

Total	50	30
-------	----	----

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In 2008, the total funding for public elementary and secondary education was \$2.3 billion, or 38% of the total recurring dollars in the state's General fund and in 2009, the total was \$2.4 billion, or 44% of the state's General fund. New Mexico's Public School Finance Act has been hailed as one of the most innovative plans in the country. The formula is designed to distribute operational funds to school districts objectively and in a non-categorical manner while providing for local school district autonomy. School districts have the latitude to spend their dollars according to local priorities. Some have questioned the formula, and in response the State Board of Education, the Legislature and the Governor commissioned an independent study of the funding formula that found it to be a highly equitable formula with fewer spending disparities than in other states. No overt efforts are made to diminish disparities within districts.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>33</b>
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The state has a cap that says that in school districts under 1,300 students, no more than 10 percent of its student population could attend charter schools. They say it has never come to that, but the fact remains that this discourages innovation, transformation and possibly educational improvement—the 3 hallmarks of their state theory of action. Local school district boards and the state can authorize charter schools. The Charter Schools Division within the Public Education Department makes recommendations for approval, denial, suspension and revocation of the state chartered schools. The Charter Schools Act of 2006 allows for the renewal of existing charter schools through multiple authorizers, uses strong accountability for applicants and existing charter schools, offers an appeals process for authorizer decisions, mandated board training and expectations of academic and fiscal management results. The state developed new forms and procedures to assist charter schools developers in understanding the application process and how applications would be evaluated. The tools are on the state website and have become models of best practices for the 89 district authorizers in the state. More applicants have applied to the state than districts in recent years. In 2007, the state received 9 applications and approved 2. That same year only one application was received by a local district. In 2008 and 2009, there were no applications to districts, and 27 to the state, with 14 approved. (They don't offer reasons for the applications denied.) Local district authorizers have closed 4 schools since 2005. Three were closed for fiscal mismanagement and the fourth for failure to meet academic progress, governance issues and financial mismanagement. In 2009, the state denied a renewal for poor academic performance. 18 of the 88 charter schools are established to serve students deemed "at risk of failure." While they offer guidance for local districts on how to approve, there remains a question as to why there are no applications submitted to districts. Few schools have been closed for academic reasons, but it's not clear how the rest are performing and whether they are achieving. Charter schools are funded equally as deemed in the statute, at not less than 98% of the school-generated program cost, with 2% going to the school district for administrative support. The Public School Capital Outlay Council has provided charter schools with lease payments funding in the amount of \$700 per student. A constitutional amendment was passed 2 years ago that allows districts and charter schools to enter into a lease for purchase agreement. They have also included charter schools in receiving local bond funding. School boards decide whether to operate innovative, autonomous public schools. Some of these include magnet schools and Family Schools (half public schools curriculum coupled with a half-day education by the family.)</p>		

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b> The state has restructured divisions and departments making education a cabinet level department and giving it more prominence. It has also made a host of other legislative actions to promote many of the areas in the 4 assurances, including work on accountability, data collection, funding for traditional public schools as well as charter schools, work on growing new teachers, enlisting STEM industry partners, joining standards and assessment consortium, and engaging students in new ways through technology.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>46</b>

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments:</b> Embedded throughout the application, both in work already underway and yet to get started, STEM features prominently. With intellectual assets already invested in the state (2 National Laboratories, universities, air force bases, Honeywell and Northrup Grumman) they are well positioned to make inroads in growing future mathematicians, scientists and high tech workforce. The state has a Math and Science Bureau. They plan to strengthen STEM prep for teachers and to train superintendents on how to incorporate STEM into their districts. They will adopt STEM curriculum aligned to national and international standards. They have challenges to advance studies and careers in STEM especially in underserved and minority population areas. They are also pushing toward student computer literacy and a 5 year public awareness campaign "STEM Matters."		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments:</b> The state's plan is coherent and includes significant efforts lined up for each of the four assurances. Their past efforts have shown that they are beginning to take education reform more seriously in recent years, even if they have yet to see real gains in student achievement or turnarounds in struggling schools. They have a solid majority of LEAs signed on, as well as the state level teacher union president (though not the union president of the largest district). Their plans to address teacher shortage and equitable distribution, rolling out new standards, collecting and using data and really doing something about their lowest performing schools have some unique and potentially successful strategies in mind for their challenging geography.		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>310</b>

funding recommendations and does not explore how this expansion would be accomplished. For the criterion of program expansion, the proposal does not have a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable targets.

<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: Regarding the criterion to provide effective, data-informed professional development, there is little attention in the response, with the exception of STEM programs, to the need for professional development to be data-informed. In the response to the criterion to measure the effectiveness of professional development supports, there is little attention to evaluation of professional development activities.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>73</b>

**E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The State has the authority to intervene in schools but not in LEAs.		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>30</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	25
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Regarding the criterion for a plan to identify lowest-achieving schools, New Mexico has already identified these schools. Regarding the criterion to support LEAs in turning around lowest-performing schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models, New Mexico presents a plan that identifies actions, responsible persons and timelines. One of the promising components of the plan is the use of Cadres of Exemplary Teachers and Principals. However, the State has demonstrated little experience in turning around schools, and the New Mexico Department of Education has not yet demonstrated the capacity to carry out a turnaround agenda.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>35</b>

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: New Mexico meets the criterion that percentage of total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education were greater in 2009 than in 2008. In addition, New Mexico meets the criterion that states that there is equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs. However, the response does not address the part of the criterion regarding equitable funding within LEAs, between high-poverty and other schools.		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>35</b>

<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
The State does not meet the criterion of a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools. Although New Mexico has been supportive of the expansion of charter schools, portions of the charter school law effectively inhibit the expansion of charter schools. The State meets the criterion that requires that student achievement be a significant factor in charter school authorizations and renewals. It also meets the criterion regarding equitable funding compared to traditional public schools (98%) and the criterion regarding funding for facilities. Further, the State allows LEAs to operate innovative autonomous public schools.		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
In recent years New Mexico has changed the governance structure for public education and has made significant legislative changes. These changes have been intended to provide opportunity for innovation and to improve student outcomes, goals which can and should be evaluated.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>47</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments:</b>		
New Mexico's plan for STEM is consistently addressed throughout the proposal. With the goals of rigorous academic standards, cooperation with universities, industry, museums and other institutions, and preparation of more students, particularly students in underrepresented groups, for careers in STEM fields, New Mexico has taken action and started a variety of programs. These programs provide New Mexico with a head start toward progress in STEM disciplines.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments:</b>		
New Mexico is taking a systematic approach to reform. The proposal addresses all four education reform areas and the State success factors. The proposal shows how the State and its participating LEAs will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease achievement gaps, and increase graduation rates. The determination of the State and its participating LEAs is evident in the proposal. The proposal is noteworthy for its plans for online and web-based innovations to support its reforms.		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>341</b>

Total	138	65
-------	-----	----

**E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	10	5
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The state has the legal and regulatory authority to intervene in its persistently lowest achieving schools, but not in its LEAs.		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	40	23
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	18
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The state has identified 35 persistently low achieving schools. It has also identified its schools in need of improvement. The state has a Turnaround Coordinator. New Mexico has made plans to address the needs of its persistently low achieving schools. The plans offer a number of innovative ideas for which the state should be commended. The New Mexico Exemplary Teacher and Principal Cadres is a promising idea. These cadres will be trained to intervene and possibly lead the neediest schools. They will also earn additional compensation and recognition. The idea of building regional Community Engagement Collaboratives is also a good one. Schools can't do it alone. Building on the states instructional coaching model is another very powerful idea. It's a strength in that there are currently 400 such coaches. What they need however is in depth training and a common framework for doing their work. Tapping in into students' interest in technology through virtual games and actual laptops or hand held mobile devices are a very motivating ways to engage students and to build on STEM priorities. The High Needs High Poverty design that is being used in NYC, Philadelphia, and Chicago is a terrific way framework for working with persistently low achieving schools. The evidence or historic performance of working with persistently low achieving schools is very limited. The plan has many exciting elements, but needs greater focus so that those implementing it can fully understand it and remember what's essential. A clearer and sequenced design process is needed.		
<b>Total</b>	50	28

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The percentage of total revenues to support education in New Mexico increased by 6.6% between 2008 and 2009. Equitable funding of LEAs is not clearly presented. An independent study is cited, but no data are presented from which district comparisons can be made.		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	35
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: As reported in the application, New Mexico has a charter school law that has been acclaimed by the National Charter School Alliance. Since 2001 charter schools have grown from 2000 students in 25 schools to 12,000 students in 74 schools. They are essentially funded at the same levels as traditional		

schools receiving 98% of the funding that traditional schools are allocated. Because of the great number of small districts there is a high or 10% cap on the number of charter schools that may exist in a school district. The 10% district cap on charter schools may be viewed as mildly inhibiting to growth. The number of recent charter applications is low. The state helps charters with leases and districts are free to operate autonomous public school other than charters.

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b> The state presented an overview of its governance structure developed in 2003. The Secretary of Education is currently appointed by the governor and is a member of the governor's cabinet. This change heightened the importance and visibility of educational reform in state. Since 2003 a great deal of legislation aimed at improving student achievement has been passed.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>43</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments:</b> STEM discussion and plans are present throughout the entire application. New Mexico is poised for a great deal of development in this area.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments:</b> New Mexico has developed a comprehensive approach to education reform and fully addresses the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA. New Mexico's unique state context reflects numerous success factors. LEA support is strong, enhancing the state's chances for successful implementation of its school reform agenda.		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>351</b>
--------------------	------------	------------

(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	25
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The State has identified persistently lowest-achieving schools using the definitions and processes in the RTTT application and receives full points under (E)(2)(i). The State provides a detailed plan for turning around the State's lowest-achieving schools. The plan is heavily dependent on the State's capacity to provide supports to LEAs and schools implementing <i>turnaround strategies</i> . Evidence of past effects in turnarounds shows that the State has some, but not extensive, experience with three of the four intervention models. It is unclear if, under the applicant's plan, the State Department will have the capacity to provide the necessary supports to LEAs implementing intervention models in the 5-10 schools a year targeted under the performance measures for this subsection.		
Total	50	35

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	7
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant increased its percentage of the total recurring dollars in the State's General Fund from 37.8% in FY08 to 44.4% for FY09. A score in the "high" range is awarded for (F)(1)(i). The applicant provides a history of the State's effort since the 1960s to improve equitable funding among districts because of differences in local wealth. In 1974, the State enacted the Public School Finance Act, which contains a formula designed to distribute operational funds to school districts objectively. A 1996 comprehensive study found the State to have a "highly equitable formula." No information on equitable funding within LEAS (between high-poverty schools and other schools) is provided. The applicant states that within statutory and regulatory guidelines, school districts have the latitude to spend their dollars according to local priorities. A score in the "medium" range range is provided for (F)(1)(ii).		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	31
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The State has a cap of no more than 15 new charter schools in any given year or 75 in a five-year period. Districts under 1,300 students have a cap of no more than 10 percent of the student population allowed in a charter school. Most of the charter school growth has been in urban areas, where there are no size caps. With 88 charter schools, over 10% of the state's schools are charters. "Medium" points are awarded for (F)(2)(i) because the charter caps, while they have not prevented 88 charter schools from being created in the State, do serve to inhibit to some degree charter school growth in the non-urban parts of the state. Evidence for (F)(2)(ii) is largely complete, with the exception of 5 years of full information on charter school applications and closures, and is scored in the "high" range. Charter schools are funded equitably under the statute ("not less than ninety-eight percent") and the proposal is scored in the "high" range for (F)(2)(iii). State law also allows charter schools to enter into a lease for purchase agreements for facilities, and a "medium" score is awarded for (F)(2)(iv). Other innovative, autonomous public schools are allowed in the state, including magnet or special focus schools. A score in the "medium" range is awarded for (F)(2)(v).		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	3
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides an overview of changes to its governance structure for public education since 2003 and a listing of major legislative changes related to the four education reform areas in ARRA. These changes further demonstrate the state's historical commitment to significant reform and how RTTT will complement and build upon those changes.		

Total	55	41
-------	----	----

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: The applicant addresses STEM policies and innovations throughout the proposal, including efforts to increase teacher quality in STEM fields, the development and adoption of STEM curriculum aligned to national and international standards, efforts to advance careers in STEM, especially in underserved and high-minority populations areas, and an initiative to engage students in computational modeling and computing. The competitive priority is met.		
<b>Total</b>	15	15

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: This application provides a clear path to improving the State's RTTT agenda across all four education reform areas of the ARRA, as well as the State Success Factors Criteria. The State demonstrates that it is committed to adopting and developing wide-ranging reforms focused on raising student achievement and to implementing them statewide. The applicant has taken a serious, systematic approach to RTTT that meets the threshold for being considered for funding.		
<b>Total</b>		0

<b>Grand Total</b>	500	317
--------------------	-----	-----

transparent link between task force findings on effective programs – or data on effectiveness – and state funding decisions. This is a weakness endemic to much of NM plan.(4/7)

<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>
<p>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments:            (D)(5) NM outlines the four main existing mechanisms for professional development in the state. Combined they form a solid platform for delivering a plan but there is no proposed action other than strengthening the structures. There is no explicit plan to support LEAs in providing support for teachers or principals to help them acquire the skills and capabilities to work in a data driven educational environment. There are no quantifiable goals. (3/10) ii. In this area NM again proposes that a task force develop recommendations to strengthen existing programs and to advise 5 funding agencies. But there is no analysis of the strengths or weaknesses of these existing professional development programs that would support a decision to strengthen them or guide the work of the task force. In summary the proposed activity fall short of evaluating, measuring and continuously improving supports for teachers and principals. (3/10).</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>51</b>

### E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:            NM has legal authority to intervene at school level but does not appear to have authority to intervene at district level.(5/10)</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>25</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	20
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:            i. NM has identified persistently low performing schools with a data driven process (Appendix E-2-1). (5/5) ii. NM has a thorough and comprehensive strategy in this area with a clear theory of action and a definite and well thought out approach. The plan lays out the State's commitment to support LEAs in a collaborative manner and describes the various actions it proposes. The narrative also includes lessons learnt from past actions in NM and in other states. Its goals are achievable but lack ambition (see the small numbers in the performance measures section) which are low considering how many schools the State identifies as schools in need (506) of improvement and has a goal of 5 schools for 2010/11.(20/35)</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>

### F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:            i. Table F1-1 shows that NM shows that NM's recurring expenditure for public K-12 education and higher education increased as a % of total revenues. (5/5) ii. The narrative while interesting historically is not responsive to the criteria. It is not possible to discern if high need LEAs receive equitable funding</p>		

from the material presented unless it is assumed that the 1974 law creating the formula is the best possible distributive mechanism for allocating state resources. This is hard to accept. Lack of attention to this issue suggests a lack of leadership and commitment to education reform. (2/5)

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>33</b>
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>i. There is a cap on charter enrolments in the law - that no district can have more than 10% of enrolments in charters - but it has not been triggered. Nonetheless its presence is a market barrier. There has been a cap on new approvals – again it has never been “activated” but it still is a impediment to growth. Combined they produce a low cap. (2/8) ii. NM’s charters serve populations similar to local populations or to serve greater concentrations of poverty. There are explicit processes for approvals and renewals and one charter school has been closed for failure on academic grounds. Academic standards and curriculum plans are assessed in consideration of initial charter approvals (Appendix F2-2). (8/8) iii. The NM funding formula for charters ties state support to a fixed percent of the state norm with 2 percent going to the district for administrative support. This is small proportion of the total state norm but this form of withholding could be replaced with a fee for service approach with all monies going to the school. (7/8) iv. Charters also get lease payments, access to bond facilities for capital works. (8/8) v. NM “enables LEAs to operate alternative innovative or autonomous public schools. (8/8)</p>		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>As noted in A2 NM realigned its machinery of government to give greater prominence to education reform some years ago. More recently it has linked education to the broader economic reforms to combat the recession and underpin increased competitiveness. These actions plus the sustained program of legislative acts and programs demonstrate the States commitment in this area.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>43</b>

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<p>Competitive Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>NM includes a succinct statement of its plan to emphasise STEM - addressing teacher quality, curriculum standards, advanced studies for sub groups and a public awareness campaign and these are supported by a solid budget plan. There are numerous points in the general narrative- B2 &amp; B3 for example where STEM activities are included in a sensible and constructive manner suggesting that the State has a strong commitment to this area</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>No</b>
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There are parts of the NM proposal that are strong and build on the work of the last decade- the good administrative leadership and the alignment with broader economic reform for example. LEA</p>		

participation is solid and targeted at low income areas. The proposals for dealing with low performing schools are well devised but the targets are lacking ambition. There are market barriers to charters and while they have not been triggered this could be because they have suppressed demand. Technology is prominent in many parts of the plan which is positive but sometimes more attention need to be placed on the roll out and capability building activities that will be needed to make sure the technology is used productively. This is underscored by the weakness of the professional development section. Two areas where more attention is need -- or more clarity -is the state's attitude to using student performance growth measures as a significant factor in personnel decisions and the state financing formula. The first is at best understated in the plan and the second is unexplored to the point where the narrative is non responsive to the item. The lasting impression is that the state plan is tentative about committing to action -- many areas are left for exploration by a task force and subsequent decision making by a diffuse set of state actors and agencies. While this has an air of real politicks and the "art of the possible" approach to reform it is essentially passive and lacking leadership. This plus some gaps in coverage, which belie coherence, mean that the proposal falls short of displaying a commitment to comprehensive reform.

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

Grand Total	500	307
-------------	-----	-----