

## Technical Review

As the application notes, the removal of the principals often is a concern for local communities that have difficulty attracting qualified and effective leadership. Michigan's application is strengthened with its proposed Turnaround Academy that is designed to train leaders for managing the turnaround process.

The State provided evidence that it has had some success with elements of the RTT turnaround models. Using these types of interventions, 282 out of 596 schools have come off the list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The State has replaced staff in 73 schools, restructured 112, and used outside experts to build capacity in 82 schools. While the State indicates that some progress has been made, it acknowledges that the pace has been too slow. The State's plan using the SIG and RTT funds in a targeted manner with intensive supports for the lowest performing schools has the potential for making rapid change to give all of Michigan's students the education they deserve.

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

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	10
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
(i) Michigan is commended for making education a funding priority given the severe economic downturn it is facing. While total State revenues declined between FY2008 and FY2009, the percentage of revenues used to support education increased from 44.47% in FY2008 to 47.15% in FY2009.		
(ii) Both the Primary Operations Funding Formula and formula for Early Childhood Preschool Services make weighted adjustments based on a measure of income to equalize funding between high- and low-poverty districts. The At-Risk Categorical funding stream provides additional support to LEAs with high concentrations of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch. State laws require that Title I schools must receive equitable State funding.		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	26
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	2
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other Innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
(i) The applicant notes that Michigan has long been in the forefront of the charter school movement. While the State caps the number of charters that public universities can operate, there no caps on the number that can be operated by intermediate and local school districts. The lack of cap on these entities effectively allows an unlimited number of charters to operate across the state; only the type of authorizer is limited. Full points were awarded, however there is concern that the State did not provide a copy of the charter school legislation. There is lack of clarity in the specifics of the law regarding this criteria. This		

reader is assuming the narrative was written in good-faith and accurately reflects the legislation which was not provided in the application.

(ii) The State provided sufficient evidence that it holds charters accountable for outcomes including student performance. Charters must state their achievement goals and show evidence to their authorizers that they are being met. Authorizers have denied a significant number of weak applications. The State provides a mechanism for on-site monitoring of charter schools. Between 1998 and 2009, 26 charters were closed for non-performance including poor academic achievement. Michigan's oversight of charters recently was strengthened under a new law allowing an authorizing body to revoke the charter if it has been identified as persistently low-performing.

(iii) The State makes provisions to equitably fund charter schools. Charter schools are treated the same as all other schools in State funding formulae. Because charters cannot levy local mills, the State pays their foundation allowance.

(iv) Michigan does not provide direct funding to traditional or charter schools for school facilities. While no funding for both types may appear to be equal, it is highly unequal for charter schools. Unlike traditional schools, charters do not depend on local levies or tax revenues to support facilities which leaves them at a significant disadvantage in building or renting property. Points were awarded for the Michigan Public Education Facilities Authority which serves as a facilitator of school debt by issuing bonds on behalf of charter schools.

(v) In addition to charter schools, the State has been piloting innovative schools that serve disadvantaged youth including the Not School program, an on-line educational community for students who have dropped out or have been expelled from traditional schools and the New Tech High School that allows high school students from around the State to take all of their coursework through the New Technology School. It appears that these programs may have the flexibility to define their instructional models, but it is not clear if they have control over staffing or budgets. It also is not clear if these programs have open-enrollment provisions. For example, the program for students who have dropped out seems more like a traditional alternative school. The score reflects the concern that the programs described in the application do not meet the RTT definition of innovative, autonomous schools.

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	5	5
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
In this section, Michigan reinforced its commitment to reform that it has demonstrated throughout its application. The State has provided evidence that it is committed to and moving forward with reforms from early childhood through postsecondary education and in each of the four RTT areas. The reforms focus on the whole child and include programs for student health and well-being. Michigan's positive environment for fostering reform could give it an advantage in implementing its RTT program.		
<b>Total</b>	55	41

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	15
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
Michigan articulated a comprehensive plan to address the STEM priority. The Michigan Merit Curriculum has increased the rigor and amount of coursework that students are required take including three years of science and four years of mathematics including geometry and Algebra 1 and 2. The application provided strong evidence of support from the STEM community including higher education and the private sector.		

## Technical Review

Several STEM initiatives, such as the Girls Math Science Conference, reach out to young women. Other STEM programs seek rural students to get them interested in fields of study in the STEM disciplines.

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

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>As Michigan's application demonstrates, the State has articulated a comprehensive and cohesive plan to implement each of the four RTT reform areas. Michigan makes a compelling argument that sweeping reforms are urgently needed not only to improve student achievement, but to save the State from continued economic collapse as its manufacturing base has eroded. The State has secured authentic buy-in from the majority of LEAs; the reforms ultimately could reach 89% of all students and 92% of those living in poverty. In addition, the State has secured broad stakeholder support including teachers, administrators, higher education, parents, and the business community. The application focuses on on-time investments in education that will build the capacity and infrastructures needed to to sustain long-term and meaningful reforms. Although the application falls short in some areas on how and when certain provisions of the plan will be implemented, in general, Michigan is on the right track to move into a new era of how it will educate its students for the 21st Century and beyond.</p>		
Total		0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>380</b>

development initiatives. As a result, the response was scored in the medium range.

Total	138	85
-------	-----	----

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

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	5

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

Michigan's state statute allows the Superintendent of Public Instruction the authority to provide technical assistance to any school that is unaccredited. Further recent legislation authorizes the state superintendent to place the persistently lowest achieving schools under the supervision of the State School Reform Officer. However, the intervention mentioned is only for fiscal purposes - however, it does not appear that the state has the ability to intervene in LEAs in corrective action for academic purposes. As a result, the response was scored in the medium range.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35

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

As a result of recently passed legislation, all schools identified in the lowest 5% of performance will be subject to intervention for turnaround or closure. Once the school is placed under the supervision of the state, the state can either approve a school's redesign using one of the four intervention models or issue an order imposing one of the four intervention models. As a result, the response received maximum credit.

Michigan has presented a clear and transparent process by which low performing schools will be identified. By the end of the 2010-2011 school year – the state will rapidly improve 70 schools identified as falling through the use of the turnaround models. Schools identified as low performing will have to use one of the reform models (transformation, turnaround or restart) or close down. All schools receiving these funds will be required to complete a comprehensive needs assessment and planning process at the start of the intervention. In Detroit, the state has used external providers to facilitate the turnaround process. The state department of education provides technical assistance in developing the school improvement framework to assist schools in the review of school data to target school improvement efforts to specific needs. This model indicates that the state will provide adequate support to turn around persistently low achieving schools. As a result, the response received maximum points.

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

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5

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

Michigan's state budget reflects that the total percentage of revenues available to the state for education increased between FY 2008 and FY 2009. As a result, the response was given full credit.

LEAs with at-risk students, including students who tests below grade level in English language and math, science, are eligible for additional funding to provide instructional and direct non-instructional services for them. Further, the state provided \$88 million on school readiness preschool programs in FY 2009. The budgets presented provided clear evidence that the state is equitably funding high poverty schools and LEAs. As a result, the response was awarded full credit.

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>28</b>
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	4
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	4
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	4

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

The legislature passed a package of bills that expanded authorizing opportunities for university-based schools primarily on their quantity and successful student academic achievement. The proposal does not indicate whether or not there is a cap on the number of charters that can be established. The lack of clarity in the application does not provide whether or not the state has restrictions regarding statewide high performing charter schools- therefore, it is very difficult for the reviewer to access the degree to which the state inhibits and caps the the actual number of charter schools. As a result, the response was scored in the middle range.

The application has identified that the state has laws and regulations regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, reauthorize and close charter schools, with measurable student performance being central to the review. The response received maximum credit.

The state school aid appropriations act treats public charter schools the same as LEAs for the purpose of receiving funding. As a result, the response was scored in the high range.

The state does offer a long term facilities financing option for charter schools- however there is little specific data on how the state provides further equitable access to facilities for charter schools. However, it is noted that the state provides no facilities access to any school in the state - but no evidence is provided to indicate the equity in facilities for charter schools. As a result, the response was scored in the middle range.

The state allows the superintendent of public instruction to issue waivers to LEAs to allow a high percentage of students to take all of their coursework on line- this plan is an innovative way to allow greater options for student access. However, this option does not reflect that this is an open enrollment option for public schools. Although these procedures are innovative, it does not appear that autonomous. As a result, the response was scored in the middle range.

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

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

The applicant describes other significant reform conditions, including initiatives that span a student's education career to provide support throughout the pre-k-20 continuum. As a result, the response was given full credit.

Total	55	43
-------	----	----

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

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
Michigan has outlined a number of high quality STEM programs to promote schools' ability to offer rigorous courses of study in STM, collaborate with industry, higher education, and other partners to prepare more students for advanced study and careers in STEM. Programs include hiring engineers to serve as teachers and considering exploring the NJ Traders to Teachers model. As a result, full credit was awarded.		
Total	15	15

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

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
Michigan has articulated a comprehensive, and coherent reform agenda that addresses the reforms in the four education areas described in ARRA and a clear credible plan to achieving these goals. 87% of the state's LEAs have signed MOUs confirming their commitment to the reform efforts. As a result, full credit was awarded.		
Total		0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>393</b>

they decline, the schools may be subject to state takeover and state selection of the intervention. Additional supports from the state include a comprehensive needs assessment, mandatory external provider training that specifies performance expectations and familiarizes external providers with state legislation and regulation, and the development of a turnaround academy to help prospective schools leaders learn to manage the turnaround process. The state provides evidence that over the past four years, 282 out of 596 schools have come off the list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring but notes that data collection has not been strong enough to show a direct correlation between the approaches used to improve schools and a school's ability to make adequate yearly progress or dramatic improvements in student achievement. A clear and comprehensive timeline for implementing the activities is not included in the plan for this subsection. A score in the "high" range is awarded for this subsection.

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

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
(F)(1)(i)		
The state increased the level of its State budget support for elementary, secondary, and public higher education from 44.47 percent in Fiscal Year 2008 to 47.15 percent for Fiscal Year 2009. High points are awarded.		
(F)(1)(ii)		
The state's funding policy leads to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs because all LEAs are paid a per-pupil foundation allowance for general operations and the state's share of the foundation allowance is paid after subtracting the local revenue per student an LEA generates from millages leveraged against its property taxable values. The state pays all of the foundation allowance of charter schools, as they are not authorized to levy millages. In addition, at-risk categorical funding is paid out to LEAs and charter schools based on the number of pupils in the LEA or charter school who meet federal income eligibility criteria. The state also ensures equitable funding within LEAs by conducting a very detailed comparability analysis within grade ranges and requiring that LEAs allocate Title I funds to schools within a grade range in proportion to the school poverty rates, with higher poverty schools getting more Title I funds. A score in the "high" range is awarded.		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>28</b>
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	3

**(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools**

8

1

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

**(F)(2)(i)**

The state currently has 243 charter schools serving 100,000 students. Although some providers (public universities) have caps on the number of charter schools they can authorize (up to 150), other providers (such as community colleges) do not. The number of charter schools could exceed 10 percent of the state's schools. "High" points are earned for having no overall cap on the number of charter schools that can be authorized.

**(F)(2)(ii)**

The state has a rigorous approval, monitoring, and reauthorization process for charter schools. The state's current legal and regulatory framework addresses all of the items described in the selection criteria, and student achievement is a significant factor in all authorizing decisions. A score in the "high" range is awarded for this subsection.

**(F)(2)(iii)**

The state treats charter schools the same as LEAs for the purpose of receiving funding from general operations and major categorical funding, such as special education, at-risk, and preschool. Since Fiscal Year 2008, charter schools have been allowed to receive the same foundation allowance increased as traditional LEAs, up to the level of combined state and local funding as the districts in which they are located. Charter schools are authorized for federal funding based upon federal requirements.

**(F)(2)(iv)**

The state does not provide direct funding for facilities to charter schools or to traditional public schools, nor does the state impose differential facility-related requirements. The Michigan Public Educational Facilities Authority offers a long-term facilities financing option for charter schools, under which the state serves as a facilitator of charter school debt by issuing bonds on their behalf. A score in the lower end of the "middle" range is awarded.

**(F)(2)(v)**

The state highlights a couple examples of innovative schools, as well as the State Superintendent's plans for LEAs to "re-imagine" their education system through Project ReImagine, but it is not clear whether these schools are also autonomous. No points are awarded for this subsection.

**(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions**

5

5

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

**(F)(3)**

The state highlights its reforms in five areas: early childhood, coordinated school health, early/middle colleges, Promise Zones, and the Michigan College Access Network. These initiatives span a student's education, providing support throughout the preK-20 continuum. Results such as lower grade retention and increased student achievement overall and by some subgroups, among other important outcomes, are provided. Full points are awarded for this section, which does a good job of showing the state's comprehensive approach to education reform and innovations.

**Total**

55

43

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



	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>The applicant provides a comprehensive focus on the STEM disciplines throughout the application. The state offers a rigorous course of study in STEM disciplines, is cooperating with STEM-capable partners, including universities and foundations, to help with integration of STEM content into the classroom, and is supporting programs to prepare more students, including underrepresented groups and females, for advanced study and careers in STEM.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>In most respects, this is a solid application—clear, well organized, comprehensive, and detailed in how the applicant will use RTTT funds to implement significant reforms across most of the four education reform areas of the ARRA, as well as the State Success Factors Criteria. A striking exception is Part D, which is of significantly less quality than the rest of the application, even though the state has considerable capacity in its existing professional development system and is trying (with limited results) to add a focus on coherence to its system in its plans.</p>		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>366</b>
--------------------	------------	------------

develop the an appropriate plan of action. Through the State School Reform/Redesign Office, each school must complete a "comprehensive needs assessment," which will be used to inform the selection of one of the four intervention models. This seems to ensure that each plan is based on the needs of the school rather than a one-size fits all. In addition, the state is rightfully taking a more hands on approach, requiring schools to trade in autonomy for deep intensive support as they implement one of the four intervention models. Providing deep intensive support seems to be a smart strategy as an all hands on deck approach should increase the likelihood that reform is effective, and it is a state approach that has made a difference in the past improving schools, according the limited data the state has on hand. The state's aggressive assessment timeline i.e., conducting reviews in the summer before the start of the school year reflects a strong serious commitment by the state to turning around its lowest-achieving schools. Moreover, the state is encouraging a greater role for its Intermediate School Districts by helping each one build its capacity to support school improvement. This strategy combined with the due diligence the state has already performed (e.g., inviting potential external providers with success turning around low-performing schools to submit a proposal to join their external provider network) makes the state well-positioned to provide LEAs with effective support implementing one of the four intervention models.

An outstanding challenge for the state's turnaround efforts is the role of collective bargaining. The statute requires LEAs to seek input from unions and their grant application requires them to submit an addendum to the collective bargaining agreement. It is not clear what happens if a district cannot reach an agreement. The state's stellar plan falters in its evidence section. The application asks the state to provide its historic performance on school turnaround as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools that States or LEAs attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and lessons learned to date.

The state explains that it has attempted to turn around 267 schools using three broad approaches. The state does not discuss its results or in depth lessons learned. The application simply states that 282 of the 596 schools have "come off the list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring," but the district does not detail why. The state reasons that its data collection has not been strong enough to show a direct correlation. This response is insufficient. While the state may not have quantitative data, it is unclear to what extent is has or even considered gathering qualitative data, such as interviews with MDE staff involved in the successful and failed turnaround of previous schools. Of note, the number of schools coming off "the list" is greater than the number of schools the district has intervened in.

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

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
Michigan's education appropriation as a percent of its total budget has increased from 44.47% in FY'2008 to 47.15% in FY'2009.		
The state takes into consideration the taxable property values of LEAs and provides LEAs with lower property value a greater per-pupil payment. In addition, the state provides at-risk categorical funding to high-need LEAs. Collectively, the state has policies in place that lead to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs. The state through a "very detailed comparability analysis" attempts to ensure similarly situated schools are funded at equal levels.		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	0

(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	0
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	0
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0

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

The state does not include its charter law; instead, it provides a link, which is assumed to correspond to a website of its charter statute. Per the reviewer guidance, "reviewers are prohibited from using outside information, including Web links included in the application." Consequently, it impossible to fully evaluate if and to what extent the law:

- (i) enables high-performing charter schools "(caps)"
- (ii) authorizes and hold charters accountable for outcomes
- (iii) ensures equitable funding charter schools
- (iv) provides charter schools with equitable access to facilities

It can be inferred based on the state's narrative that it has a charter school law; it cannot be assumed that the state's narrative is consistent with its charter law. For example, the state's narrative in section (E)(1) was inconsistent with its law. Since high, medium, and low points can only be awarded based on an evaluation of each element within the context of the state's charter law, in the absence of the law, the only available option is to award no points.

While the state's narrative is insufficient for the purposes of awarding points, in fairness to the state and the public, an evaluation of the state's narrative follows:

The state has a charter school law, and the law does not prohibit the number of charter schools that can operate in the state. In addition, the state seems to be encouraging charter schools with a proven model to scale via its School of Excellence initiative.

Although the state has a cap, limiting institutions of higher education to 150 charter schools total or limiting each per university to 150 charter schools (the chart does not clearly delineate and the law is not available to clarify), institutions have not come close to reaching this cap. The closest school, Central Michigan University, is at 40% of the cap.

The state's narrative asserts "student achievement is a significant factor in all authorizing decisions" and highlight its recognition by the Center of Education Reform as evidence.

The state's charter schools are treated and funded like LEAs and the state, according to their narrative, removed any cap that would prevent the equitable funding of charter schools compared to traditional public schools.

The state is clear on its long-term facilities financing options for charter school, yet absent on short term options. Short term options encompass, but are not limited to, whether charter schools are able to rent/lease a vacant public school building and whether a charter school has to secure a building or can use the current building when transforming a failing school into a charter school. The state is consistent in its treatment of charters and traditional public schools; in the sense, it does not provide "direct funding" to any school. However, in order to truly make charter school equitable to traditional public schools the state would need to provide them with additional assistance.

The state includes great examples of innovative school structures. However, the narrative does not respond to the innovative, autonomous public schools criterion. It is not clear if these "outstanding examples" are:

*open enrollment public schools that, in return for increased accountability for student achievement, have the flexibility and authority to define their instructional models and associated curriculum; select and replace staff; implement new structures and formats for the school day or year; and control their budgets*

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
Michigan clearly articulates a record of support for education reform that will help advance Accelerate Michigan, notably its efforts around areas: Early/Middle Colleges, Promise Zones, and the Michigan College Access Network.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>15</b>

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>The state lists numerous activities and undertakings in this section. Each initiative seems good when evaluated individually, and collectively reflect a broad comprehensive STEM agenda. Reviewer guidance for this section, ask evaluators to "evaluate [this section] in the context of the State's entire application." In doing so, it is clear that Accelerate Michigan, the state's Race to the Top plan, does effectively and consistently weave an emphasis on STEM through its application.</p> <p>The application has a high-quality plan to address the need to</p> <p><b>(i) offer a rigorous course of study in STEM</b></p> <p>Evidence: Michigan's Merit Curriculum, which requires all high school students to take three years of science, including either chemistry or physics, and four years of mathematics, including geometry and Algebra 1 and 2.</p> <p><b>(ii) cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other STEM-capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students</b></p> <p>Evidence: University partnerships with Oakland and Wayne University that prepare engineers for the classroom. The Woodrow Wilson Michigan Teaching Fellowship program which offers incentives for recent graduates and career changers in STEM</p> <p><b>(iii) prepare more students 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</b></p> <p>Evidence: A host of activities: First Robotics, the Real World Design Challenge, You Be the Chemist, the Girls Math Science Conference, a mentoring program with the Girl Scouts, and weekly sessions with rural students are examples of student services provided through the Mathematics and Science Centers Network and Career and Technical Education to increase STEM participation.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>After review and reflection, it is clear that the state's application addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA, albeit with varying degrees of success, as well as the State Success Factors Criteria. The state's theory of change, creation of the Accelerate Michigan Office as well as the State School Reform/Redesign Office, implementation of its Responsive Instructional Support System and Teacher Evaluation Framework to name a few collectively work together to demonstrate that the State and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform.</p> <p>The State demonstrates in its application significant LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans. The state clearly describes how it, in collaboration with its 737 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.</p> <p>In sum, the state meets this priority.</p>		
Total		0
Grand Total	500	333

School Ranking Business Rules were appended.) The business rules emphasize student achievement by weighting achievement and progress with a 2 to 1 ratio. Weighting proficiency more heavily assures that the lowest performing schools, unless they are improving significantly over time, still receive the assistance and monitoring they need to begin both improvement and/or to accelerate improvement to a degree that will reasonably lead to adequate achievement levels. The ranking process identifies which eligible Title I and Title I eligible secondary students (Grades 7-12) will receive School Improvement Grants and will fall under the supervision of the State Schools Reform/Redesign Officer. Approval by the United States Department of Education is pending. The Michigan Department of Education will then publish the rules and list of schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving. High schools will also be included if they have a four-year graduation rate below 60% for the last three consecutive years.

The fact that business rules were employed to use in the ranking of schools is an indicator of the care taken to perform this serious function. Transparency is evident.

E.2.ii Many supports have already been mentioned in previous sections: curriculum alignment with Common Core Standards, introduction of RESPONSE and formative assessments, and the use of the Framework for Educator Evaluations. The current system of supports provided to schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have four elements: a school building audit, a process mentor team, leadership support, and instructional coaches. All schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving (bottom 5%) are required to implement one of the four reform models: turnaround, restarts, school closure, or transformation. An LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50% of its schools. The Appendices which accompanied this response provided and complemented detailed explanations of the procedures to be taken in implementing the reform models. The Michigan Department of Education will generate a list of providers to work with schools implementing all models other than closures. These providers will be available to work with all persistently lowest-achieving schools. Depending on the model chosen, the School Improvements Grant will include (among many) incentives to retain effective and highly effective teachers and principals, and to provide and addendum in situations where collective bargaining is needed.

Michigan's response to Criteria D.2.ii is extensive. It is evident that the State has been deeply involved in efforts to assist and improve persistently lowest-achieving schools

Total	50	50
-------	----	----

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	10
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5

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

F.1.i Michigan continues to make education funds a priority at a time when the state is experiencing significant cuts. The state spent more than 2.5 percent for education in FY 2009 than in FY 2006. Although the level of state support for elementary, secondary, and public higher education decreased from FY 2008-FY 2009, the level of total revenues available also decreased from FY 2008-FY 2009. The percentage of educational spending from FY 2008-FY 2009 increased from 44.47% in 2008 to 47.15% in 2009. The exact differential was 2.68%.

F.1.ii High-need LEAs receive equitable funding because there are specific accommodations made for

LEAs with low property taxable values. LEAs are paid a per-pupil foundation allowance for general operations. The state's share of the foundation allowance is paid after subtracting the local revenue per pupil an LEA generated from millages levied against its property taxable values. For two LEAs with the same foundation allowance, the LEA with the lower taxable values per pupil will receive a larger state per-pupil payment. Levels of state and local support are different for each district and changes from year to year, depending on the local adjusted non-homestead property taxable value. Because public school academies (charters) are not authorized to levy millages, the state pays all of their foundation allowance.

The state requires that any Title I school receive equitable funding, the same as non-Title I schools within the LEA. The state does a detained comparability analysis within grade ranges: that is, all elementary schools must receive the same funding, all middle schools must receive the same state funding, although the high schools may receive more funding than the elementary and middle schools. The state also requires that the LEA allocate Title I funds to schools within a grade range in proportion to the school poverty taxes, with higher poverty compensation plans that requires equitable compensation.

The data indicate that Michigan allocates a consistent percentage of State revenue to education and that Title I schools receive equitable funding the same a non-Title i schools within the LEAs.

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>28</b>
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	4
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	8

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

F.2.i With the combined strength of existing charter schools laws and the addition of innovative charter expansion legislation in 2009, Michigan expects to increase both the quantity and quality of its charter school sector. Michigan law allows four types of public educational bodies to authorize public school academies: state universities, community colleges, intermediate school districts, and local school districts. Only universities were originally capped at 150 charter schools though they could authorize an additional 15 Urban High School Academies and an unlimited number of Strict Discipline Academies which are designed to serve alternate population of students. Under existing law, Bay Mills Community College, a tribal college able to authorize statewide, has no cap and authorizes schools across the state. Intermediate and local schools districts also have no cap. There are currently 243 public school academies, including three high schools and seven district discipline academies. In December, 2009, the Michigan Legislature passed a package of bills that expanded authorizing opportunities for university-chartered schools based primarily on their quality and successful school achievement. Ten new charter schools and up to two "cyber" charters may also be authorized under this legislation. The new charter schools known as "Schools of Excellence" will no longer be considered a charter school and leave an opening for a new charter to be authorized. Vacancies under the "cap" can be filled for a school in an area with below-graduation rates. This unique "smart cap" approach provides growth in the charter section that is only limited by quality, and encourages this growth in areas of greatest academic need.

Numerical data were not available to determine the percentage of charter schools that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charters areas. In Michigan, schools with caps exist, but legislature and policy initiatives, coupled with fresh authorizing activity among new and existing authorizers, are expected to result in increasing levels of chartering activity. Charter school advocates expect the state to experience an increase in the overall number of charters during the next three to five

years.

F.2.ii Primary responsibility for charter school oversight has been delegated to accredited public institutions of higher education, local or intermediate school districts, and recognized tribal schools. Authorizers are allowed to utilize up to 3 percent of the per pupil state funding for schools they charter to support their oversight activities. Under Michigan's primary charter schools law, authorizing is a voluntary activity in which consideration of student achievement is a significant factor throughout the process. Authorizers may receive applications from any person or entity, and may issue contracts to applicants on a competitive basis, taking into account educational goals, the population served, financial resources, and, if applicable, the applicant's track record. Consideration of student achievement is a significant factor throughout the charter process. Recently passed legislation amending Michigan's charter schools law also strengthens it by codifying existing practices on the use of student achievement as a significant factor in making reauthorization decisions, and as it relates to the closure of persistently low-achieving schools. In the past 15 years, 39 public schools charter schools have been closed for not meeting performance requirements

F.2.iii The State School Aid Appropriation Act treats public school academies the same as LEAs for the purpose of receiving funding from sections allocating general operations and major categorical funding such as special education, at-risk, and pre-school. LEAs and public school academies are paid a per-pupil foundation allowance for general operations, a mix of state and local per-pupil revenues. Because public school academies are not authorized to levy local mileages, the state pays all of their foundation allowance. The total amount of revenue an LEA or public school academy receives is derived from multiplying the number of pupils an LEA or public school academy educates by its foundation allowance. New public school academies are funded at the level of combined state and local funding of the district in which they are located. Prior to fiscal year 2008, the per-pupil funding cap for public school academies was \$1,000 less than for traditional school districts. In fiscal year 2008, this cap was removed and thus allowed public schools academies to receive the same foundation allowance increases, up to the level of combined state and local funding as the districts in which they are located. Public school academies are authorized for federal funding based upon federal requirements.

F.2.iv Michigan does not provide direct funding for facilities to public school academies (charter schools) or to traditional public schools, nor does Michigan impose differential facility-related requirements. The Mission Public Educational Facilities Authority offers a long-term facilities financing option for public schools academies. Under this program, the state serves as a facilitator of charter school debt by issuing bonds on their behalf. Bond payments are then intercepted from the public school academy's state school aid payments, which offsets some of the risk for investors.

F.2.v By using a combination of Title II D funding and waiver authority granted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Michigan has provided opportunities for the development of innovative schools. The Superintendent of Public Instruction issues waivers to local school districts to allow a percentage of high school students to take all of this coursework online. Recent legislation also allows the Superintendent of Public Instruction to approve two new cyber charter schools. Several examples of additional innovative schools follow. A research based year-round school, Not School, is a constructivist online virtual-learning community intended to support young people who are excluded from the formal education who have dropped out. New Technology Schools are small schools with no more that 400 students in Grades 9-12. They have a nonselective admission policy and provide a full-day program so students can take their entire core curriculum in the school. The New Technology School model engages students through the use of one-on-one computing and incorporates the learning of and assessment of 21st century skills, focusing on the STEM fields or on digital media arts.

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

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

F.3 The response to this criteria showcases many of the significant initiatives undertaken by



Michigan. These initiatives have established a foundation for reform and have demonstrated conditions that lead to student achievement for all. Early Childhood, Coordinated School Health, Early/ Middle Colleges, Promise Zones, and the Michigan College Access Network. These initiatives span a student's education career to provide a support throughout the preK-20 continuum. An example of an initiative from each of the five areas follows. The Children's Cabinet was established to oversee cross-agency policy related to children and their issues. A coordinated school health program consists of eight separate but interconnected components which endeavor to support school districts, to address the health needs of students and staff, and to foster an effective school climate. The state legislature allocated grant funds for the start-up of Early/Middle Colleges with a focus on preparing students for health and STEM careers. Promise Zones have been established to expand opportunities for students to attend college through universal "place-based" scholarship programs. The Michigan College Access Network promotes postsecondary education by supporting local college access programs, which helps citizens learn about higher education options, get into college, and earn their degrees.

A broad range of significant initiatives has been undertaken to serve Michigan's preK-20 continuum. Concern, insight, knowledge, and dedication indicate the State's awareness of its needs.

Total	55	43
-------	----	----

**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>

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

Since 1988, Michigan has invested in a Mathematics and Science center Network to support the improvement of STEM education for students and teachers. The 33 regional Math and Science Centers in the network stimulate and sustain K-12 student interest in STEM through leadership, curriculum support, professional development, and student services. As Michigan adopts and implements the Common Core Standards, the Mathematics and Science Center Network will be used to roll out mathematics standards through the development of companion documents, a redesign of a formative assessment item bank, and the formation of professional development of professional sessions for math educators to increase their knowledge and understanding of the new standards. Alternate routes to certification will enable the use of Michigan's STEM-rich labor force to bring content expertise to math and science classrooms. The Woodrow Wilson Michigan Teaching Fellowship Program will increase the quantity and strengthen the quality of Michigan teachers in STEM. The Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellowship offers recent graduates and career changers in STEM a stipend of \$30,000 to complete a specially designed master's degree program at one of six Michigan universities, in exchange for a commitment to teach for three years in a high-need secondary urban or rural school. This effort will enable Michigan to address teacher shortage areas in mathematics and science with teachers who have substantive content knowledge. Externally funded programs have added to the state's efforts to increase professional development in STEM while leveraging opportunities for collaboration with universities and businesses. Programming through the Mathematics and Science Centers Network and Career and Technical Education provides hands-on activities and competitions designed to attract underrepresented groups into STEM career paths. In addition, the state participates in efforts with external funders to provide STEM-rich activities to students. Currently, 4,800 students in 80 states across Michigan participate in the Ford Partnership for Advanced Studies. This partnership is an academically rigorous, interdisciplinary curriculum and programs that provide students with content knowledge and skills necessary for future success.

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

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>When preparing this application, Michigan realized the need to include more stakeholders in its endeavors. Letters from stakeholders indicated that they were pleased to be involved in the discussions and planning sessions which accompanied the state's efforts to produce a revised plan which would meet all requirements of Race to the Top. Michigan's plan accented the importance of the role played by participating LEAs. Throughout the plan, the themes of student achievement and teacher effectiveness resonated in its content. Great pride in Michigan's accomplishment and endeavors was also apparent. The state addressed each of the reform areas comprehensively and coherently. Descriptions of how funding was allocated to reform initiatives and accountability measures were carefully referenced. The applications's concern to provide quality education for Michigan's children-the K-20 population, could be accounted for in each of the responses. Accelerate Michigan is definitely undertaking a systemic approach to education reform.</p>		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>436</b>