

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:                      The plan discusses intervention but expressly explains the state has no authority to take over a persistently failing school/district. The focus is around collaboration, which is admirable, but apparently if the situation is in crisis, the state cannot take over the institution(s) involved. This raises serious questions about the state's ability to develop an effective effort in this particular area of reform.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	3
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	17
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:                      (i) The application describes a scenario around low performing schools that is very confusing. For example, the statement "some schools chose not to participate"- how can schools chose not to participate? What does this mean? There apparently is not a strong effort to develop a plan to tackle persistently low performing schools, especially within the context of previous information about the state not having the legal authority to take over these schools. Apparently it is all voluntary. (ii) The application lays out a very detailed plan about how the state supports LEAs- it is quite apparent that the state works collaboratively with the LEAs and does not have the authority for major intervention. In terms of major reform, this lack of authority raises real questions, but overall, the plan is well documented and appears to be entirely appropriate. The "Follow the Child" initiative is quite impressive. There is apparently no direct identification of any of the four turnaround models contained in the application.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>20</b>

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:                      (i)-1 point It appears the state does not meet the standard as education funding has decreased while Transportation and Health and Human Services has increased- the percentage declined from 33.4% to 28.1%. Reference was made to the fact that student enrollment has declined as well. (ii)- 5 points Full points for (ii) due to the five funding levels as policy in the state. The application clearly laid out the policy of more funding to high-need LEAs and schools. This explanation meets the requirements of the application.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>15</b>
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:                      (i)-2 points The explanation contained in this section leads one to assume there is not a charter cap- it is not clear from the materials presented. Yet later in this section it appears as if there is a cap because of the terminology of suspension of approvals "due to budget constraints". Low points are awarded due to mixed signals in the application. (ii)-8 points The application outlines in satisfactory detail the authorization and accountability aspects of the charter school initiative in the state. This meets requirements for the awarding of maximum points for (F) (2)(ii). (iii)- 5 points Funding for charter</p>		

<p>schools, according to state regulations and statute, is at approximately the 80% level. Accordingly six of eight points are awarded. (iv)- 0 points No points are awarded in the area of facilities, as the application clearly states that there are no provisions to provide funding for charter school facilities. (v)- 0 points No points are awarded, as the application states that the state is "currently considering" proposed legislation, but there are no existing statutes to support the requirements of (F)(2)(v).</p>		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:                  The application describes many programs, philosophies and initiatives but does not provide any evidence of student achievement data used to gauge the effectiveness of this programs, philosophies and initiatives.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>24</b>

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<p>Competitive Reviewer Comments:                  The application discusses periodically throughout the process the state's commitment, involvement and efforts in the area of STEM. This appears to be one of the strongest elements of the proposal. There is ample evidence of the positive impact of the STEM effort in the state, especially with the P-16/higher education initiative.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>No</b>
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments:                  The state does not meet this absolute priority because two of the four reform areas are not satisfactorily addressed in the application. In addition, the level of LEA participation and commitment does not rise to a level that is conducive for strong reforms being implemented statewide- the lack in the number of LEA participants and the low number of MOU signatures of Union leaders is a real source of concern. This state has many positive attributes, including superb work in standards and assessments. In addition, the state's alternative credential systems seem to be a real model for others to review. Yet in the area of great teachers and leaders, the application lacks substance, direction and a concrete plan that rises to the level required for real reform-- there is just not a level of depth of commitment required to meet real education reform. The persistently low performing school section is also extremely weak, very vague and lacking in long-term commitment- once again the level of commitment as written in this proposal raises serious, sepcific questions about the state's legal ability to intervene and the implications of this lack of state involvement. This state self-describes itself as a local control state. How this issue plays out in the application around two of the reform areas perhaps explains the weakness in these areas. It appears this state does not meet the requirements of this absolute priority.</p>		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>276</b>
--------------------	------------	------------

The state outlines a reasonable approach to identifying the lowest-achieving schools in the state, as defined in this application process. The plan describes the plans for turning around the lowest-achieving schools, building off the current statewide system of support (SSOS), including its more recent use of the "roundtable" process. Evidence is provided of a series of supports offered to priority schools. Evidence regarding achievement gains appears to present state-level data broken out by special population and race/ethnicity; relation of these data to those schools selected or schools previously identified for intensive support is unclear. The state uses essentially a transformation model, per the definition of this application process; use of extended learning time is unclear, and the plan concludes that "in the past, New Hampshire has not enforced bold reform." Lessons learned from Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI) draw more generally from school reform literature, and specific lessons from the state's work seem unclear. While 4 of 6 schools in restructuring in 08-09 exited, 233 schools were classified as SINI, a jump from only 6 in 2003; only 12 schools exited SINI in 2009. The future impact of prior approaches does not seem promising, and further distinction of proposed plans from prior efforts would appear warranted. The state presents a detailed work plan through four cohorts.

<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>33</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:            From FY08 to FY09, the education budget increased in nominal terms but declined year-to-year as a percentage of the budget. The state indicates that rising health/human services costs drove this, and that the K-12 population is in decline. Equitable funding is sought through the revised per pupil funding, which will be fully implemented over the next two years (full implementation by July 1, 2011). As the funding format is determined by the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced lunch at the school level, it appears to provide equitable funding both between high-need LEAs and other LEAs, and within LEAs. No data on actual distribution per LEA or per LEA characteristics are provided.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>18</b>
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:            The state limits the number of state-authorized charters to 20 within its pilot ten-year program, though only 16 were granted, as additional approvals were suspended owing to budget constraints. At present, only 11 state-authorized charters exist, though there is no statutory limit on the number of LEA-authorized charter schools (though only one LEA-authorized charter is mentioned, planned for Fall 2010). Charters are open enrollment schools in the state. The state has laws, regulations, etc. regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize and close charters, and data regarding applications, approvals, denials and closure are summarized in the plan. Charters receive a pass-through of 80% of the district's average cost per pupil for the prior fiscal year, and no funding for facilities is provided charters, though such funding is available to local districts. Current state law does not appear to support other types of non-standard schools.</p>		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:            The plan presents some recent rules, laws and regulations as significant reform conditions, though their likely impact is unclear. The shift to competency-based assessments and the regional secondary school reform effort appear promising. The plan provides some evidence of the impact of Extended Learning Opportunities Project, which may warrant further elaboration and integration with the overall proposal.</p>		

Total	55	26
-------	----	----

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: The state provides a plan for developing and implementing rigorous study in STEM fields, increasing access to STEM classes (especially the underrepresented and females), recruit/retain/develop top teachers so as to have an equitable distribution of math/science teachers (especially in rural areas), and provide special support for priority schools in these areas.		
<b>Total</b>	15	15

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: The application comprehensively and coherently addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria. Sub-section comments provide further analysis. The plan provides notable attention to the state's experience as an innovator in constructed response assessments and in multi-state consortia for high-quality standards and assessment. The state's commitment to supporting local innovation, and to allow implementation pilots as sources of evidence toward determining state directions distinguish its plan. The state does not appear to have several foundations critical to its reform plan, however, at both statutory and stakeholder support levels. Greater specificity in terms of planned development of facilitating structures or mechanisms, including data systems, appears warranted for several components of the plan. In an effort to expand and/or highlight prior feedback, it should be noted that further evidence regarding the following would strengthen the plan: 1) The development/collection/analysis of qualitative/quantitative data on professional and community variables to complement the student assessment data described; further evidence warranted to gauge implementation, sustainability, formation of local capacity, shifts in professional norms, etc., including, e.g., gauges of collective efficacy, instructional practice, community engagement, parental support, working conditions, changes in use of daily time, daily professional routines, understanding of plan vision, school climate (e.g., My Voice Survey), etc.; 2) The impact of the total plan on school-level decision-making practices and demands, particularly the impact on school-level leadership practice; the plan has components to which it is committed (many seem well-warranted per evidence presented) and on set timelines; how this plan drives support rollout while also stimulating the demand-side pull from practitioners remains unclear; the plan must balance local flexibility in adapting to local context and support for this balancing warrants further clarification; 3) An opportunity exists in the continued development of longitudinal student data systems to link to non-school data, providing the greater "360-degree" view of the child, and the promise of more integrated analysis of drivers to educational performance, and thus the promise of more efficient and effective use of funds and interventions across agencies, public and private, supporting this development; 4) Data regarding local community support and civic capacity remains limited, and yet are critical factors in successful reform efforts; 5) Data regarding the drivers of inequitable teacher and principal distribution in the state; 6) Explicit strategies in how the gap between tool development/dissemination and tool use will be bridged, given the frequent experience of this gap in prior reform efforts; 7) With a public commentary period built into the rollout of the new Common Core standards, fallback strategies should be considered, should public comments/engagement demonstrate further work needed to		

coalesce sufficient support; and 8) Further supporting evidence of sustainability, e.g., how standing state funds would be reallocated to sustain an enhanced continuous improvement cycle, how existing funding sources would support ongoing collaborative support structures and intensive assistance, and how existing funding would support the upkeep of new standards, assessments, enhanced technologies, etc.

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

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>310</b>
--------------------	------------	------------

<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>(D)(4) Reviewer Comments:  (D)(4) A consortium has been formed to develop a system of incentives based on increases in student growth. Additionally, the use of a growth model will become part of New Hampshire's accountability system. Linking student performance to specific teachers is also a priority of the New Hampshire legislature. However, insufficient specificity about the plans were included in the application to judge whether the plan was adequate.</p>		
<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
<p>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments:  (D)(5) The State will build on its system for professional development, which will blend policy and practice. Priority areas are: standards and assessment, STEM, teacher effectiveness, leadership, high school transformation, and Board Exam/Move on When Ready. The professional development will be offered for each Innovation network and may be in person or online. Also, the state will engage a contractor to design and implement a 4-year mentoring program. The state has a manageable and efficient plan for evaluating the effectiveness of its support system for teachers and principals. This plan is well thought-out and detailed and will focus on leadership, technology integration, and content.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>96</b>

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:  (E)(1) The State has the authority to enforce sanctions on schools and districts. If a local school board does not revise its improvement plan within 60 days or if the State Board of Education does not approve the revised plan, the State Board has the authority to direct the local school board to implement the plan.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>27</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	22
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:  (E)(2)(ii) The State has identified 4 levels of support provided to districts, and is organized by levels of need and support available. Turnaround models that have shown success in New Hampshire are those used in the lowest performing districts and schools. New Hampshire has proposed that under its RTTT Plan that 10 districts, along with 12 of the persistently low-achieving schools, will receive the most intensive support services. These districts will be bound to the tenets of an MOU that each of these 10 districts must sign. This plan would be more effective on a statewide basis if more districts were included. A detailed work plan has been included in New Hampshire's RTTT application.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>37</b>

### F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (F)(1)(i) Even though the dollar amount of education funding increased by \$11,231,015 from FY 2008 to FY 2009, the percentage of the budget that it represented fell from 28.5% to 28.1%. Thus, the level was substantially unchanged. (F)(1)(ii) The State uses five per pupil funding levels. The top tier provides double the per pupil aid as the base tier. Tiers are determined by the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced price meals at the school level. All students at a school are funded at the same per pupil level.		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>13</b>
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (F)(2)(i) In 2003, the NH General Court amended the charter school law to create a 10-year pilot program authorizing the State Board of Education to grant up to 20 applications during that period. In fall 2009, 15 of 16 applications have been authorized. Eleven are still open. The figure of the total number of all schools in the state was not provided; therefore, a percentage cannot be calculated. The targets provided in the guidance were considered in assigning a low score to this section. (F)(2)(ii) Pertinent statutes were described. (F)(2)(iii) An "adequacy payment" follows each student to a charter school.		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (F)(3) To increase the rigor of NH high school courses, students are granted course credit based solely on demonstration of student mastery of course-level competencies. The competencies must be aligned with the state's assessment system. The state instituted an Extended Learning Opportunities program, and the drop-out rate for students participating in that program has been reduced at a faster rate than for non-participants. Raising the mandatory attendance age from 16 to 18 has had a positive impact on reducing the drop-out rate, as well. Positive impacts are being realized by New Hampshire's focus on High School Redesign. Also, of note is the State's desire to partner with neighboring states in various endeavors, such as common assessments, which is both efficient and cost effective.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>25</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>
Competitive Reviewer Comments: A focus on STEM is a theme that crosses all elements of this application.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
Absolute Reviewer Comments: This application takes a comprehensive approach to education reform; however many of the components are merely in the planning stage. The proposal is weakened by the low participation rate among districts. The commitment to engage stakeholders in decisions that impact students and schools, while efficiently using public resources, is noteworthy but not comprehensive. The goals are		

attainable and should result in decreases in achievement gaps across subgroups and increases in the rates of high school graduation and preparation for college and careers.

Total		0
Grand Total	500	332



piloting of statewide reforms such as the educator evaluation model. The plan, as presented, has the potential to effectively support schools in their turnaround efforts. 20

<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>35</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------

## F. General

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>i. The proposal states that appropriations for education DECREASED from FY2008 to FY2009, from 28.5% to 28.1% (all funds) and from 33.4% to 28.1% (state funds). This decrease in funding support indicates low points for this criterion. ii. The proposal describes an equitable state education funding formula that creates five funding levels based on district students eligible for free or reduced lunch. Those schools at the highest student poverty level received twice the per-pupil funding as those with the fewest student in poverty. In addition, the proposal describes a new equity component to the formula that will go into effect in FY2012, in which additional state education aid is provided to communities with low property tax bases. These features of the funding formula qualify for high points on this criterion.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>16</b>
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>i. The proposal describes two routes for charter school establishment: local development approved by local school board and submitted to state for chartering, and state charter. The LEA-approved route has no caps, while the state-approved route has a statewide cap of 20 schools. Only one currently operating charter school has been certified by its LEA. The rest of the currently operating charters (10 of 11) are state approved. Lists and descriptions of currently operating charters were provided along with information regarding why some charters have closed. The percentage of schools in the state that are charters was not provided (statement left blank). However, Section A data indicates that there are 169 public schools in the state, so 11/169 equals 6.5%. While the state places no statutory caps on LEA-approved charter schools, it appears that attaining LEA approval presents barriers such that only one school has been approved in 15 years. It is not possible to ascertain from the proposal the nature of those de facto barriers. For the combination of the statutory cap on the state route to charter approval, plus the evidence of logistical barriers to LEA charter approval, this response qualifies for medium points on this criterion. ii. The SEA monitors and holds accountable the authorized charter schools, with criteria that include academic performance, fiscal responsibility, and sustainability. Student achievement targets are an important factor in charter renewal decisions. Charters have closed due to lack of students and financial insolvency, but the proposal does not indicate if state action was taken in these cases. The state does have the authority to revoke a charter due to risk to students, violations of the charter contract, financial instability, and violations of law. The proposal does not address whether the charter schools must serve student populations similar to LEA populations; many of the operating charter schools have been established particularly to serve students at risk. This accountability structure meets the requirements of this criterion. iii. Charter schools are eligible to receive at least 80% of the average per-pupil allotment as the regular public schools in the LEA. This response qualifies for medium points on this criterion. iv. The state does not provide funding for charter school facilities; thus no points are awarded for this criterion. v. The state does not currently enable LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools; thus no points are awarded for this criterion.</p>		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The narrative in this section focuses on high school reforms, including course-level competencies, a rise in the age for compulsory school attendance from 16 to 18, and extended learning opportunities. No data is provided as to whether these efforts have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other measurable outcomes.

<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>24</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments:</b> The proposal describes a STEM approach that concentrates on ensuring the universal availability of rigorous STEM coursework, improving the knowledge and skills of STEM educators, creating pipelines for STEM careers, especially among underrepresented student groups; and reducing the need for mathematics remediation in college. Components of the STEM priority are infused throughout the application. Therefore, full credit is awarded on the Competitive Preference Priority.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments:</b> The state has not done an adequate job of addressing the four RTTT education reform areas and the State Success Factors. Each area exhibits weaknesses as described in the comment sections for each criterion. In particular, the lack of progress on the longitudinal data system, the low level of LEA participation, and the incomplete responses regarding Section D (Great Teachers and Leaders) indicates that this state is not prepared to undertake the level of reform required in this competition.		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>228</b>
--------------------	------------	------------

provide for one of the four school intervention models: turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformation.

<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>19</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:            While the State appropriations to K-12 education increased from FY 08 to FY 09, the percentage declined. Funding seems to occur differentially to accommodate for local funding capacity toward ensuring an equitable distribution of funds. It is not clear, however, the extent to which the Adequacy Aid can address potential inequities of funding available to LEAs. The tiered per pupil funding and accountability plan has not been fully implemented and so it is difficult to assess the impact of these policies.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:            The charter laws passed in 1995 allow for charter schools; charter school proposals must first be approved by the local LEAs, however, before being considered by the State Board. From 1995-1999 only one charter proposal was approved by a local school district. That charter was not able to open because of lack of funding. In 2003 the State amended the charter school law and created a pilot program for authorizing the State Board to grant up to 20 state charter schools. At this time, 15 charters have been authorized although additional charters will not be considered through 2011 because of budget constraints. In this context, it appears the State de facto has charter school laws that effectively inhibit the number of charter schools. Annual assessments of charters consider progress toward school goals, so it appears there are mechanisms for monitoring, holding accountable, reauthorizing, and closing charter schools. Funding for charters that are approved by the local districts under the 1995 law is set at a minimum of 80% of the LEA funding. Funding for state charters under the 2003 law is to match or exceed local funding, although this level of support must occur through private means. It is unclear what the state obligation in these cases is. The state does not provide funding for facilities and does not have policies in place to support the development of autonomous or innovative schools.</p>		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:            The State has increased the compulsory age for education from 16 to 18. Also in place are credit recovery programs and extended learning opportunities for students. It is not clear whether LEAs are required to support these initiatives and the conditions upon which participation might be mandatory, however, and specific laws, statutes or policies were not cited.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>21</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>
Competitive Reviewer Comments:		

STEM courses are offered through a virtual learning academy and concurrent enrollment programs are provided for STEM courses. The State also seems to have a strong working relationship with the various two-year and four-year IHE's in the state. It is not clear how students are encouraged/required to increase STEM proficiencies/coursework, or how teachers are identified and/or mandated to increase their proficiencies in STEM content, however. While structures to support extending STEM offerings are in place or being planned for expansion, plans for systemic improvement of STEM education and focused attention on increasing student participation in advanced STEM offerings are not in evidence.

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

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>No</b>

**Absolute Reviewer Comments:**

While the State has some reform elements primed, there are not sufficient reforms or infrastructure in place to ensure a comprehensive, systemic approach to statewide reform. Especially crucial are the need for clearer mechanisms for determining student achievement growth and teacher and principal effectiveness. Other reform approaches, including assessing teacher preparation programs, developing and supporting alternative approaches to teacher/principal certification, and supporting and targeting charter and other innovative schools hinge on having a comprehensive and clearly articulated data information system that is transparent and available for use by multiple constituencies. In addition, there does not seem to be statewide commitment or buy-in to the State's proposal. In order for reforms to be far reaching, especially in the context of strong local governance of public schools, there needs to be evidence of commitment from a larger proportion of the LEAs. The State plan and existing context has not demonstrated existing capacity or commitment to developing data systems that improve instruction, preparation and evaluation of effective teachers and leaders, and turning around the lowest-achieving schools.

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

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>210</b>
--------------------	------------	------------