

learned from their attempts to turn around 24 schools over the last five years. Given their acknowledged "long history of failure", the proposal could have discussed more fully the important lessons learned from their past attempts. Fuller discussion of the work that would be embarked upon by such a group as Mass Insight would also have bolstered the plan.

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

Panelists offered additional clarity on how their plans were based on important lessons learned from past work with low achieving schools, including the need to require schools to pick from 1 of 4 reform models specified in RTTT. They also offered insights about ways in which they were working with community schools, to enact such changes as offering after-school enrichment and homework support, consider longer school years, include health center services, and elicit greater parent and community engagement. The panel also expanded on the value-added to working with such an outside group as Mass Insight, to expand their capacity in addressing their work with low achieving schools.

Total	50	40	47	
-------	----	----	----	--

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	8	9	

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

Delaware's recent state budgets reflect that it makes education funding a priority. The percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary and public higher education increased from FY 2008 to FY 2009, going from \$1.36 billion or 41.2% of total state revenues in FY 2008 to \$1.39 billion or 41.4% of total state revenues in FY 2009.

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

The panel capably demonstrated that education was a strong priority in the state, and how they had carefully considered the current budget in the proposed plan, and had planned for committing future state funds to ensure its sustainability in future years. Similarly, their ambitious plan demonstrated that they plan to aggressively move forward during the first two years of the grant, to maximize the utility of the grant dollars.

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	32	36	
---	----	----	----	--

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

Delaware has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools. Charter schools were first authorized in 1995, and there are now 18 Charters, accounting for 9% of public schools and educating 7% of the total student population. The State has clear laws and regulations regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, reauthorize and close charter schools, with measurable student performance being central to the review, with charter schools required to maintain student achievement levels that are at or above the state average. The State's school funding formula ensures that charter schools receive equitable funding to traditional public schools. The table in the appendix provided somewhat contradictory evidence regarding average amount of information provided to charters vs. regular schools. The State provides charter schools with some funding for facilities, through minor capital funding appropriated by the State, and notification of vacant and unused buildings owned by the state that may be suitable for charter schools. Aside from Charter schools, Delaware is proposing to give LEAs more funding flexibility over their budgets, and is newly creating Partnership Zones to allow select, persistently lowest-achieving schools greater flexibility in selecting staff and greater operational flexibility. It also has three independent-mission schools, and six vocational technical high schools, that can customize graduation requirements to match requirements of national industry-based



certificates. Further elaboration regarding how these types of schools constitute innovative, autonomous schools would have been helpful.

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

Panelists provided additional clarity on current work with some of their charter schools, and the innovation possible given less proscriptive use of budget to buy standard curriculum materials, and the important role and support that businesses and the private sector can play in offering support and helpful "external pressure points" to education.

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	
---	----------	----------	----------	--

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

The applicant describes a number of other significant reform conditions, including programs that provide services to students at an early age through college, and school-based wellness centers in 28 of Delaware's 32 high schools.

<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>49</b>	
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Init</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	

**Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Delaware has outlined a number of STEM programs to promote schools' ability to offer rigorous courses of study in STEM, collaborate with industry, higher ed, and other partners, and prepare more students for advanced study and careers in STEM, including underrepresented groups and women. Programs and strategies include: the creation of a STEM Coordinating council, programs such as Engineering in Elementary, and Project Lead the Way, and teacher professional development programs, with such groups as Dupont, University of Delaware, and MIT.

<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Init</b>
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	

**Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Delaware has articulated a comprehensive, coherent reform agenda that clearly addresses reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA, and a clear and credible path to achieving their goals. 100% of the state's 38 LEAs have signed MOUs, confirming their commitment to the reform efforts, and draws upon clear progress it has already made in each of the four reform areas.

**Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

The panel presentation and responses to reviewers' questions clearly demonstrated the vision, passion, and commitment from diverse leadership and stakeholders in Delaware, to carry out the State's comprehensive reform agenda. Building on past accomplishments, strong buy-in at all levels, and a clear,

well-articulate and well-integrated plan, the State appears well-positioned to take good advantage of RTT funds to embark on a successful education reform across all four education reform areas.

<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>471</b>	



record in not being very successful in turning around low performing schools (as outlined in the application), the plan seems to be SEA-driven with a focus on intervention. The plan does not have any major dramatic new direction, and thus while adequate, it does not stretch creatively to find new ways to reach these schools. Also, as noted in (A)(2), the budget of \$8.2 million for this effort needs further clarification. Twenty-five points are awarded.

Total	50	39	39	
-------	----	----	----	--

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	8	8	
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
(i)- The state meets the requirements of this criteria- the percent of total state revenues for elementary, secondary and postsecondary increased from 41.2% in 2008/09 to 41.4% in 2009/2010. Full points are awarded. (ii)- The state's policies regarding equitable funding are based on a statistical model outlined as Divisions I, II and III, and all are built on an equitable distribution of funds, with high needs districts with low tax bases receiving additional funds. What is not addressed is state regulations and policies between schools within high needs districts. Three points are awarded.				
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	33	33	
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
(i)- Delaware has no caps on the number of charters allowed in the state, with a steady growth of charters occurring over the past 14 years. Charters account for 9% of the public schools and educate 7% of the total student population. Full points are awarded. (ii)- The state has a variety of rules and regulations on authorization, approval, monitoring and accountability. Delaware has one of the most flexible charter laws in the nation re: who can hold a charter, ranging from private non-profits to LEAs to individual schools themselves. This flexibility is backed by a strong system of monitoring and accountability. Delaware has closed charter schools based on performance. Full points are awarded. (iii)- Equitable funding is clearly allowed and practiced based on state statute and policy. This has been consistently applied and enforced beginning with the original legislation and continues currently. Full points are awarded. (iv)- The State does not provide charters with facilities funding, other than minor facilities funding, and does not impose any facility-related requirements that are stricter than those applied to traditional schools. Five point are awarded for minor financial support for facilities. (v)- The State supports LEAs in operating innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools. Vocational Technical High Schools were provided as an example. However, the explanation of the state's support of a wide variety of autonomous schools is lacking, and further questioning/clarification is needed to understand Delaware's support for autonomous schools. Future effort will focus around funding flexibility and partnership zone schools. Four points are awarded.				
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	5	3	3	
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
The state has provided a number of appropriate examples of the reform efforts in the state, including the Reaching Higher for Success Initiative, Early Warning System and a wellness program. There was no evidence provided to support other laws, regulations or policy around favorable conditions. Three points are awarded.				
Total	55	44	44	

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

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Int
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	15	15	
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
The STEM effort in Delaware is a five-part effort that crosses the entire spectrum of K12 education and is mentioned repeatedly throughout the application. Especially noteworthy is the STEM Coordinating Council that manages the STEM effort and works in partnership with outside organizations and LEAs. The effort meets the requirements of this section.				
<b>Total</b>	15	15	15	

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

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Int
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes	Yes	
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
Delaware is to be commended for producing a remarkably comprehensive and cohesive reform plan that more than adequately addresses the four reform areas. The state is very strong on the history of reducing achievement gaps and raising student performance levels of all students, especially on NAEP. Their work on standards, assessments and data systems is equally as strong. The state has outstanding work processes in place to monitor, evaluate and hold LEAs and schools accountable. Their charter school laws are among the most open in the nation. Their work in turning around low performing schools is not historically positive, yet the plan moving forward holds great promise. And their support for developing teachers for low performing schools and districts is stellar, although much more needs to be done for school administrators. Overall, the Delaware plan meets the absolute priority requirements as outlined in this application.				
<b>Total</b>		0	0	
<b>Grand Total</b>	500	430	446	



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

(i) DE has new regulations (effective 2010) to identify the lowest-achieving schools with equal weight given to all students English and mathematics results and the three year trend. At the high school level, a 60% or less graduation rate is used. The state does not address the use of sub-population scores. The schools in this classification are Partnership Zone schools. 10 schools will be in the first cohort representing more than 25% of the schools in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. (ii) The state intends to work intensively with these schools to implement one of the four turnaround models included in RTTT. The process to get to a turn around model seems overly long with the timeline of at least 4 months before any improvement process could start. While the need to negotiate is important, students in these schools would miss another half-year of effective teaching and learning.

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

(ii) Based on the discussion with DE, the plan to turn around persistently low-performing schools is of high quality and achievable.

Total	50	43	48	
-------	----	----	----	--

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	7	7	
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
(i) DE's state education budget increased slightly from 2008 to 2009 with a slight increase from 41.2% in 2008 to 41.4% in 2009. (ii) DE has an equalization formula and has recently added needs-based funding to its distribution model. The state is currently developing legislation to further refine LEA funding.				
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	30	30	
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
(i) DE has no restrictions on charter schools. Approximately 9% of its public schools are charters educating 7% of the total student population. (ii) DE has what it considers a strict charter law and regulations that ensure that charters are effectively educating their students. Student achievement is part of the review. Charter schools submit annual reports, the SEA annually reports to the governor and legislature on the progress of charters. 2 Charter Schools have been closed due to poor student performance. (iii) Charters receive equitable funding based on student allocation formula but not on the other equating measures. The per pupil weighted figure for the state is \$7450.03, for Charters the weighted figure is \$6679.50. Their range for charter funding includes the highest and lowest cost per student. (iv) Charters receive additional funds for professional development, special programs such as driver education, transportation services, and some minimal capital funds. Charters also receive an equitable portion of local tax revenues. (v) The state supports innovative public schools at the LEA level. However, this does not seem to be used.				
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	5	3	3	
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
Other reform conditions include most notably providing medical services in all the high schools. Other initiatives are a Governor's academy. Given DE's size and student population, additional activities in support of students and families were expected. The application did not include student achievement data or other effectiveness measures in support of these programs.				
Total	55	40	40	

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

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	15	15	
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> In addition to its on-going emphasis on STEM, Delaware intends to work with 6 - 8 LEAs with poor performance on college readiness to pull under-represented student into the programs. The state will also sponsor a STEM residency program with the University of Delaware as well as provide loan forgiveness and scholarships for STEM teachers.				
<b>Total</b>	15	15	15	

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

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes	Yes	
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> DE clearly meets the absolute priority for RTTT. It has clearly presented its plans for implementation based on a thorough analysis of where the state has been over the past fifteen years. The state has set ambitious yet realistic goals for improvement.				
<b>Total</b>		0	0	

<b>Grand Total</b>	500	437	454	
--------------------	-----	-----	-----	--



model work. Should this negotiation process not work, the school will be closed, made into a charter, or turned over to a third party. These consequences if site leadership and unions do not agree provide an unusually strong incentive to agree. In addition, the state will mediate the negotiations and determine whether the negotiated agreement is sufficient. It is a positive that teachers' unions were part of the creation of this approach. The state will provide other supports which are likely to help. These include helping to recruit and hire new staff, helping hire consultants to help choose and implement the reform model, and very large amounts of discretionary funds. The state will also create a new office that will provide support and oversight. There are concerns. The turnaround timeline is too short. Turning a school around in two years when key staff are new and the program is a substantial departure from past practices is too short a time. The turnaround also requires the selection by someone of the right mix of new leadership and staff, the very rapid blending of new with carryover staff, an effective amalgam of consultants and staff, and a fortuitous choice of the right reform model. The state's history to date with turnarounds and its leaving most of these decisions to a newly forming staff do not create the highest probability that these conditions will occur. Finally, it is not clear that such learning as is emerging from the state's rapid movement toward charters is being applied in any telling way. Overall, the plan merits 24 points. [26/36]

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

E. 2. ii.

The presentation clarified that the lowest achieving schools will be required to adopt one of the four RTT models for school reform (and that the previous practice of issuing an annual school improvement plan will no longer suffice.)

The presenters clarified the role of the "MASS Insight." They described the organization's assistance to date and provided concrete examples of how they will contribute to turning around low performing schools. The presenters detailed what has been learned from the charter school movement in the state and how this learning will inform turnaround efforts under the plan.

The effect of the presentation was to raise the quality of the plan and increase the impression that the state can accomplish its goals.

30/35

Total	50	41	45
-------	----	----	----

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	6	6	

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

(i) The percentage of total state revenue used to support public education elementary through "higher" education was increased from 2008 to 2009. [5/5] (ii) The state provides three levels of funding one of which is intended to enable lower income LEA's "to provide a level of funding closer to that of LEA's that can rely on higher property taxes." There is no evidence or description of the level of equity this achieves. There is no indication that there are state policies that create equitable funding between high poverty and other schools within LEA's. [1/5]

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	26	26
---	----	----	----

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

(i) The state has no limit on the number of charter schools. It does not inhibit increasing the number of high performing charter schools. It does not otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools. Charter schools constitute nine percent of all state schools and serve seven percent of the total school population.



Both the number of schools and the students served have steadily increased since charters were authorized in 1995. [8] (ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools. The state requires that student achievement be a significant factor in renewal. Although the state prohibits student selection that violates any state anti discrimination law, it provides no information to show it encourages charter schools to serve student populations similar to local district populations-especially high need students. The state has closed/not renewed ineffective charter schools. [7] (iii) Seven percent of the state's total student population is enrolled in charters. The state says that in 2008-9, charter schools received 4.8 percent of the state's K-12 funding, 5.7 percent of federal funding and 4 percent of the local funding. Although there is an extended description of the kinds of funds (sometimes including percentages) charter schools receive from various sources, this Reviewer could not find sufficient information to rely on any data other than the specific percentages above. Two of the three percentages fall below 79% of what traditional school students apparently receive from the same sources and one (federal funds) is 81 percent. Therefore, the points awarded are in the "low" range as directed in the scoring rubric. [2] (iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities other than major capital funding that can be used for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements. It provides some assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, and the ability to share in bonds and mill levies. It provides financial support for other operations. It allows charter schools substantially more flexibility in spending compared to traditional LEA's, and this can result in savings compared to similar spending by LEA's. The state does not appear to impose facility related requirements that exceed those imposed on traditional schools. The absence of major capital funding prevents the state from being awarded all available points.[7] (v) The state cites the existence of a few highly innovative schools. Citing vocational schools without an explanation of how they meet the applicable criteria is not persuasive. Citing plans for schools that do not meet yet exist is not responsive to the request.[2]

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

F. 2. iv.

The presenters clarified the availability of the capital funding for charter schools. The revolving fund created by the private sector is an innovative method for creating a pool of money for such uses that could be a model for other states. Because the state did not provide such funding directly, however, the state's score could not be raised above that given in the Tier I review.

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	5	4	5	
---	---	---	---	--

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

The state describes several efforts that are designed to provide support and academic focus for students and families, prevent dropping out, foster wellness, and provide free access to higher education, i.e. an associate of arts degree. Although the state does not prove direct links between any of these efforts and either increased achievement, increased graduation rates, or narrowing achievement gaps, these efforts are "best practice" initiatives, and the state has experienced significant gains in two of the three areas. [4/ 5]

**(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

The Tier II comments under "A2" above reflect that the state's presentation demonstrated the existence of additional conditions conducive to reform. Without repeating what was written there, the presentation made more clear that the presenters who are the key leaders of reform in the state possess the vision, motivation, skills, and commitment to make a success of public school reform as proposed in this plan. Because of this, an additional point is awarded in this subsection. 5/5

<b>Total</b>	55	36	37	
--------------	----	----	----	--

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

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

<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
--	-----------	-----------	-----------

**Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The state addressed the STEM priority where relevant thought the application. Its plans for offering rigorous courses of study in STEM areas are competent. The state has or will engage industry, experts, museums, universities and research centers to significantly increase and successfully engage students in these areas. The state has competent plans to prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the STEM areas. The plans are reasonably calculated to increase the numbers of members and meet the needs of underrepresented groups and women. [15/15]

<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

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

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes	Yes	

**Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The state's application comprehensively and coherently addresses all four of the education reform areas in ARRA. The state has been seriously and substantively addressing education reform since at least the mid 1990's. Therefore, the application addresses the state success factors comprehensively. The state has gained the participation of every LEA and charter school in the state in its plan. The expectations for participation are demanding and thorough. The MOU for each is quite demanding. The state has a history of significant achievement in increasing student learning, reducing achievement gaps and increasing college matriculation. This plan builds on that foundation and is well conceived to improve on what has already occurred. The plan meets the criterion of high quality throughout and sets demanding but achievable goals.

<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
--------------	--	----------	----------

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>460</b>
--------------------	------------	------------	------------



<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>
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:                      Delaware has made education funding a priority. Education funding in the state increased between FY 08 and FY 09 and the state's funding formula is designed to ensure equitable funding across LEAs. In cases when this doesn't happen with low-income LEAs who don't generate as much education funding due to local tax revenues, Delaware provides "equalization" funding, which is intended to help supplement education funding in low-income LEAs and their schools so it is more in line with communities who can generate more revenue for education due to their property taxes. Delaware did not provide any information in this part of the application on how the state's policies lead to equitable funding between high-poverty schools within a LEA.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>30</b>
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:                      Delaware has worked to ensure there are successful conditions in place for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools in the state. The state has no cap on the number of charter schools or new charter schools eligible to be authorized each year and the state has laws in place to authorize, monitor, hold charter schools accountable for their results and to close low-performing charter schools. Although Delaware states that their charter school funding is the same as traditional public schools, the table that is attached to the application contradicts this so more information needs to be gathered here. Delaware does state that it provides minor funding for facilities to lease but it is not clear from the application that the state provides funding for their charter schools to purchase property. The state does currently operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools, most clearly in high school, but it isn't clear from the application how these schools have increased student achievement or high school graduation rates, especially since most of these schools are high schools.</p>		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:                      Delaware seems to have created additional favorable conditions to education reform. It has a wide range of additional services in place to support college and career pathways, such as the Student Excellence Equals Degree scholarship program and the 28 school-based wellness centers located at high schools throughout the state. These centers receive state funding yearly. It is not clear, however, how these wellness centers, for instance, have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps or resulted in other important outcomes for the students of Delaware.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>42</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:                      The applicant has a strong plan in place to address all three aspects of the STEM priority. Delaware's STEM strategy has five main parts: 1) creating a STEM coordinating council to manage the network of</p>		

businesses, IHEs, nonprofits, and LEAs that are innovating in the STEM fields; 2) Focused Interventions, which is an effort to work with 6-8 LEAs with the lowest performance on college-readiness exams, AP exams and poor STEM rigor to target groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM careers and courses of study, and to encourage a higher percentage of women to pursue STEM pathways; 3) STEM Residency, which will be implemented in the 2010-11 school year and will target STEM subjects and prepare graduates to teach in high-need schools; 4) Scholarships and loan forgiveness, to encourage teachers to become certified in critical needs areas such as STEM fields and, 5) Continued technology innovation in distance learning, which is an effort to use online learning to increase student performance.

<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>

**Absolute Reviewer Comments:**

Delaware has met the absolute priority because the state has comprehensively and coherently addressed in its application all four education reform areas specified in ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria needed to demonstrate that the state and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. With 100% of LEAs participating in RTT and a commitment from each participating LEA given their signed MOUs and the scope of work plan and goals that have been set, Delaware is a strong candidate for implementing all of the RTT reforms in the coming years.

<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>
--------------	--	----------

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>442</b>
--------------------	------------	------------