

(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: They will start identifying low performing schools by developing a transparent system to identify and differentiate among the state's persistent low achievers by considering student achievement and student growth. They will use an A-F grading system for all schools. Nearly 100 schools have not made AYP for 6 consecutive years and 23 are slated for intervention. Schools will be judged based on performance and improvement, and high schools will also be evaluated based on graduation rates. They will also include a measurement of the learning gains of the lowest 25% of students at every school. This system is a simple but meaningful one and takes into account two important indicators of school performance: growth and achievement. With these facts known, IDOE can make better judgments on the trends at low performing schools, determining which ones need more supports and which ones need direct interventions. The state is focusing on 2 core strategies to turn schools around: 1) They will contract with carefully selected, high capacity turnaround partners who will assume responsibility and gain wide authority (autonomy over staffing, curricula, scheduling and budgeting) for implementing and overseeing restarts and turnarounds. 2) They will provide strong incentives and targeted assistance to schools on a negative trajectory, sending in supports, setting benchmarks for improvement, and entering into rigorous MOUs with school districts to ensure rapid improvement. If they don't improve, the state will intervene directly in the schools with a turnaround management organization. They include timelines, activities and responsible parties. They have used the turnaround model 4 times, school closure 7 times and transformation 8 times since 2004. They have thorough and innovative plans in mind for both of these strategies and are taking advantage of resources that have already proven successful, and partnerships to incubate and create supply of turnaround school management organizations and turnaround school leaders. However, a lot is resting on the success of these turnaround organizations who will have to work within the individual union bargaining agreements, which may hinder their efforts.</p>		
Total	50	45

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Indiana increased the percent of the state's general fund budget for K-12 and higher education between 2008 and 2009, from 44.5% to 52.4%. Indiana has a per student foundation-based school funding formula that ensures equitable funding between high-need school districts and other districts, as well as within districts, between high poverty schools and other schools. They use a complexity index that is multiplied by the adjusted student count for each school district. Beyond that, school districts can divide state funds among their schools as they see fit. While they take into account the makeup of the district and its schools when they compute the per pupil funding formula, the district can spend the money however it chooses, and the state has no way to influence that investment to equalize funding across a district.</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	34
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The state law does not restrict the number charter schools that may be approved or opened, the number of students who may enroll, or the amount of funding they may receive. There are no caps on charter schools and in 2009, the biennial budget allowed and funded virtual charter schools for the first time. However there is a limit to the number of students who can currently enroll in a virtual charter</p>		

school. There are currently 53 charter schools in 21 cities and 9 more scheduled to open fall 2010. Indiana's charter school law provides for multiple authorizers, including mayors, universities and school districts. IDOE is also applying to be an authorizer, to become the second one that can operate charter schools statewide. There are boilerplate elements to the application process, and the major authorizers (mayor of Indianapolis and Ball State University) have enhanced the application process and received awards for their innovation and excellence in the approving of charter schools. They have a process for monitoring and accountability that includes goals and evidence of improvement in assessment results, attendance and graduation rates. They give a detailed list of applicants, acceptances and denials and the reasons for denial. In the last 5 years, they have closed 1 school for financial, achievement and governance reasons. They don't mention any effort to encourage charters to serve high needs students. The Indiana Charter school law states that charter schools must receive state tuition support in the same manner as traditional school districts and IDOE ensures that schools receive their commensurate share of federal funds for special education, Title I and other federally funded program areas. In addition, charter schools can apply for an advancement load to cover operating costs of opening or expanding. Importantly, Indiana will change from calendar year tuition support payments to a school year system in July 2011, which will make the loan provisions unnecessary. The General Assembly has also enacted laws to ensure that charter schools receive the same funding for AP testing fees, PD, remediation, alternative education, technology and text book reimbursement. Average tuition support for charter schools = \$6,989, for traditional public schools = \$5,744. IDOE has applied for matching funds in the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grants Program and was awarded a grant of \$15 million over the next 5 years. Matched by the state, the total is \$30 million dedicated to charter school facilities. Charter schools can also receive Qualified School Construction Bonds and Academy Bonds to fund new facilities or make improvements. The state has found ways to make sure charter schools get funding for facilities. Indiana's freeway school law permits LEAs to enter into contracts with the State Board under which rules and statutes may be waived in exchange for meeting or exceeding certain performance expectations. School boards can also enter into agreements with educational management organizations. Districts can also use time and credit differently, offer flexible attendance, students can attend early college, dual credit and dual enrollment programs. The application includes the codes and laws that allow this freedom of operation to districts.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	2
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: The application cites the following: 1) Enforcement of the 180 school day requirement, protecting school days from too many early dismissals 2) Development of the Dropout Prevention Grant to identify students at risk of dropping out and to provide appropriate interventions 3) Establishing the Graduation Performance Reward to promote competition among high schools to reduce the number of dropouts, with financial rewards for staff at winning schools 4) Establishing a pilot incentive program in Indianapolis and Gary to reward schools that increase student performance and college and career readiness. 5) Teacher pay incentives including bonuses for teachers who stay at high needs Indianapolis schools and meet high performance standards Though they admit they were behind to start with, these are basic steps toward starting reform. Combined with their State reform conditions criteria, they add up to progress, but not significant reform conditions.		
Total	55	44

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

In offering a rigorous course of study in STEM, Indiana is increasing participation in Project Lead the Way (a curriculum for middle and high schools that forms partnerships with higher education and the private sector to increase engineers and teach professionals), and opening more New Tech High Schools especially in the bottom 5% of schools. The state will expand an existing initiative to help schools select and adopt research based curricular materials that are aligned with the Common Core Standards to support student-centered STEM instruction. Teachers across the state will have access to materials and PD. They are also piloting new courses for schools. They are partnering with I-STEM and have developed a strategic plan to provide access to STEM education experts, professional development opportunities and STEM faculty, curriculum and industry experts. They plan to use RTTT funds to fully develop the infrastructure for the materials support system for hands-on, research based STEM instruction. Attracting the largest number of schools in any state to participate in Project Lead the Way courses and growing it New Tech High Schools are some of the ways the state is helping to prepare student for advanced study and career sin STEM. Their interest and investment in STEM is explained in this section, however it is very lightly touched on in the rest of the application, mentioned only a few times with regard to professional development and turnaround schools. For this reason, I don't think it warrants the 15 competitive priority points.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments:

The application is coherent and comprehensive in its efforts to address the 4 education reform areas. Their emphasis is on structure, believing that if they get innovative and effective management involved in each of the 4 areas, they'll be able to have statewide impact in improving student achievement. To this end, they are relying heavily on the use of external vendors and contractors, hoping to foster innovation and excellence, and importing expertise from other fields. They have convened broad support for the plan, and notably have support from the teachers unions for basing evaluations at least 51% on student growth. Their plans make causal links to increasing student achievement, narrowing the achievement gap and increasing graduation rates.

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

Grand Total	500	393
--------------------	------------	------------

schools into one of four intervention models. No schools will be eligible for State intervention and implementation of one of the four models until 2010-2011. There will be an RFP to a turnaround management organization to oversee this portion of RTT. There is also an organization, Mind Trust, which encourages entrepreneurs in the schools. This is headed by the former Mayor who was successful in chartering schools. The state will also identify principals who have been successful at turning around schools and will give them a stipend to assist struggling schools. Nearly 100 of the schools serving about 50,000 students have not made federal adequate yearly progress for six years. The State has already begun the process of intervening in these schools through an initial review. The State has a well thought out process for addressing this issue and is already seeing some initial results with just the first review. The State has the ability to intervene in 88 of 92 county school districts but has only done this in 19 schools to date. It states that it recognizes that the incremental processes of the past do not work.

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

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: While the total of the State's General Funds has decreased between FY08 and FY09, the percentage and the actual dollars for the State's General Fund Budget for education have increased indicating support by the General Assembly. The State has a complex school funding formula to ensure equity in funding between high need and other districts. This foundation also increased on a per student basis between CY2008 and CY2009. It is unclear why CY was used here and FY was used in the other calculation. The state allows each school district to determine how money is appropriated among schools within their districts. The State is allowing this process to continue. There is no indication as to whether districts are making equitable funding decisions among schools within their districts.</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	36
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The proposal has a 3rd party endorsement included which states that the State received a "B" on the 2010 Charter School Law Rankings and Scorecard. There are no legislative caps on charter schools; laws ensure that charter schools receive the same funding as traditional schools for professional development, technology, textbook reimbursement, Advanced Placement testing fees and remediation. Funding for charter schools is not restricted by policy or legislation. Per pupil funding (average tuition support) is higher than for school districts. Charter Schools are provided facilities acquisition assistance to fund new or make improvements to existing facilities. There is a federal grant with matching state funds as a grant. This should assist charters with the credit issue for building or renovating facilities, but the amount of money allocated is not nearly enough to really cover the cost of building a state of the art facility. Virtual charter schools are currently being piloted for a limited number of students. So far they show promise as another way to deliver instruction through charter schools. The State will need to ensure that there will not be caps on virtual charter schools beyond the pilot stage as it appears that the current legislation does not cover them. Only 1 charter school has been closed, but almost two thirds of the applications for charter schools have been denied. The State (with a partner) will create a charter school incubator to increase the number and quality of charter schools. This process should decrease the number of denials. Currently, there is only one statewide authorizer, but by 2012, the State DOE will seek to begin authorizing statewide. Although there are multiple authorizers, they are all connected to higher education or soon the state department of education. 9 new charter schools opening in 2010 have signed agreements and will be participating in the RTT reforms. The State does have legislation that allows LEA's to enter into contracts that waive certain rules and statutes in exchange for high</p>		

performance expectations from these innovative schools which are still within the traditional school governance structure. The State has ensured successful conditions for high performing charter and other innovative schools.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: The State reallocated funding from long established programs that failed to increase student achievement. The State shed responsibilities that distracted State staff from a focus on RTT reform areas. The State invested in an online portal that serves as a Best Practices Clearinghouse. The State has established a separate fund center for the receipt of RTT funds so the monitoring will be easy and effective. Participating LEA's will be required to establish their own separate fund center accounts for State disbursement of RTT funds. 51% of teacher or principal evaluations must be based on student growth data.		
Total	55	48

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: The state has created a strategic plan involving business, community, non profits, universities and educators. The legislature has invested state funds in the most recent budget for a STEM high school model to expand statewide. The state has the highest number of schools nationally participating in Project Lead the Way, courses for middle school students which focus on increasing engineers and technical professionals. A plan to continue having STEM as a priority is included in the proposal. The STEM initiative was addressed in several sections of the proposal. For example, when describing teacher shortage areas; when discussing academic achievement (going beyond math and reading); in the overview; when discussing high school graduation rate, etc. The plan does not adequately address underrepresented groups. The State has not documented how the STEM plan will address low achievement.		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: The State will review data on a quarterly basis for diagnostic decisions and on an annual basis for summative assessments. Ineffective programs and practices will be identified and recommendations will be made to discontinue. The State has already begun many of the RTT initiatives on its own and is well poised to meet the RTT reform in all areas. The State has comprehensively and coherently addressed all four areas. It has committed state funds to this process and intends to continue to meet the ambitious yet achievable goals it has set with or without the funding.		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	381
--------------------	------------	------------

publish the performance of teachers prepared by different institutions and revoke accreditation status if the institution cannot "produce results" it does not clearly articulate what state support and interventions would be provided to institutions prior to loss of state accreditation. D4ii-The application identifies the development (by an external vendor) of a data system that will enable the state to assess teacher and principal preparation programs and identify those that make the greatest contribution to raising student achievement and closing the achievement gap as the key to expanding those that are successful in producing effective teachers and principals. However, there is no baseline data linking teacher/principal effectiveness to increased student achievement, so making this connection and projecting performance measures seems highly speculative.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	5
(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: D5i -The articulated plan for providing effective support to teachers and principals is very general. A chart indicating the program, specific professional development, number of participants, timelines and individuals responsible would have strengthened this plan. D5ii - The plan for measuring, evaluating and continuously improving the effectiveness of the supports in this section is vague. It indicates that a variety of tools for pre and post assessments will be used but does not describe what these might be.		
Total	138	60

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The plan clearly describes that the state has the statutory authority to and can intervene directly both in schools and districts, and describes the possible state actions.		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	15
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	10
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: E2i - The application described a plan for identifying the lowest-achieving schools using the definitions in the notice. E2ii - The plan identifies contracting with external turnaround management organizations as the strategy for providing support for LEAs implementing one of the four school intervention models. However, contracting with an external entity does not describe what will be implemented in these persistently low-performing schools, nor does it provide any indication of how schools will improve. It also describes that IDOE will "enlist a qualified independent partner to serve as the evaluator of the State's overall turnaround strategy and interventions in individual schools". It is not clear what supports will be provided or what evaluation criteria (other than student achievement) will be used in the evaluation.		
Total	50	25

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	7
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		

F1i (5) - The application indicates that the percentage of the total revenues available to the state to support public education for 2009 was greater than in 2008. F1ii (2) - As articulated in the application, while state funding policies of LEAs is equitable, LEAS make decisions regarding the distribution of state funds and currently there is "no provision for the state to intercede in that distribution" which indicates that there is no assurance of equitable funding between schools.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	34
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: F2i - The State charter school law does not prohibit or inhibit the number of high-performing charter schools. F2ii - The application provides information about the number of charter school applications, the number approved, and the reasons for denial, closure or non-renewal (only 1 out of 111 was closed or non-renewed). The criteria for these decisions appears to be unique to each authorizing agency and student achievement was not mentioned as a significant factor in determining non-renewal or closure, nor was serving high needs students indicated as a priority. F2iii - As described in the application, the State's charter schools receive equitable funding when compared to traditional public schools. F2iv - The application described funding for charter school facilities and did not appear to limit access to public facilities or in any way impose stricter criteria for facility-related requirements. F2 v - The plan adequately describes a variety of other legislation that allows LEAs to operate innovative schools other than charter schools.</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	3
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: As described in the application, the State appears able and willing to allow LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools (network model schools and virtual schools). Evidence of the success of these schools to provide significant reform is not clear.</p>		
Total	55	44

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
<p>Competitive Reviewer Comments: The application describes a plan that adequately addresses the three priority areas required for this STEM initiative but additional details included throughout the plan would have demonstrated the priority as a strong component of the overall reform effort. The plan only minimally described how STEM programs would address the needs of underrepresented groups; additional information in this area would strengthen the application.</p>		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments: The plan addresses each of the four areas but the implementation details are vague in many areas.</p>		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	320
-------------	-----	-----

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

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Indiana's K-12 educational allocation increased from FY 2008 to FY 2009. It allocated an additional 800 million dollars and went from 31.8 percent of the general budget to 38.8 percent. The state's funding formula takes into account wealth, student need, and towns with low wealth. The information provided does not make clear that funding to schools is equitable. It was stated that LEA's can distribute monies received from the state as they see fit. It ensures equitable funding between high need districts and other districts and between schools within the district and high poverty schools.</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	30
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Indiana currently does not have laws that prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high performing charter schools, and there is no cap on the number of charter schools. The state encourages charters and innovative schools. The state recently funded and is piloting virtual charter schools but it appears that some limits are present. The average tuition support for charter schools per student exceeds the average for traditional school districts by more than twelve hundred dollars and funding for facilities is equitable. These elements support positive conditions for charter and other innovative schools. There are 53 charter schools in Indiana. The state has a process for approval of charters; 17 of 27 were not approved in 2009. Progress in charter schools is monitored and charter schools have been closed. There also are provisions that allow charters that exceed expectations to have a number of rules and regulations waived so that they can experiment and innovate. In sum, Indiana has a number of things in place that create success conditions for high performing charter schools. Bridge money, allowing new charter start-up funding was not addressed in the application.</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: A number of state programs have been created through law, regulation, or policy to promote statewide reform: (1) enforcement of the 180 day school year, (2) dropout prevention grant, (3) performance incentives for high school graduation and, (4) pay for performance in selected districts including Indianapolis, Elkhart, and Lafayette. These programs enhance reform conditions and increase the state's ability to increase graduation rates and narrow the achievement gap.</p>		
Total	55	42

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0
<p>Competitive Reviewer Comments: Indiana has in place a number of programs and schools that impact STEM and it has integrated some strategies to to enhance STEM in its Race to the Top plan. They have a rigorous course of study. More evidence needs to be provided to support the state's plan to cooperate with industry, experts, museums, universities, research centers, or STEM capable partners. Plans for strengthening content</p>		

across grades and disciplines, and for preparing more students for advanced study and careers need to be strengthened in the application.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments:

Indiana's application demonstrates the state and its LEAs are taking a systematic approach to state reform. The application comprehensively and coherently addresses each of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factor Criteria. The state's plans and funds target increased student achievement, closing the gap, and increasing graduation rates.

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

Grand Total	500	369
--------------------	------------	------------

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	6
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(i) Applicant has made education funding a priority by increasing actual dollars and the percent of the budget devoted to K-12 and Higher Education. The percentage (52.3%) for education across all levels appears reasonable. (5/5) (ii) Applicant describes its funding formula which is designed to provide vertical equity. However, because applicant does not provide standard indices for judging the magnitude of funding equity, it is difficult to judge how effective this formula is in creating funding equity. Moreover, applicant reports that the state makes no effort to ensure that funding for high-poverty students actually follows those students to their schools. For both reasons, applicant has received a low score. (1/5)</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	24
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(i) Although the applicant states that the legislature has not imposed overall caps on charter schools, the applicant does indicate that there may be, at the current time, a restriction on the number of students who may attend virtual charter schools. This limitation may be considered at least mildly inhibiting, as it may have the effect to limit access to charter schools for students in rural areas. (4/8)(ii) Applicant reports that the State has laws that allow for multiple authorizers, and those authorizers have established policies regarding approval, monitoring, and reauthorization of charter schools. Applicant describes an exciting plan to provide an incentive to up to two state universities with the greatest potential to become high-quality statewide authorizers. Application does not make it clear that the state requires growth in student achievement to factor strongly into approval and reauthorization process. (5/8)(iii) Applicant reports that state law "is clear that charter schools must receive state tuition support in the same manner as traditional school districts." Applicant's description of the need and intent to change how payments are made to charter schools makes it clear that currently the charter schools actually do not receive tuition support in the same manner in practice. Applicant explains that state charter school funding policies have led some charter schools to have to take out bridge loans. Notwithstanding the admission of need for changes, applicant reports that the ultimate result of funding policies is that charter schools are receiving more money for tuition on average than regular public schools. So, charter school funding process in Indiana appears to have both strong and weak aspects. (6/8); (iv) State has provided competitive grants and loan programs to help charter schools with their facilities funding needs; these are positive programs, but it is not clear that these programs result in equal funding for charter schools regarding their facilities needs. (4/8)(v) The state enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools; however, the evidence provided in the application does not make a compelling case that this law is resulting in schools that have strong autonomy over essential local school functions, such as: defining their instructional models and associated curriculum; selecting and replace staff; and controlling their budgets. The applicant does describe how this provision is leading to schools that are exerting control over seat time. Applicant states that the State Board is exploring ways to improve this policy. (5/8)</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	3
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>To a medium extent the applicant, in addition to information provided under other State Reform Conditions Criteria, has created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes. Among the additional things that Indiana has done to improve student achievement is the passage of a law to increase the length of the school year from 175 to 180 days. Additionally, Indiana has instituted its first dropout prevention program to</p>		

help identify at-risk students and to provide appropriate interventions. Applicant also reports that the state has recently created a reward program for increasing graduation rates at schools with the lowest rates.

Total	55	33
--------------	-----------	-----------

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments:

(i) Applicant cites stagnant NAEP scores as one reason to increase the rigor of its course of study in math, the sciences, technology, and engineering and the fact that some IHEs in Indiana have raised their admission standards to require greater amounts of coursework in math and science as a second reason. Applicant explains that more students are participating in Project Lead the Way, a STEM-focused course of study. Unfortunately, applicant fails to provide evidence that PLTW or the other potential courses of study have been shown in rigorous evaluations to raise student achievement in STEM fields. Additionally, applicant intends to continue to pilot more rigorous STEM courses based on its work with the DANA center at the University of Texas. Further, applicant argues that the adoption of the core standards will have a positive impact on support for student-centered STEM instruction. (ii) Applicant describes how the I-STEM resource network helps support professional development of teachers in STEM teaching. Applicant lists a number of partnership projects as evidence that it understands the need to raise the quality of STEM preparation for its high school graduates. (iii) Applicant again cites the role of PLTW and NTHS as vehicles for high-quality STEM instruction as a way to prepare students for advanced study and careers in STEM. Applicant does not provide any evidence that these are research-based programs that actually result in having more students prepared for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Applicant does not provide sufficient evidence that it is particularly focused on addressing the needs of underrepresented groups of women and girls in STEM. Because applicant's STEM plan does not completely address all three factors listed in this competitive preference, it has not earned the 15 points.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments:

To a sufficient extent to meet this priority, the state's application has comprehensively and coherently addressed all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that the State and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The state has demonstrated in its application sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans. In addition, the applicant has 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.

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

Grand Total	500	345
-------------	-----	-----