

In February 2011, the policy issues that were considered by the Board of Regents included: a regional approach to funding; the evaluation role of the Blue Ribbon Commission; the critical programmatic elements being reviewed and scored, the Regents Priorities to be addressed and the budget scoring process. Highlights included:

Regional Approach

The regional approach to funding the partnerships that was discussed included: New York City, The Big Four (Buffalo, Rochester and Syracuse City School districts and Yonkers Public Schools), and Rest of State. This approach was recommended to ensure an equitable distribution of funds to high need communities across the State. The applicants must partner with one or more of the State's 647 high need schools (this includes SURR schools, Persistently Low Achieving Schools and/or Schools in Improvement Status). Funding of $10 million would be allocated to each region based on the percent of high need schools within each region.

Blue Ribbon Commission and Board of Regents Committee

Consistent with New York's Race to the Top application, it was decided that a Blue Ribbon Commission of distinguished school leader educators would be convened to assist in the review and rating of all applicants for participation in the pilot program. The Commission will be appointed by the Board of Regents. It was recommended that the proposed role of the Commission in reviewing and scoring the technical/programmatic section of applicants' proposals. This section of the RFP would be worth a total of 60 points. Potentially approvable applications would be independently reviewed and scored by two members of the Commission using the scoring rubric. The two scores

would be averaged together and that total will be the narrative/technical score for the applicant's proposal. In the event there is a 15-point or more difference between reviewers in the narrative/technical score assigned to an application, a third reviewer of the Commission will evaluate the application. The lowest score will be dropped and the narrative score will be based on the average of the remaining two evaluations.

Those applications that receive a minimum score of 45 points from the Commission would be forwarded to a Committee of the New York State Board of Regents (Committee) for review and scoring. The Committee will assign to each application a score of up to 20 points relating to the identified Regents priorities in the evaluation rubric. The Chancellor will appoint members of the Board of Regents to serve on the Committee to review applications under this pilot program. Each application will be read by two Regents. The two scores will be averaged together and that total will be the score each applicant receives for addressing the Regents Priorities.

All members on the Committee and the Commission would receive appropriate procurement and ethics training.

Proposed Evaluation Rubric

Non-budgetary components of the evaluation rubric will address both requirements included in the Commissioner's Regulations and programmatic priorities identified by the Board of Regents in their overall reform agenda. Both the Commission and the Committee will be asked to assess specific items related to the Regents priorities. Specific Regents priorities include educating students with disabilities; educating English language learners; and for preparing teachers and principals for hard-to-staff subject areas, especially in the STEM disciplines and for high need schools that will positively impact student achievement and reduce/close the achievement gap or reduce the achievement disparities among the various subgroups.

Final Tabulation

After completing the budget scoring (up to 20 points), the Contract Administration Unit will add the point scores for all the scoring sections and provide a rank order of the proposals based on their scores.

Appendix I provides the scoring rubric from February 2011.

Decision: Improve the proposal review process

The proposal review process has four steps that are intended to thoroughly evaluate the quality of proposed programs:

1. Blue Ribbon Commission Review (60 points) - Evaluates the proposal's programmatic components. Only proposals meeting a minimum amount of points advance to the next phase of review.

2. Review of Board of Regents Priorities (20 points) - Evaluates how thoroughly the proposal addresses the Regents Priorities.

3. Contract Administration Unit Review (20 points) - Determines "best value" programs.

4. Program Office Review (not scored, but approval is required for applicants that are identified to receive an award and that plan to confer degrees).

The Graduate Level Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Pilot RFP was issued in November 2010 and preliminary awards were announced this month. In order to enable these Graduate Level Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Pilot Programs to start in a timely manner, the Department proposes the following changes to the "Blue Ribbon Commission Review" and the "Review of Board of Regents Priorities" as follows

- Improved scheduling and coordination. Members of the Blue Ribbon Commission and the Board of Regents Priorities will conduct their reviews on-site during a one or two day review session scheduled in advance.

- Each application would be reviewed by three members of the Blue Ribbon Commission, the lowest score would be eliminated and the two remaining scores would be averaged. While this would require more applications being scored than under the Clinically Rich Teacher RFP, the process itself would be streamlined by removing the "3rd reviewer" stage for applications that had variation of 15 points or more.

- More focused and defined narrative. The Regents Priority narrative would be limited in length to approximately 5 to 10 pages in order to provide more targeted information.

Decision: Revise the definition of "high need school" for the purpose of the clinical experience component to mean "achieving high need school"

The clinically rich principal preparation pilot programs are intended to increase the supply of highly effective principals in "high need schools," which are defined to include Schools Under Registration Review, low performing schools, and other high need schools approved by the Board of Regents. Candidates will be selected, in part, on whether they have experience in high need schools and will be required to commit to be a school building leader for at least four years in a high need school upon graduation from the program.

In order to learn how to succeed in these challenging circumstances, candidates need to learn from principal mentors who are themselves successful. Therefore, the Department recommends that for the clinical experience component of the program, candidates only be placed in *achieving* high need schools, that is, schools that are demonstrating improving performance and/or positive academic growth with one or more groups of high need students.

Decision: Clarify regulatory language around recommendation of certification

The regulations for the clinically rich principal preparation pilot program currently provide that "a designated officer of the institution offering the pilot program shall be required to recommend the candidate for an initial certificate, upon completion of the program and after consultation with the principal-mentor."

It is recommended that the regulatory language reflect that this requirement applies only to situations in which a candidate is not yet certified. Candidates who already hold the School Building Leader certificate may be eligible to participate in the clinically rich principal preparation pilot program. However, in such cases, there is no need for the designated officer of the institution to recommend the candidate for a certificate.

Therefore, if approved, the Department will put clarifying regulatory language before the Board of Regents at its September meeting.

Discussion: Issues for discussion in the design of the RFP and scoring of applications

Last week, the Graduate Level Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Pilot Program procurement process was completed and preliminary award notices were sent to the winners. These awards will be final once approval by the Office of the State Comptroller and Attorney General is obtained. There were 38 applicants and 11 applicants who will receive funding (see Appendix II). Based on that experience there are a number of issues that will be discussed with the Board:

How can the RFP be designed to ensure more innovative applications?

How should regions be defined for purposes of funding?

How can sustainability be better evaluated in the Regents priorities while adhering to OSC procurement guidelines? Should matching funds be required?

Should the definition of eligible organizations be changed to exclude partnerships with high need elementary schools and limit funding solely to middle and high schools?

Should there be any changes to the scoring rubric based on teacher preparation pilot project experience?

<u>Recommendation</u>

It is recommended that the Board of Regents approve the modifications relating to the evaluation and design of the Graduate Level Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Pilot Program Request for Proposals.

It is recommended that Department staff confer with the Board on issues for discussion and advance any revisions in the design and evaluation process for this program at the September Board meeting and release the RFP later that month.

Timetable for Implementation

The proposed modifications will become effective immediately to ensure timely posting of the Graduate Level Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Pilot Program Request for Proposals.

Appendix I: February 2011 Scoring Rubric

Blue Ribbon Commission Scoring Rubric (up to 60 points)

A. Collaboration (Maximum 4 points)

The proposal provides a clear and detailed description of the scope and extent of involvement by collaborating partners, showing substantial collaboration among them in the planning and proposed implementation of project activities and indicates substantial collaboration.

B. Recruitment (Maximum 3 points)

Proposal describes the specific strategies, admission standards, and activities that will be used to recruit and select to not only a diverse group of the highest caliber of candidates to the pilot program but also candidates with a strong commitment to high need schools; and lists the specific criteria that must be met by participants in order to be eligible for the program.

C. Program Objectives, Strategies, Activities, Services, and Performance Measures/Data Sources (Maximum 50 points)

- The proposal describes how School Building Leaders are prepared in the use of technology in an effective and innovative fashion to positively impact the operation of a high needs school. (Up to 5 points)
- The proposal describes the preparation of School Building Leaders to take into account the rich variety of cultural styles found in high need schools so as to enable effective, appropriate, and beneficial interaction and collaboration between school personnel and the community. (Up to 5 points)
- The proposal describes how program participants will be monitored and evaluated on their performance formatively throughout the clinical program component and summative upon completion of all program requirements, including the roles of all parties involved (e.g. mentor-principal, program provider personnel, high-needs school personnel, other stakeholders). (Up to 10 points)
- The proposal describes in detail how the institution plans to select and provide training for mentors and how the mentors will be employed to provide effective support to the new School Building Leader throughout the program. (Up to 10 points)
- The proposal describes in detail how the institution will effectively prepare School Building Leaders to work with students educationally at risk, including students with disabilities and English language learners. (Up to 10 points)
- The proposal describes the process used by the institution to provide continued mentoring support for pilot program graduates. (Up to 5 points)
- The extent to which school leaders will be prepared to use data and other research based strategies to strengthen teacher effectiveness. (Up to 5 points)

D. Institutional Capacity (Maximum 3 points)

The proposal describes in detail the institution's prior positive impact on growth and achievement of all students and provides a clear description of the institution's experience, commitment, and plan to provide a research-based approach to implementing the Graduate Level Clinically Rich Principal Preparation Pilot Program.

Appendix I: February 2011 Scoring Rubric

Regents Committee Scoring Rubric (up to 20 points)

- The extent to which innovative approaches are employed using research-based clinically-rich educational models. (up to 7 points)
- The extent to which the proposal demonstrates collaboration with parents and community organizations and members to identify and respond to diverse school community interests and needs. (Up to 4 points)
- The extent to which the proposal prepares School Building Leaders for high need schools focused on improving student achievement for educationally at risk students. (Up to 9 points)

Contract Administration Unit Review – Budget (up to 20 points)

This section of the RFP is independently scored by the Department's Contract Administration Unit.

The budget section of the proposal represents 20 points of overall score and will be awarded points pursuant to a formula calculating the "best value." This calculation will be computed by the Contract Administration Unit upon completion of the final narrative scoring by the New York State Board of Regents.

Appendix II: Graduate Level Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Pilot Program Awardees

Mercy College	$2,373,985
SUNY Oswego	$1,727,500
Syracuse University	$1,663,659
Union Graduate College	$1,274,368
SUNY Albany	$1,426,515
New York University	$2,121,291
Adelphi University	$816,016
Fordham University	$2,518,080
American Museum of Natural History	$2,625,000
CUNY Lehman College	$810,000
CUNY Queens College	$2,618,268