

takeover by the state school reform/redesign officer. Once a turnaround model is selected, schools will be provided the following supports: an external facilitator, to assist with a comprehensive needs assessment; a process mentor team, to assist in plan implementation; leadership support in the form of a Principal's Fellow, Leadership Coach, and interactive training sessions delivered by Michigan State University's College of Education; and instructional coaches to assist with implementation of evidence-based practices. Further, the state will provide assistance to schools and districts in selecting appropriate turnaround vendors by providing them with lists of approved vendors and evaluations of potential vendors; turnaround training to districts; and, for Title I schools, access to the Statewide System of Support. It is somewhat concerning that the state can approve the LEAs themselves to serve as "vendors" for turnaround schools, since the districts will be the ones applying for state funds to implement school turnaround efforts. The applicant does provide significant evidence of effective school turnaround in the state, with 282 schools turned around in the past four years, out of 596 schools identified in need of improvement. Particular successes in the Pontiac school district and Detroit Public Schools are detailed. The applicant also provides data on the state's ambitious yet achievable targets set for school turnaround over the course of the grant. The applicant earns 33 points on this criterion. (33 points)

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

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(1)(i) The applicant includes state financial data documenting that, while total state revenues declines from FY 2008 to FY 2009, the percentage allocated to public education (elementary, secondary, and postsecondary) increased from 44.5% to 47.1% of total state revenues. This significant increase in percentage of funding devoted to public education, especially in a time of fiscal crisis, earns the applicant full points on this criterion. (5 points) (F)(1)(ii) The applicant describes state policies in place to ensure that high-need LEAs receive equitable funding with other LEAs, and that high-need schools within LEAs receive equitable funding with other schools in the LEA. For districts, the state weights its foundation allowance for general operations by the LEA's property-taxable values, providing proportionately more funds to LEAs with lower property-taxable values. In addition, the state provides supplemental funding to districts who meet the federal Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) requirements. Finally, the state funnels extra funds to districts with high numbers of young children (grades 1-5) determined to be at risk of educational failure, calculated through a district poverty measure (the higher a district is on the state poverty ranking list, the more funds it receives to support early-grade education). For schools, the state requires by law that any title I school must receive equitable state funding with any non-Title I school within the LEA. The state also requires that the LEA allocate Title I funds to schools in proportion to the school poverty rates, with higher poverty schools receiving more Title I funds. This comprehensive equity rubric covering both districts and schools earns the applicant full points on this criterion. (5 points)

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	36
---	-----------	-----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(2)(i) The applicant indicates (and cites appropriate supporting state legislation) that there are no caps on the number of charter schools operating in the state, nor on the number of students that may be enrolled in those schools. In fact, currently 6% of the state's public schools are charter schools, enrolling 6% of the total number of public school students in the state. Further, the state recently passed legislation encouraging both the creation of new charter schools by districts, and also the designation of charter schools that meet certain criteria as "schools of excellence." Designation of a

charter as a school of excellence (based on student performance criteria) increases the authority of the charter authorizer to open more charter schools. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (8 points) (F)(2)(ii) The applicant supports the strength of the state's legal and regulatory framework for charter school oversight by citing that it was recognized as the third best in the nation by the Center for education Reform in 2008. New state legislation strengthens the use of student achievement data as significant factor in charter school evaluations. The state uses regular site visits and reporting systems to monitor fiscal, legal, and academic results of charter schools on an ongoing basis. In addition, each charter much go through a comprehensive performance review in the final year of its contract as a condition of renewal. The state also conducts site visits and operational reviews of all of the state's charter school authorizers. The applicant provides data on charter schools closed in the past fifteen years, indicating that the most common reasons for charter school closure were governance, financial, and academic performance issues. Also, new legislation indicates that any charter school open for over four years and still landing in the bottom 5% of schools (lowest-performing) must be closed by the authorizer. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (8 points) (F)(2)(iii) The applicant explains that not only do charter schools in the state receive an equal share of State and Federal funding as compared to other public schools in the state, since LEAs are not allowed to levy taxes to support charter schools, the state pays the full amount for that portion of a charter school's per-pupil funding. In addition, a recently-lifted cap on charter school funding by the state ensures that charter schools receive the same level of per-pupil funding from state and local resources as any other public school in the same district. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (8 points) (F)(2)(iv) The applicant indicates that the state provides no facilities funding to either charter schools or other public schools. The Michigan Public Educational Facilities Authority does offer a long-term facilities financing option for charter schools that offsets some of the risk for investors. Also, charter schools are not subject to stricter facilities requirements than other public schools. The applicant earns 4 points on this criterion. (4 points) (F)(2)(v) The applicant indicates that the state provides authority to districts and schools to develop innovative models through Title II D funding and waivers granted by the state. The applicant presents detailed examples of several innovative models that have been created through this authority. The features of the models are varied, but many include online offerings for flexible scheduling, some serving as completely online schools. Others focus on other elements of innovative models, including but not limited to: intensified STEM instruction; providing intensive supports to students at risk of not completing a college-ready high school curriculum; providing flexible school day and academic year schedules; encouraging early learning initiatives such as project-based learning and early language acquisition; and viewing learning stages as a continuum (rather than discrete levels), and providing appropriate student support with respect to this model. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (8 points)

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

5

5

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(3) The applicant describes five large state programs designed to support student achievement that are not covered by earlier sections of the application. The first two provide coordinated wrap-around services for students and families: the Governor's Children's Cabinet brings top leadership from the departments of Education, Human services, Community Health, Labor, Energy, Economic Growth, and Corrections to coordinate services across agencies; and the Coordinated School Health Program recognizes the link between health and educational performance, and provides supports to all students and intensive supports to students in need. One program focuses on early childhood: the Great Start Readiness Program funds early education opportunities for disadvantaged children. The last two provide supports for college access: the Michigan College Access Network will provide an online portal for students and parents to access college access information, including local programs, required coursework, and postsecondary entrance expectations, among other topics. Promise Zones provide college scholarships to students in the poorest schools and districts. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points)

Total

55

51

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: The applicant stresses a STEM focus throughout the application, making clear indications as to how work in each of the four ARRA reform areas will apply specifically to STEM instruction. The applicant also provides a summary, in the competitive priority section, of their STEM plan. In this summary, the applicant addresses each of the competitive priority areas in turn and in detail. In the section on "offering a rigorous course of study in STEM", the applicant explains that the state enacted the Michigan Merit curriculum in 2006, <i>requiring all high schools</i> students to take three years of science and four years of math. In the section on "cooperating with STEM-capable partners", the applicant mentions alternative routes to certification that specifically target the preparation of math and science teachers; the Mathematics and Science Centers Network (MSCN) that provides curriculum support, professional development, student services, and a clearinghouse for education materials and information in STEM; and several externally funded programs that bring cutting-edge STEM content and instructional resources to Michigan's educators. In the section on "preparing more students for careers in STEM", the applicant describes MSCN and the state's Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, which promote student interest and engagement in STEM fields and careers, and include competitions that specifically target students underrepresented in STEM career fields. Since points for the STEM Competitive Priority are awarded as all or nothing, and the applicant presents a coherent and detailed plan for inclusion of STEM priorities in its state education reform agenda, the applicant earns 15 points on this criterion. (15 points)		
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 absolute priority is addressed throughout the application. All four ARRA reform areas are comprehensively and coherently addressed by the applicant; sufficient LEA participation and commitment is demonstrated; and the applicant describes how its plans will translate to increased student achievement, decreased achievement gaps across subgroups, and increase graduation and college-going rates. The applicant meets the absolute priority.		
Total		0
Grand Total	500	378

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: Michigan has the legal authority to intervene in school districts and to close ineffective schools including charters for instructional and financial shortcomings. Michigan's strength is twenty years of solid experience closing unsatisfactory schools, replacing principals, and bring in vendors from other states. The intense involvement in Detroit schools, and also Pontiac, demonstrates strong state leadership, resolve and considerable effectiveness.		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	35
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Michigan has used existing data to audit, inform and assist low achieving schools. More than most states, Michigan has brought in other vendors and school managers, and supported dozens of charter schools. Not all have worked, but Michigan is way above average in trying new school reforms and approaches to school improvement. Michigan has lifted 282 schools off the low performing school list, closed many others, and replaced less than effective principals. Michigan needs to describe more fully how many principals will attend the Turnaround Academies and what will be done to upgrade existing principal preparation programs to prepare better new school leaders that can work with teachers and others to raise pupil achievement levels over time.		
Total	50	45

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Michigan's industrial tax base has suffered major losses, but the state has sustained major support for public education with strong backing from labor unions. While other states have been compelled to cut local school aid, Michigan continues to spend almost half the state budget on schools and has sustained those levels of support in recent years. Prospects for additional state aid are bleak for the next few years.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	33
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Michigan was a very early champion for charter schools. The state has authorized dozens, screens new charter applicants rigorously, and has closed 26 charters for academic and/or financial shortcomings. Charter schools may float bonds for facilities, a major factor showing strong state support. Michigan proposes creating six new technical high schools, and is developing ten Promise Zones with extra pupil and family services in high poverty neighborhoods which could promote learning and staying in school. The proposal might include lessons learned from the Harlem Children's Zones or other sources and other states.		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: MI is committed to developing new modes of expanding college access and family health to support pupils and learning. More could be mentioned to identify ways to increase the high school graduation		

rates by 5% including the use of early college or dual enrollment programs, relying on the very strong network of Michigan community colleges.

Total	55	47
--------------	-----------	-----------

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments:

Michigan has created a network of 33 regional math and science centers which blanket the state. They have accepted dozens of new science and math teacher fellowships, funded by Kellogg, to increase the supply. Michigan aggressively developed STEM career preparation and encouragement programs for young women, partnering with the Girl Scouts. Robotics is one of several magnet programs showing commitment. Michigan strongly emphasizes STEM.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments:

MI is committed on all four core reforms. The state every two years has raised educational standards and pledges to do so again in 2010 by adopting the Common Core. The legislature authorized a State School Reform Officer, a new deputy state superintendent to help coordinate the complex new educational reforms, concentrating on the 15 LEAS with the highest poverty levels and lowest scores. The state is committed to raising the high school graduation rate to 80% which would match the other top states in 2010, and to increase the numbers of highly effective teachers and principals. Although the work on modernizing the needed data systems is almost complete, the state is committed to organizing the data to align with higher education requirements. There are impressive new resources for improving math and science teacher training, but not enough detail on how principals will be better trained other than through a Turnaround Academy. The task of improving dozens of low performing schools will need more help from universities (professional development programs) and from community colleges (early college programs) than have been identified in this proposal.

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

Grand Total	500	373
--------------------	------------	------------

(ii) The State has strengthened its legislation to support initiatives targeted at the lowest-achieving schools, and with the implementation of a statewide database that can track student performance over time, and link students to teachers, and teachers to their preparation programs, a plan is now underway to turn around the lowest-performing schools.

Total	50	36
-------	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (i)The percentage of revenues used to support public education grew 2.5% from 2008 to 2009. (ii) Sufficient evidence was presented to support that equitable funding of high-needs LEAs and schools.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	34
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (i)Michigan has a 15-year history of support for charter schools, and appears to be very selective about the charter schools approved, as evidenced on p. 155 of its application. Various types of charter schools are operational and are designed to meet the learning needs of many types of students. (ii) Michigan has statutes and procedures for monitoring and reauthorizing charter schools. (iii)Funding is equitable compared to that of traditional public schools.		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: Michigan has other state initiatives in: health and safety,exemplified in the funding of 80 school-based health centers; early childhood, exemplified by its adoption of Early Childhood Standards for Prekindergarten through Second Grade and other laudable initiatives.		
Total	55	49

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: There is a very great emphasis on STEM, and that theme can be found as a top priority in each of the pertinent sections.		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

This application is well-intentioned. The addition of a centralized data system will open up many avenues for successes in Michigan and provide a cohesive structure for implementing a cohesive reform package that will enhance the retention of qualified educators and provide a clear path for the state to meet its goals of instructional improvement.

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

Grand Total	500	376
-------------	-----	-----

performing preparation programs has merit. But there is insufficient information as to what will occur after the programs are rated that will increase the effectiveness of the higher education institutions in preparing teachers and principals. Given the complexity and difficulty inherent in improving preparation programs a more strategic plan is needed.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	14
<p>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: MDE proposes to enhance support provided to teachers and principals by organizing existing professional development options. It asserts that the use of regional consortia enables them to reach all LEAs in Michigan. Enhanced professional development revolves around the work of the cross-functional professional development team described earlier in the application. It is posited that the cross functional team enables them to employ exemplary programs more effectively and reduce duplication and weak approaches. The new options include RISS and initiatives and activities related to the MDE reform plan. They provide a viable strategy for measuring, evaluating and continuously improving the effectiveness of the support. The approach and activities are appropriate. More detail is needed to clarify activities and how they will be implemented.</p>		
Total	138	80

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: New legislation provides the state superintendent the authority to intervene in the lowest five percent of schools and in LEAs. Michigan has chosen to concentrate its efforts on Detroit Public Schools and 15 other LEAs where there are high numbers of schools in the lowest five percent of the lowest achieving schools in the state. It was not clear how many schools that is or might be.</p>		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	33
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	28
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The state identified 15 LEAs with schools in the lowest five percent of student achievement by following, Business Rules for Lowest 5 Percent, developed to address this need. Ranking schools in reading and mathematics and use of a growth measure over the past three years are included in the protocol. MDE provides a detailed, comprehensive, plan for turning around schools in the 15 LEAs. The approach is systematic and strong. Detroit is the other LEA identified for school improvement. It presents a significant and important challenge. There is little explanation of what that entails. More explanation about the effort to support low performing schools in Detroit is needed.</p>		
Total	50	43

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

Michigan's educational expenditures, as measured by percentage of education expenditure, increased from FY 2008 (44.4%) to FY 2009 (44.5%). While this included higher education the applicant did not report data for K-12. It is assumed that the increase was equally applied. The state ensures and equitable distribution of funds among districts and schools through a funding formula that takes into account property taxable values and requires that Title 1 schools receive equitable funding.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	30
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Michigan currently does not have laws that prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high performing charter schools. It also does not have a cap on the number of charters. But Michigan law does limit the number of university charter schools. Michigan recently enacted legislation to encourage more districts to authorize more charters and to reward charter schools that increase student achievement. Funding for charter schools is the same as LEAs for the purpose of receiving funds. LEAs are able to operate innovative schools with waivers. University authorizers provide an avenue for many of the state's charter schools. There is no information on the number and type currently operating in the state. Applications for charters are increasing; 57 applied in 2008-2009. But 52 (91%) were denied. The limit on university charters and weaknesses in applications were cited as primary reasons for denial. Needed is information that clarifies the extent to which the university cap limits or hinders approval of charters. The state visits charters, monitors them, and closes those not operating effectively or not serving students effectively. Recent legislation closes any charter school in the lowest five percent in achievement. Michigan has closed 26 charter schools since 1998. Michigan also has provisions that promote innovative schools. In summary, information that clarified aspects of current practice and conditions was provided. More information in the areas identified through these comments is needed.</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: A number of state programs not described in the state's plan enhance reform conditions. These include coordinated school health programs: a unique breakfast program that increased breakfasts by 12 per cent, Children's Cabinet provides oversight for implementation of the cross agency policy related to children and their issues, Promise Zones expand opportunities for students to attend college, and Michigan College Access Network supports local access and helps students get into college. Michigan also has implemented a number of strong early childhood initiatives. The programs identified enhance reform conditions.</p>		
Total	55	45

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
<p>Competitive Reviewer Comments: Michigan has a number of STEM initiatives in place and integrated activities and plans throughout the application that address three STEM components: (1) rigorous course of study, (2) STEM capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers, and (3) preparation of more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering and mathematics by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups, and of women and girls.</p>		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: Michigan'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	366

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	34
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	29
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Michigan has a clear process to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools as well as non-Title I schools, and the state has used the system to identify schools, including four high schools that have had a graduation rate less than 60 percent. Michigan has used a variety of efforts to turnaround schools with some success, as evidenced by 40 per cent of schools in a special training program making AYP for two consecutive years. The plan for Michigan requires schools that are not improving to use one of the reform models to improve student achievement or close. The state will use a mix of Title I, IDEA, School Improvement Grants and RttT funding for these efforts. This is a strong leveraging of various funding sources. The overall plan for turning around schools includes focusing on identifying, qualifying and training vendors that will help schools and districts in the turnaround efforts. The state will monitor all aspects of the process and "work collaboratively with districts, schools, and vendors to ensure schools are on sustainable paths for improvement." In addition, the state will provide many steps in the process, such as RFPs for districts and training for vendors and will mandate some training in data for schools. The state will require districts to apply for funds for turnaround, and the application includes some specific information and requirements the should prepare districts and schools for the process. Overall, this seems to be a solid plan, albeit with a heavy reliance on vendors to provide all the support to the schools and districts. The vendors are anticipated to be ISDs/RESAs "and others." The vendors may already have a relationship with the school they are trying to turn around. This could be positive, as the vendor's prior knowledge could save time and provide insight into some problems not evident to a new-comer. It also could create problems as the vendor may have to make difficult decisions regarding relationships or programs it had supported in the past. While the state is considering monitoring and reporting requirements for vendors, special observation of prior relationships may be necessary.</p>		
Total	50	44

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The state provided a higher percentage of revenue for education in 2009, 47.15% than it did in 2008, 44.47%. The policies for state funding formulas seem to lead to equitable funding. After the operations funding formula is distributed, there is at-risk categorical funding and new funding for early childhood preschool services that targets high need districts and at risk students. The state has safeguards to ensure schools within LEAs received equitable funding.</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	40
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal states that there is no set number of charter schools allowed to operate in the state. Legislation was recently passed that encouraged more ISDs and LEAs to authorize charter schools, as most are now under university authorizers. Six percent of the student population is currently enrolled in charter schools clustered in the state's urban areas, and there is no limit to the number of charter schools in the state. The state has strong regulations regarding charter school oversight, including requiring student achievement is a significant factor in making reauthorization decisions and closing charter schools. Charters have been closed for academic reasons, and state law now requires an</p>		

authorizer to revoke a charter if that school has been in the lowest performing 5 percent of public schools in the state. A funding equity gap between charters and traditional school districts was closed by the legislature in 2008 and charters receive equitable funding from state and federal sources. The state does not provide funding for facilities, but it does provide some mechanism of support for facilities through bonds. Other innovative, autonomous public schools are encouraged and operating in the state. These include schools for dropouts that are online, New Tech High Schools, two new cyberschool charters, and a program from the superintendent challenging districts to re-imagine the PK-12 system.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: The state has numerous programs, some coordinated with agencies outside of education, supporting student health, especially at the early ages. Student health, including getting enough to eat, is crucial to success in school. The state lists other initiatives, some of which are in cooperation with other agencies that have responsibility for children. These are commendable efforts.		
Total	55	55

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: Although Michigan did not address STEM thoroughly through out the proposal, the state has a number of significant plans that build upon efforts already underway. The current curriculum and the adoption of the Common Core Standards both support a strong math and science curriculum. Their long-standing Math and Science Centers Network provides strong support in STEM, and the state's Career and Technical Education program has programming focused on up-to-date areas that are important to Michigan's economic development. As noted elsewhere, the Woodrow Wilson Michigan Teaching Fellowship is a very positive partnership as are the many efforts in preparing more students for advanced study and careers in STEM. While not tightly linked, all these activities supporting STEM make up a strong commitment.		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: Although there is serious concern about the lack of support from the teachers' unions and not being able to see the MOU that was signed between the participating districts and the state, this concern is not sufficient to overcome the fact that the proposal did address all four of the education reform areas. Michigan has a particularly strong effort underway in adopting standards and assessments and with charter schools.		
Total		0
Grand Total	500	338