



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Michigan Application #3150MI-7



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	62
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	45
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	12

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) Michigan articulated a comprehensive, coherent reform agenda that is research-based and demonstrates alignment across the four RTT reform areas. The State is looking not only to the RTT reforms to improve student achievement, but to lift Michigan out of the severe economic challenges it is facing with the demise of its manufacturing base. As the application notes, "[f]or Michigan, the stakes are incredibly high for all involved—we must succeed or our state will spiral into irrecoverable poverty and unemployment." Along with this urgency was a sense that the State is making an authentic commitment, not only to reform, but to a sweeping cultural change in how Michigan's children are educated. The State intends to use RTT funds to build the infrastructure and capacity it needs to move forward into this new era of education. Michigan detailed its theory of action that will build collective capacity to transform schools "from 20th Century artifacts into 21st Century assets that will serve as the foundation for the New Michigan".

(ii) The State is commended for the level of commitment it received from LEAs in carrying out these reforms. Eighty-seven percent of the State's LEAs agreed to participate in the RTT effort. The State received universal support from LEA superintendents and local school boards as well as letters of support from 83% of local teacher union leaders (where applicable). Since Phase 1 of RTT, Michigan made significant progress in securing educator buy-in for the initiative; according to the application, in Phase 1 only 8% of local union leaders signed on to support the RTT application.

The State provided a Memo of Understanding (MOU) with a detailed statement of work and clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the State and for the participating LEAs. The State received a commitment from all participating LEAs to implement all of the elements of the reform plan. With this level of commitment, Michigan seems well-positioned to move forward quickly in implementing the the RTT reforms that will reach a clear majority of students.

(iii) While securing universal participation of school districts might be a worthy long-term goal, points were not withheld for the 13% of the district that chose not to participate. The nearly 87 percent of LEAs that have agreed to participant in the RTT effort will reach 89% of all students and 92% of those who live in poverty. This high degree of participation and genuine commitment from LEAs across Michigan will translate into broad statewide impact.

Michigan has set goals for increasing student achievement, reducing achievement gaps and increasing. However, some of the longer term goals may not be ambitious enough to meet the spirit of the aggressive RTT reforms. For example, the State sets its ten year goals for reducing the achievement gap by 75% and increasing the percentage of students completing a postsecondary or career training

programs to 50%. The score reflects this concern.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	28
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	18
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) Michigan's application clearly demonstrates that there is strong leadership from the Governor and State Superintendent to support the RTT initiative. Furthermore, the State legislature passed a reform package to clear the way for several RTT reforms. While the application notes that Michigan is a local control State, it describes activities that are appropriate for the State to assume to build "collective capacity" systemwide. Michigan detailed these supports in each of the reform areas which will accelerate its current reform model-Responsive Instructional Support System (RESPONSE). Through this system, the State will develop the Teaching and Learning Framework to provide LEAs with access to best practices and resources in teaching and learning. The State will lead the efforts to build the IT systems necessary to support the RTT reforms, and oversee the development and roll-out of the new standards and assessments. While the State is focusing on supporting LEAs, the Accelerate Michigan Office will monitor and intervene in districts that are not making progress.

The application also includes evidence that it has a viable management plan in place to carryout the activities of the RTT grant. The RTT grant will be housed in the Accelerate Michigan Office (AMO) within the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) which will oversee State and LEA progress in each of the four reform areas. The Office will facilitate the development of and communicate all reform policy decisions to stakeholders across the State. The application indicates that the Deputy Superintendent's Office will manage the grant. It is not clear how the AMO and Deputy Superintendent's offices will coordinate the policy and grant management aspects of the grant. While the application names two leaders of the RTT team, it would have been beneficial to have the resumes attached for key senior staff to ensure that they held the qualification necessary to manage a grant and program of this magnitude. The score reflects this concern.

It is clear that Michigan would use its RTT grant to make targeted investments in building its infrastructure to support long-term reforms which should be sustainable after the grant ends. Of the \$199 million requested for the State Innovation Fund about 12 percent will be used for salaries and fringe benefits for SEA employees which should be sustainable. An analysis of the budget demonstrates the State's commitment to capacity building including:

- \$32 million to develop and administer new assessments not covered by the common core;
- \$27 million to fully implement a Statewide Longitudinal Data System, including funds to develop a data portal for educators;
- \$17 million to develop an educator evaluation system,
- \$9.6 million to improve the effectiveness of educator preparation programs; and
- \$24 million to provide effective support to teachers and leaders.

(ii) Michigan's application demonstrates that the State has obtained broad stakeholder support for this effort. Letters of support were submitted from such stakeholders as teachers, administrators, parents, higher education, and the business community. While some of the human capital provisions of RTT may need to be collectively bargained, both the Michigan affiliates of the National Education Association (NEA) and American Federation of Teachers (AFT) collaborated in preparing the application provided letters of support. This suggests that the human capital reforms will be bargained in good faith. The State has an infrastructure in place through the Education Alliance of Michigan made up of executive directors of teacher unions, administrators, parents, postsecondary officials, and the business community across the State to reach stakeholder consensus on critical reform issues.

Technical Review

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	24
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	19
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) Michigan has undertaken several reform efforts that are aligned to the RTT initiative. While the State has been hard-hit economically, it has continued to use Federal, State, and local funds to drive comprehensive reforms. The State has established high-quality standards and assessment and revised them within the last 6 years. It has invested in a State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and is piloting a data portal for educators that would be expanded with RTT funds. In the area of Great Teachers and Leaders, the State is transforming its teacher preparation programs from seat time to school-based clinical experiences and is piloting the use of Individual Professional Development (PD) Plans that will allow educators to strategically plan their own PD based on student needs. Michigan's Statewide System of Support has provided intensive interventions to Title I schools that did not make AYP for 3 consecutive years. These supports have helped nearly 300 schools meet their AYP goals. Clearly, Michigan has laid a strong foundation on which to build the RTT reforms.</p> <p>(ii) The State presented evidence that students overall have been making achievement gains in most subjects and grades on State assessments. However, gains have been greater in math than in reading and gaps remain across subgroups. Students perform better on State assessments than on NAEP. The State provided a rationale for this disconnect including the lack of alignment between State standards and NAEP. The State did not provide a detailed explanation as to why there have been some gains in student achievement overall and why gaps remain across subgroups.</p> <p>It is difficult to assess the progress the State is making on increasing the graduation rate since it changed the method for calculating this measure in 2007. Since 2007 the rate has hovered around 75% causing the State Superintendent to launch the Superintendent's Dropout Challenge that provides intensive supports to 10-15 students in each building who are at risk of dropping out. This goal is to reach 40,000 to 60,000 students to keep them from dropping out of school.</p>		
Total	125	114

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Michigan provided evidence to show it is participating in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Consortium which will be internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness. According to a National Governors Association press release provided in the appendix, 51 states--including Michigan--are participating in the consortium. The application provided a process and a timeline that ensures Michigan will adopt the standards by August 2, 2010. The legal process of adopting the standards requires State Board of Education approval; the MDE will submit the Common Core Standards to the Board for consideration on June 15, 2010.</p>		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10

Technical Review

(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
Michigan provided evidence that it is participating as a Governing State in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium which is dedicated to developing high-quality assessments. According to information contained in the appendix, 32 states were participating in the consortia as of April 29, 2010; this constitutes a significant number of States.		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	18
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
Michigan provide a well-developed plan to roll-out the new standards and assessments to districts, schools, and classroom teachers through its RESPONSE system. The plan provides a clear alignment between standards, assessment, curriculum, and instruction. Michigan's Merit curriculum also aligns K-12 standards to postsecondary learning standards. For assessments not available through the SMARTER Balanced Consortium, the State will issue RFPs to intermediate districts and higher education institutions to develop assessments. While the State provided a clear understanding of the steps required in transitioning to enhanced standards and assessments, and notes that most assessments will be validate for use in 2014-15, a detailed schedule for accomplishing the milestones could not be located. The score reflect this concern.		
The plan provides for significant investments in professional development through the Teaching for Learning website to assist educators in understanding the standards and how to incorporate them into their practice. The online PD will include instructional surveys to assist teachers in identifying areas where they need support. The State makes a clear linkage on how the new balanced assessment will feed into the Framework for Educator Evaluations (see section D). While the State will not provide direct training to schools, it is launching a significant technical assistance effort to support LEAs as they develop supports for teachers around the new standards and assessments.		
Total	70	68

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
Michigan provided evidence that it has completed 10 of the 12 America COMPETES Act elements. However, in reviewing the status of each element, it appears that several will not be fully in place until December, 2010. Points were not awarded for partially complete elements. Points were awarded for elements 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9,10 and 11.		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
Michigan has made considerable progress in making data available to stakeholders such as educators, MDE staff, researchers, students, parents, and the public. The application describes the Data for Success portal that currently is being piloted through a consortium of intermediate school districts. Leveraging Institute for Education Sciences (IES) and RTT funds, the State plans to expand this system as Michigan's education portal as a "one-stop shop" for Michigan education data. The portal will serve many purposes		

from providing teachers with user-friendly assessment data so they can make data-driven instructional decisions, to giving MDE the data it needs to monitor the progress LEAs are making across the RTT domains. Data from the SLDS and other systems will populate the portal giving stakeholders access to robust data sets. The plan also discusses the Regional Data Initiative that will house summative assessment data. It is unclear how this effort will interface with the Data for Success portal. The plan does not go far enough to describe the process and procedures needed to join the various system and what entity will oversee the coordination of system. The score reflects this concern.

While the plan presents an aggressive, but obtainable, schedule to begin the portal development by October 2010 and to develop the analysis tools and reports by June 2011, it is not clear when the portal will be available to educators and other stakeholders. The score reflects this concern.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	10
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	3
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	3
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) Again, the plan identifies two data systems aimed at improving instruction--the Data for Success Initiative and Regional Data Initiative--but does not clearly describe the relationship between these two initiatives. It is difficult to assess the State's goals for increasing access to these systems. The application provides general statistics for the users of the Regional Data Initiative that indicate that 98 percent of districts and 45 percent of charter schools have signed up to gain access to classroom-level instructional improvement systems, and that 55 percent of LEAs loading data into their regional data warehouse. The application further notes that 33,314 user account have been created, but does not discuss how many would need to be created for universal participation. Data are not presented to provide any indication of what data are being accessed by educators and how they are being used in the classroom. The application does not discuss access or usage targets for the Data for Success system.

(ii) Michigan's plan lacks clarity on how it will provide professional development supports to districts on the use of instructional improvement systems. Again, its not clear how the PD modules developed under the Regional Data Initiative will be incorporated into the Data for Success portal. It is also not clear how the PD offered will be reviewed to verify that the trainings are of high quality. The State plans to evaluate the effect of these PD opportunities through teacher surveys. While surveys can be helpful to improve trainings, they do not measure the effects of PD on student outcomes.

(iii) While the State is moving forward to facilitate a regional research agenda through the Research Collaborative, it is not clear if the State is controlling the research agenda or if researchers can propose their own areas of study. It also is not clear if researchers independent of the State and Research Collaborative can conduct research using the State's datafiles. Making data available to independent researchers would be critical in stimulating non-biased research on Michigan's educational system and practices. The application does not discuss how it will ensure the confidentiality of individual-level student or teacher files.

Total	47	32
--------------	-----------	-----------

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1

(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	3
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	2
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	1
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	0

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) The applicant suggests that Michigan has had alternative routes in place since 1994, but provides no statutory evidence that the State had the authority to create these routes until 2009. There is not enough of a description of the Detroit efforts to verify that these were alternative routes or recruiting mechanisms designed to attract teachers to work in hard-to-staff schools. The Wayne State University effort was referred to as an "alternative approach" which may not be the same as an "alternative route".

The statute could not be located to verify that the approved routes meet the RTT criteria for alternative routes. Specifically:

- Evidence could not be located to ensure that routes can be offered outside of IHEs. While the narrative states that the Innovation in Teacher and Administrator Preparation Consortium "will invite programs both inside and outside of universities to be approved", it's not clear if the State currently has the authority to establish non-IHE-based programs;
- The narrative states that approved programs "must be selective in their acceptance practices", but does not provide sufficient documentation on the selection standards; and
- While candidates are required to teach while pursuing the route, there is no evidence that they are supported through supervised experiences such as mentoring.

Points were not awarded for elements of the above criteria. Points were awarded for the routes limiting coursework through testing out options and because candidates are awarded the same level of certification that traditional route completers receive.

It is not clear if alternative routes are available to principals. Michigan is somewhat unique in that, for most of the last decade, principals were not required to hold a certificate. In 2006, principals could hold voluntary certificates. The State began requiring certificates for new administrators in 2009; however, it appears that administrators receive their preparation for certification through traditional routes.

(ii) The State has not been using alternative routes to prepare teachers or principal. The score reflects the State's commitment to use them in the future.

(iii) The State did not adequately address this criterion. Without the legislation or detailed descriptions of the alternative routes for teachers, it is difficult to determine if Michigan is using these routes for shortage areas. The narrative describes Michigan as "an exporter" state suggesting that it is producing more teachers than it needs. However, even exporter states can face shortages within certain subject areas such as math and science, or within some localities such as inner cities or rural communities. The application does not address the shortage areas the State is attempting to fill through alternative routes. There is no discussion about using alternative routes to fill principal shortages.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	40
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	18

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) It is clear from the narrative that the State is committed to developing and using a growth model that will be factored into educator evaluations, but the discussion on the specifics of developing the model is lacking clarity. The application describes a process of using a range of assessments in the growth model including the Common Core Assessment in English language arts and mathematics, the New High School College Preparation Battery in grades 9-11, and locally-developed assessments for grades not tested through state assessments. The narrative indicates that LEAs will calculate the growth models for locally-developed assessments. It is not clear if the LEAs have the knowledge or capacity to calculate growth, or what supports the State will give in this area. While the State indicates when the various assessment will be in place, it does not provide a detailed schedule or action plan for developing the growth model.

(ii) The application provided evidence that the new Framework for Educator Effectiveness was developed through a highly collaborative process that included teachers and principals. One of the strengths of the Framework is its link to the Individual Professional Development Plan. In theory, each educator will design a professional development program based on the results of the evaluation. Several of the Framework's provisions may be subject to collective bargaining rules; securing a high-level of educator buy-in at this phase of the process should increase the chances that these provisions are negotiated in good faith. The Framework incorporates multiple measures of effectiveness as well as multiple ratings. While the Framework provides guidance to LEAs on what elements should be included in educator evaluations, it is not clear if the State will have oversight in ensuring that LEAs are adhering to and developing high-quality evaluations in accordance with the principles of the Framework. The State plans to hire an outside consultant to review a sample of evaluations, but does not address what the consequences would be for LEAs who are not implementing the Framework with rigor. The State also notes that it "expects that any participating district will use the Framework as the basis for developing a rigorous, locally bargained process for conducting educator evaluation", but does not provide firm projections of the number of educators who will be evaluated through this process.

(iii) Michigan provided evidence that the State recently enacted a law requiring annual evaluations for all teachers and administrators. However, it was not clear how and when educators will receive feedback on their evaluations. The discussion is rather disjointed on what data will be available and when. When looking at the student growth component of the evaluation, it is not clear what data are available at the teacher-level as opposed to the school-level. The narrative mentions using the new portal to provide assessment results to teachers, but does not provide any indication how teachers will access the other non-testing components of the evaluation.

(iv) The application does not provide sufficient detail to fully evaluate the State's commitment to using evaluations to make key personnel decisions. The State indicates that the legislature recently passed laws to require evaluations for promotion, retention, removal and tenure decisions, but also notes that these decisions may be subject to collective bargaining. It is clear from the previous section that the Framework is closely linked to the Individual Professional Development Plan. Michigan leaves the door open for LEAs to develop compensation systems that are based on educator performance, but does not provide a well-thought out plan to move in this direction. The State did not provide the performance measures requested for (D)(2). Without these targets, it is not possible to gauge the challenges the State is facing in implementing the provisions related to using evaluations to inform personnel decisions. The score reflects that concern that it cannot be determined at this time whether LEAs will be successful in negotiating these provisions in the spirit of the RTT reforms.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	6
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	4
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	2

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i and ii) Michigan provided an analysis of the equitable distribution of educators using its NCLB Equitable

Technical Review

Distribution Plan. The applicant reported that few inequities exist across the State based on the highly qualified teacher (HQT) or experience variables. The narrative notes that Michigan uses the Registry of Educational Personnel to monitor, evaluate, and identify shortage areas. The narrative falls short in providing any useful information on the shortage areas the State may be facing in high-minority or high-poverty schools well as in hard-to-staff subject areas. No data were presented beyond the Equity Plan. Furthermore, the data in the Equity Plan appear to be dated; while the cover indicates it was revised in 2009, many of the tables still refer to 2006. While the State is working on an measure of effectiveness, there was no discussion on how the State intends to move the policy discussion from highly qualified to highly effective, or what interim measures of effectiveness it could consider until the evaluation system is in place.

The State did not provide information on the level or reporting or unit of analysis in the Registry of Educational Personnel. It is not clear if the State can examine shortage areas only at the district-level where inequities tend to wash out, or within districts where inequities are more pronounced. The State provides a list of strategies aimed at reducing shortages, but they are not data driven. For example, a large part of the narrative discusses improving school climate to retain new teachers, yet applicant noted that less than .025% of all teachers in the State are first-year teachers. This suggests that the State currently is not facing a major issue is assigning inexperienced teachers to hard-to-staff schools.

The State did not provide the requested performance measures for (D)(3)(i) or (D)(3)(ii).

Points were awarded because the State is committed to moving forward with developing educator effectiveness measures and further researching the causes and degree of educator shortages.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	4
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	3
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	1

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) While the State is moving forward in developing a student growth model, its plan for linking student growth to teacher preparation programs is less clear. The narrative indicates that ultimately the State will be able to link teachers' effectiveness based on student growth back to program in which they were prepared. However, the applicant does not provide a quality plan or a timeline for achieving this goal. The State notes that it currently reports a wealth of data on the quality of its teacher preparation programs to the public, but none include a measure of student growth. It is not clear how the public will access the information on the quality of educator preparation programs. It appears that the information may be released through its Title II of the Higher Education Act. It is not clear if this is a data source that is familiar to stakeholder groups and the public.

(ii) The State plans to conduct research and convene a task force on assessing the quality of its teacher preparation programs. However, the narrative does not include how the State might expand effective programs.

The State did not provide the requested performance measures for (D)(4).

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	12
(i) Providing effective support	10	8
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	4

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(i) Michigan has made significant investments in professional development supports for principals and

teachers. However, as the application acknowledges, PD has not been planned or delivered in a cohesive manner. An RTT grant will allow the State to develop the infrastructure needed to support PD leaders across the State to carry out their functions. The new State role has the potential of helping PD providers better identify effective supports which will be critical given the linkage of the Individual Professional Development Plan to the Framework for Educator Evaluations. As discussed in Section C, PD resources will be evaluated by the State and made available to educators through the new web portal. While the MDE is restructuring its offices to coordinate and consolidate PD programs, its not clear how PD support will flow from the SEA to LEAs. It appears that various entities will continue to be involved in providing PD which may hinder the ability of the State to provide cohesive supports to PD leaders. The State does not provide an implementation schedule or give any estimates on how many teachers and principals may benefit from this support.

(ii) In order to determine whether professional development efforts are successful, the State plans to issue annual grants to evaluate PD programs. However, its not clear how the State intends to measure the effects of PD an educator receives on student achievement; more information is needed to determine if researchers will be able to conduct impact studies. The State did not provide a plan or a timeline for evaluating professional development supports.

Total	138	65
-------	-----	----

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 provided the legal citation showing that the SEA has the authority to intervene in the lowest-achieving schools (the Revised School Code Act 451 of 1976). Evidence that the State can intervene in districts that are in improvement or corrective action could not be located.		
(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)		
(i) Michigan has developed a process for identifying its persistently lowest-achieving schools. The application notes that the State is awaiting approval from the U.S. Department of Education before it will rank the schools to complete the final identification of the persistently lowest-achieving schools. The State estimates that approximately 30 -70 schools will require turnaround interventions throughout the grant period.		
(ii) The State has submitted a detailed plan and timeline to address turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools. Michigan will leverage School Improvement Grant (SIG) and RTT funds to support the lowest performing schools. The application demonstrates strong oversight of the turnaround process with the appointment of a State School Reform/Redesign officer who will have supervisory authority over the lowest achieving schools. Districts with the persistently lowest-achieving schools well be required to submit a turnaround grant application. If a district does not submit an application it may be taken over by the State. Through an RFP process, the State will develop a list of external providers to provide intensive supports to LEAs. The State has developed a monitoring system to ensure that progress is being made in each of the turn around schools.		

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
(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)		
(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.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	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
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(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.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
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.		
Total	55	41

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
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
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<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
Grand Total	500	380



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Michigan Application #3150MI-8



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in It	65	50
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	35
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Michigan has articulated a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that represents a strong collaboration by the state's teacher unions, administrators, school board administrators, and state that lays out the principles for success for students. The State includes a plan for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA. The agenda stresses an imperative to increase the high school graduation rate, participation in developing and implementing common standards, close the achievement gap, and increase student achievement in math and reading. The agenda also provides for a ten year plan for the achievement of these goals.</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates a very strong commitment from 737 of the state's LEAs, with 100% of the participating LEAs signing MOUs with signatures from every superintendent, and president of the local school boards. Michigan received signatures from 83% of participating LEA local teacher unions. The letter of support provided by the Teachers Association indicates a strong commitment to work with the state to affect student achievement. While the letter does indicate slight level of reservation by the teachers' union, and a notice for LEA unions to be cautious before signing the MOU, the letter indicates a commitment to working with the state to resolve unsettled issues. The scope of work provided includes descriptions that are often vague in scope and depth. Additional detail is necessary in the scope of work to fully understand how the goals will be achieved. Further, the scope of work does not indicate that evaluations will be used to inform tenure or full certification. As a result response was scored in the medium range.</p> <p>The application indicates that a large number of LEAs in the state- 86%- will participate to ensure that the agenda will have statewide impact in overall and subgroup student achievement. Since further information is not provided regarding what that framework is - it is difficult to determine if this framework will allow for full statewide impact. Further, the scope of work indicates that the existing growth model for reading and math in grades 3-8 will be utilized. Since the application has provided that the state is currently dissatisfied with the rate and level of student achievement in these areas under the current growth model, it is unclear why the this same growth model will continue to be endorsed and used. This goal to increase the student achievement gap by 75% in 10 years is not ambitious. As a result, the response was scored in the medium range.</p>		
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	27
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	17
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The application appropriately details the state's collective capacity by presenting that the state has strong support by the legislature to continue to protect educational funding through difficult economic times. Further the state benefits from Education Alliance of Michigan, an independent, non profit organization that is comprised of statewide teacher unions, parents, administrator, postsecondary and school business associations in an effort to engage dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans. This group attempts to reach consensus between groups on important education issues - however, it is unclear this method will provide sufficient leadership to ensure statewide capacity. Further, the state has engaged regional education service agencies that will provide instructional and professional development to local districts and identify good practices in an effort to increase local capacity. The state has indicated that it intends to continue reforms funded under RTTT after the period of funding has ended. This was scored in the high range.

The application explains that LEAs will have access to the Responsive Instructional Support System that will house best practices that have been vetted by teachers and other professionals; however, it is not clear that LEAs will be responsible for actually using them. The application demonstrates that there will be a required commitment for streamlining operations and coordinating reform efforts. Further, transparent reporting will be essential. The application explains that 14 demonstration sites will be selected to participate in their Project Re-imagine which will include streamlining of operations, it is unclear if only demonstration districts will be responsible for such high level reporting – or if this is a requirement of all LEAs participating in the program. The application indicates a strong level of state financial support and coordination of funds in order to have effective implementation. The application indicates that the state is aware that RTTT funds are used solely as start up funds for a longer term project. The response was scored in the high range.

The application provides evidence of strong stakeholder support, including letters from the teachers, administrators, and parent association groups. Further the application indicates strong support from many philanthropic and education leaders from the state legislature. As a result the response was awarded maximum points.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	25
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	20

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Michigan has demonstrated progress in each of the four reform areas. In particular, the clinical model of teacher preparation programs demonstrates progress in transformation. Michigan's Statewide System of Support has provided intensive interventions to Title I schools that did not make AYP for 3 consecutive years. This level of support has assisted over 300 schools achieve AYP goals. As a result, the response was awarded maximum credit.

Michigan has demonstrated progress in the implementation of a standards and assessment system. The standards have been revised in 2004 and 2006. Further, the state provides students with free access to the ACT college entrance exam. The state has demonstrated that math assessments scores have increased annually as a result of the rigorous standards. The application includes state wide data by subgroup for math and language arts assessments. The data provided shows an increase in achievement, with particular gains in math in lower grades. The data provided does not show that there has been an increase in cohort graduation rates. Rather, graduation rates have remained static at 75% from 2007-2009. As a result, the response was scored in the high range.

Total	125	102
--------------	------------	------------

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Michigan is part of the consortium that is part of the 51-states and territories Common Core State Standards Initiative - a significant number of states are included in the consortium. Michigan will present the common core standards to the State Board of Education for consideration in June, 2010. The core standards will also be aligned to state and local standards. As a result, the response was awarded the maximum credit.</p> <p>Michigan has identified that they have presented the standards to the State Board of Education for consideration on June 15, 2010 and have presented evidence of the adoption of the standards by June 30, 2010. As a result, the response was awarded the maximum credit.</p>		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Michigan has demonstrated good progress and a commitment to developing and implementing common, high quality assessments, in consortia with a significant number of states particular as a member of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium- which includes 29 states. The application demonstrates Michigan's commitment to adopting a common assessment in collaboration with other states when it is available in 2015. Further, for those content areas, grades, and or specialty areas not addressed by the Common Core Standards, Michigan will undertake a 3 pronged approach to develop summative, formative, and interim benchmark assessments. As a result, the response was awarded maximum credit.</p>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	18
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Michigan has provided a thoughtful and ambitious plan to support the transition to enhanced standards and high quality assessments. Michigan's plan is to adopt new standards by June 2010 and to train educators through the Teaching for Learning website by summer 2010 - however, the application does not indicate whether the website will be established by summer of 2010- or if educators will be trained to use it by summer 2010. Model Instructional units will be developed and made available on the website. Instructional surveys will be available for educators to use to evaluate their own levels of proficiency in the content areas. The state does indicate that surveys that will measure individualized educator growth will be available through this website by Dec. 2010. Michigan has presented a balanced system of assessments that includes national, state and locally developed assessment to create a system that uses multiple assessments to measure student growth. The state does provide for a high level of of collaboration with its participating LEAs, however, no timeline was included in the application for the additional assessments that the state will implement in the areas of student growth. As a result, the response was awarded credit in the high range.</p>		
Total	70	68

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully Implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Michigan has had a fully functioning data system that identifies students, teachers and courses. Michigan has also made strides toward collecting data that provides other various information necessary to address alignment preparation for success for postsecondary education. The applicant will use RTTT funding to align data and information from multiple units in the state in order to develop a complete and picture of postsecondary outcomes. As a result, the response was given credit for having a statewide longitudinal data system that includes 9 of the America COMPETES elements (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11).</p>		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	5
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The application presents a high quality plan to ensure that data from Michigan's longitudinal data system will be made available to key stakeholders and to truly encourage engagement between stakeholders to increase student achievement. Michigan will make data available to school teachers, administrators, researches, parents, students and interested public. The timeline provide indicates that these data will be made available by June 2011. The applicant will develop an education data portal that will make this statewide longitudinal data available for multiple uses. Schools and districts will be able to link locally determined summative, formative and interim benchmark assessment data to state maintained summative assessment data. The applicant maintains that this system will put the data results into context using additional local student demographics, student and teacher attendance data, transcript data, grades, teacher effectiveness measures and other school data to be used for decision making and local improvement data. The application presents a plan that will support policy maker efforts to continuous student improvement. The state will provide summative assessment information to the Regional Data Initiatives. Michigan has had a fully functioning data system that identifies students, teachers and courses. As a result, the response was given maximum credit.</p>		
(C)(3) Using data to improve Instruction	18	12
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	2
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The applicant has developed a strong Instructional improvement system that includes 4 key priorities that will support individualizing and personalizing instruction using data – including providing a data platform for the sharing of common assessments across districts using a common data warehousing tool. This level of data will provide educators in the state with sufficient information to improve instructional practices and overall school effectiveness. Additionally the applicant will form regional research collaboratives with institutions of higher education. As a result, the response was given maximum credit.</p> <p>Professional development regarding the use of data to improve instruction will be delivered through the Regional Data Initiatives beginning in Summer 2010. While the applicant has stressed the importance of measuring the impact of professional development in terms of changes in Instructional practice at the classroom level, the application does not detail how this process will be done across the state in a meaningful way. However, the applicant does indicate that two additional days of statewide professional</p>		

development will be implemented that is focused on the use of data to inform instruction. It is unclear if these two days will provide the full breadth of impact that is required to assist educators in using instructional improvement systems. As a result, the response was scored in the low medium range.

The applicant detailed that it intends to share data for research purposes through the statewide research collaborative. This high level commitment to making data available to researchers will allow researchers access to information in an effort to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional strategies and initiatives. Additionally, the Regional Data Initiative Consortia will conduct action research using the formative and summative data shared across the initiatives. High-quality topics that have been selected for research for 2009-2010 include: the impact of early childhood intervention on school readiness, teacher perception of the value of data for instructional practice, and data elements needed to provide a complete picture of postsecondary readiness. The state level research collaborative will be used to address the state research agenda. However, it is unclear whether or not researchers outside of the consortium will be permitted to have access to research and data. As a result, the response was scored in the high range.

Total	47	35
-------	----	----

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	6
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	2
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	3
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	1

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The Michigan legislature has recently enacted a bill that charges the State Superintendent to develop a process to grant an interim teaching certificate that authorizes individuals to teach in public school while completing an alternate route program. The alternate route programs must be selective in their acceptance practices, accept candidates with a bachelor's degree, and demonstrate a proven record of producing successful teachers. However, the application does not provide sufficient detail to explain the level of specificity that entails the state's selectivity in accepting applicants. There is no evidence of support through supervised services. The application does not provide detail sufficient to indicate that there is ongoing support through mentoring or coaching for participants. This was scored in the low range.

The legislature had previously enacted a law that allows anyone who meets the local district's requirements to become a school leader participation in an administrator preparation program – however, as recently as 2009 has reversed its decision and makes the administrator certificate mandatory for any Michigan educational leader with primary responsibility for administering instructional programs. As a result, the response was scored in the medium range.

The application identifies the state's proposed three tiered alternative routes to administrator credentialing system. One of the tiers allows for a credentialing process that is independent of a higher education endorsement. However, the application is unclear in whether or it is providing alternative routes to prepare principals. As a result, the response was scored in the low range.

The application does not adequately identify a process for monitoring, evaluating or identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage. The application does not sufficiently address the shortage areas that the state is attempting to address through alternative means. Additionally, the state participates with the Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows program to address the shortage of math and science teachers. No data regarding teacher effectiveness principal quality is included in an effort to provide quality regarding

areas of shortage. As a result the response was scored in the low range.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	47
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	10
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	20

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The application clearly outlines a systemic and high quality planned system for measuring student growth, and how it will be a critical factor to provide data of student growth over time to educators. The application contains clear approaches and details regarding the process, steps involved in the evaluation process. As a result, the response received maximum points.

The application provides a detailed and rigorous plan on how data will be used to create a framework for educator evaluations. The application details a collaborative framework that was developed by state officials and teacher/administrators associations. The framework includes a comprehensive approach to educator evaluations including teachers, principals, and superintendents. These evaluations will differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories regarding student growth. However, due to the collective bargaining restraints described in the application it is unclear how LEAs will use the framework in individual districts. As a result, the response was scored in the high range.

The Michigan legislature has passed a law requiring annual evaluations for all teachers and school administrators with timely and constructive feedback required. Additionally the application provides that the system-wide framework by which data is provided through assessments that will be translated into identified areas of student need which will be used to support educator practice. Additionally, the Michigan Department of Education will conduct an annual audit of evaluations to determine which schools/districts have not completed their annual evaluations in a timely fashion. This level of involvement indicates a high level of commitment on the part of the state to use feedback and evaluations to provide educators with data on student growth. As a result, the response was scored in the high range.

The Michigan legislature has passed new laws that explicitly require the use of evaluations based on student achievement/growth to inform decisions regarding: the effectiveness of educators, promotion, retention and the development of educators, whether to grant tenure, and removing ineffective tenured and untenured educators. This legislation indicates a high level of commitment from the state to ensure that districts are moving toward the use of student growth to inform key policy decisions regarding schools and educators. While, the implementation of these legislated efforts must be collectively bargained, the requirements of the laws must be met for all districts irrespective of their participation with RTTT. However, the application did not specify the level to which student growth will be used as an evaluation measure for educators and decision making for LEAs. Further, no annual targets are provided - and therefore it is unclear to determine the challenges the state will face to use evaluations to inform personnel decisions. As a result, the response was scored in the middle range.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	12
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	2

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The applicant has presented a thorough plan to achieve equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals. Quality data systems will be used to identify specific areas of specific educator need. Analysis of

longitudinal data will be used to illuminate potential sub challenges within the larger areas of need. Further, the Department of Education will determine the number of principal vacancies and where they are located by using the Registry of Personnel Data. Michigan presents a plan to recruit teachers and principals from various fields including displaced professionals from other fields. School districts are asked to report how they are implementing various policies regarding the working conditions of teaching and leading. However, the data in the Equity Plan do not appear to be current. Generally, the application provides a high quality plan with very little data to support the plan proposed. As a result, the response was scored in the medium range.

The applicant does not provide much information on how they intend to recruit teachers of hard to staff subjects. The applicant indicates that they will collaborate with the Department of Energy to recruit laid off engineers and consider exploring the New Jersey Traders to Teaching model – however, a comprehensive plan is not present in the application. As a result, the response was scored in the high low range.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	6
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	4
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	2

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The application describes a plan to collaborate with the Department of Education and the Teacher and Administrator Preparation Consortium to design research that collects data on the viability across alternate and traditional programs. The plan includes provisions to link student achievement data to the students' teachers and principals – and to publicly report this data. However, although the state is moving forward with arrangements to develop a student growth model agenda, its plan for full implementation as presented is not clear. No timeline is included for the plan implementation. There is not sufficient data to support the goals identified in the plan. As a result, the response was scored in the medium range.

Although the applicant does indicate that the state intends to convene a group of representatives of various teacher preparation institutions – a viable plan to identify and expand successful teacher preparation programs is not presented. Very little data is presented to show how or why specific programs will be expanded. It is unclear how the information presented will produce more effective teachers and principals. As a result, the response was scored in the low range.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	14
(i) Providing effective support	10	10
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	4

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Michigan proposes a plan to incorporate state level professional development to develop teachers. The plan includes a plan to incentives for schools to create and support the implementation of high quality professional development programs that are focused on the key needs of teachers and leaders. The plan presents a coherent plan for professional development to address four strategic priorities. The Department of Education has designed a pilot program to increase teacher leadership to increase internal instructional capacity at the local level. As a result, the response was awarded maximum credit.

The application does not provide a thorough explanation of how the state will measure, evaluate and continuously improve their supports to enhance student achievement. The research grants describe a mechanism to provide feedback for Professional Development- however, the plan lacks an accountability measure or a timeline to describe implementation. The application does indicate that the state supports the notion that measurement should be done to support districts in continuous improvement for professional

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.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	28
(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.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
-----------------------------------------------------------------	----------	----------

(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
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
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
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
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
Grand Total	500	393



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Michigan Application #3150MI-10



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	48
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	35
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(A)(1)(i)

The applicant sets forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Its plan, called Accelerate Michigan, is based on the idea that refocusing its current capacity (funds, personnel, and expertise) on significantly raising achievement for all students and sharply reducing achievement gaps will result in improved student engagement, improved school and district cultures, improved parental involvement and support, improved high school graduation and post-secondary success rates, and improved system capacity to sustain improvements. This subsection establishes a clear and credible part to achieving those goals and is consistent with the more specific reforms proposed throughout the application. It also highlights the specific legislation adopted in response to the opportunity to apply for Race to the Top (RTTT) funding. Specific ambitious yet achievable goals under Accelerate Michigan are as follows: increase student achievement in mathematics and reading on Michigan assessments by 20 percent in four years and 50 percent in 10 years, based on current proficiency standards; reduce the achievement gaps in both subject areas by 25 percent in four years and by 75 percent in 10 years based on current proficiency standards; increase student achievement and decrease achievement gaps as measured first on state assessments and then on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP); increase the high school graduation rate to 80 percent in four years and reach and maintain a 90 percent graduation rate by 2010; and increase the number of students successfully completing at least one year of post-secondary education or technical training by 10 percent in four years and maintain a 50 percent successful completion rate by 2020. Full points are awarded.

(A)(1)(ii)

The terms and conditions of the applicant's Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with its participating districts is largely based on the Department of Education's Model MOU and reflects strong commitment by the participating local education agencies (LEAs) to the state's plans. Three new paragraphs not in the Model MOU are included, however, at least two of which may leave open the door for inconsistent and weakened implementation of key reforms at the LEA level. One paragraph says that nothing in the MOU shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school district employees under federal, state, or local laws (including collective bargaining agreements) and the participating LEAs or intermediate school districts (ISDs) shall not be deemed to be in violation of the MOU

if any of these rights, remedies, and procedures impair its ability to comply with the MOU. A second paragraph states that if any provision of the MOU impacts a mandatory subject of bargaining, the implementation of the provision shall be subject to collective bargaining as required by law if not covered by an existing collective bargaining agreement or other agreement. No requirement that the parties bargain in good faith is included. The third paragraph is unclear in its intent; it states that there are no intended third party beneficiaries to the MOU except for the U.S. Department of Education to the extent indicated in the MOU.

The scope of work descriptions are well developed and specific, and all major reform areas are required to be implemented by the participating LEAs and ISDs (100 percent participation across all elements of state reform plans, to the extent consistent with and, as applicable, bargained with local unions). The parts of the scope of work likely to be most impacted by collective bargaining are reforms under (D)(2) and (D)(3).

Signatures are collected from 100 percent of LEA superintendents or equivalent, 100 percent of presidents of local school boards or equivalent, and 83.4 percent of local teachers union leaders. This demonstrates broad leadership support within participating LEAs, and the success of the collaborative approach taken with the local teachers unions to sign on to required reforms, subject to collective bargaining.

A score in the "high" range is awarded for this subsection.

(A)(1)(iii)

Eight-six percent of the state's LEAs are participating in Accelerate Michigan, including 89.8 percent of the state's schools, 89.3 percent of K-12 students, and 92.9 percent of students in poverty. This will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its ambitious yet achievable goals as stated in (A)(1)(i). These goals, however, are stated for overall students, not by subgroups in all four areas required under this subsection (student achievement, achievement gaps, graduation rates, and college enrollment). Specific targets for NAEP and state assessments scores are not provided. A score in the "medium" range is awarded for this subsection.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	26
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	17
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	9

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(A)(2)(i)

The applicant demonstrates that it has strong leadership at the state level, including the Governor, State Superintendent, the State Board of Education, the various executive directors of the statewide teachers unions, and administrator, parent, postsecondary, and school business officials associations. A strong network exists of 57 ISDs or regional education service agencies that greatly expand the state's capacity to implement its proposed plans. The application is less specific about the dedicated teams within the State Department of Education that will assist the State Superintendent in implementing the reforms, although the Department will house an Accelerate Michigan Office, responsible for monitoring LEA progress on initiatives and several deputy superintendents will be involved in aspects of the RTTT grant implementation. The Accelerate Michigan Office will use the Responsive Instructional Support System (RESPONSE), including a Teaching for Learning Framework, to guide the supports and resources available to districts. The state has a reasonably high-quality plan to provide effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing a RTTT grant in areas such as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, fund disbursement, and performance measure tracking and reporting. The budget is well constructed to allow the state to meet its targets, and the state is clear which other

education funds from federal, state, and local sources it will be using and aligning with the state's RTTT goals. The state emphasizes that it sees RTTT funding as "start up" costs, not operating costs, and that it believes the will exists among state legislators to make hard choices necessary to continue to fund education at the levels needed to carry out Accelerate Michigan during and beyond the grant period. A score in the "high" range is awarded.

(A)(2)(ii)

The state has gathered strong letters of support from a broad group of stakeholders, including the two statewide teachers' unions and other critical stakeholders (representing students, parents, administrators, adult education, school boards, business, charter schools, districts, early childhood, foundations/philanthropy, local and state government leaders, and post secondary). The two teachers' union letters both noted that the state is a "local control" state so the letters support the state's RTTT application but have no influence on the local teachers unions, which are advised to closely examine the application, MOU, and Scope of Work and make their individual choice whether to support the state's application at the district level. The application was put together by an inclusive process that was informed by the professional expertise of the teachers unions and other educational organizations, and this was reflected in the letters. A score in the "high" range is awarded.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	22
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	17

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(A)(3)(i)

The state demonstrates that it has made progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas and has applied its ARRA funding and other state and federal resources to make progress on such reforms. The state has implemented a high-quality system of existing standards and assessments, has made significant progress toward meeting the 12 elements of data systems described by the America Competes Act, has a long history of being a leader in teacher preparation, and has developed a Statewide System of Support for low-achieving schools that has earned national attention. Full points are awarded.

(A)(3)(ii)

The state demonstrates the gains in percent proficient across the state and for specific subgroups between 2005 and 2009 (but not including 2003 and 2004, or year-to-year data from 2005-2009) on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) in math, reading, and science. The trends shown are based on the slope of linear regression of percent proficient on the year of the test, not on simple differences between 2005 and 2009. In math, proficiency rates are improving statewide for all grades and for the five subgroups in all five grades, and gaps in achievement are narrowing for all subgroups in all grades. In reading, proficiency rates are improving statewide for all grades except for grade 4, which is relatively steady. Proficiency rates in reading are generally improving across grades for subgroups, with some exceptions in grade four and for limited English proficient (LEP) students, and achievement gaps are narrowing across grades and subgroups in reading with some exceptions in grade four and for LEP students. Additional data is provided on the high school Michigan Merit Examination, comparing 2007 to 2009 exam results, showing improved proficiency rates and narrowed achievement gaps, with some exceptions for black students and students with disabilities (SWD). NAEP data is provided in the appendices, and shows that the state's achievement on NAEP is not increasing as rapidly as on state tests, and gaps are not closing as rapidly as on state tests. Overall high school graduation rates increased prior to 2007 and have been stable since 2007. High school graduation rate data is not provided by

subgroup. A score near the top of the "medium" range is awarded.

Total	125	96
-------	-----	----

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(B)(1)(i)

The applicant is a member of the Common Core State Standards Initiative, involving 48 states, 2 territories, and the District of Columbia. The state is also a member of the American Diploma Project Network. Full points are awarded for this subsection. Requested documentation is complete.

(B)(1)(ii)

The applicant planned to adopt the Common Core State Standards in math and English language arts at the June 15, 2010 meeting of the State Board of Education. Full points are awarded for this subsection.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(B)(2)(i)

The state is a governing member of the Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER) Balanced Assessment Consortium, which plans to build a system of assessments that includes (1) common summative and interim benchmark tests in English language arts and math; (2) formative assessment processes, tools, and supports; (3) focused professional development; (4) reporting systems that provide first-hand evidence of student performance; and (5) uses of technology to deliver the assessments and provide results as quickly as possible to teachers and parents. Full points are awarded for this subsection.

(B)(2)(ii)

Thirty-two states are participating in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium. Full points are awarded for this subsection.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	18
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(B)(3)

The applicant provides a detailed, thorough, and high-quality plan for how participating LEAs will deliver

standards-aligned instruction, and for how the state will deliver comprehensive LEA supports for standards and high-quality assessment implementation. The state has extensive experience with adopting, implementing, and rolling out standards and assessments that will facilitate its rollout of the Common Core Standards. The State's P-20 Council will examine the consistency of the Michigan Merit Curriculum credits, as defined by the High School Content Expectations and the Common Core Standards, with college entrance and placements requirements, and will make recommendations for continued implementation support aligning the enhanced standards with postsecondary transition. Materials, practices, and assessments critical to support and inform classroom instruction will be provided through a Teaching for Learning website, the use of instructional surveys, the provision of model instructional units, and the implementation of balanced assessments. Last, the state has a coherent plan for professional development, and capacity to deliver it, that will focus on improving instructional practice, using data to drive decision-making and improve instruction, increasing assessment literacy, and collaborating with the state teachers' unions and other education organizations in the training of all educators on the Framework for Educator Evaluations. The state does not provide a clear timeline for when teachers will be trained to use the Teaching for Learning website or be provided other supports. Points in the "high" range are awarded for this subsection.

Total	70	68
-------	----	----

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(C)(1)		
The applicant currently has 9 of 12 America Competes Act elements in its statewide longitudinal data system. Several elements will be enhanced over the next couple years, but the required functions exist, with the exception of (1) the ability of the preK-12 and higher education data systems to communicate, (2) a teacher identifier system linked to students, and (3) other information necessary for success in higher education.		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	4
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(C)(2)		
The state sets forth a high-quality plan for ensuring that data from the State's longitudinal data system are accessible to key stakeholders, although it is less clear how the state will promote this system at the local level to inform and engage these stakeholders. The state will give particular attention to strengthening state and LEA collaboration with major research universities to establish systems through which relevant information on research-based instructional practices can be disseminated to K-12 teachers and provide a venue for researchers to assess rich data on student performance and other information. An education data portal will be a critical coordination vehicle, making statewide longitudinal data available and streamlining the data flow to support multiple uses. The state-level research collaborative will work with the state's P-20 Council to set and prioritize a state research agenda; ensure that student, schools, and system performance are measured meaningfully; build technical and human capacity to use data effectively by the state, LEAs, and research audiences; review research proposals requiring state data; establish guidelines and standards for proposal submission with data requests; and make appropriate research results available to the public. The elements of a high-quality plan are		

addressed. Points in the "high" range are awarded for this subsection.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	11
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	4
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	4
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	3

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(C)(3)(i)

The state has a high-quality plan for ensuring implementation of instructional improvement systems. The state's 57 ISDs have self-organized into eight consortia for rolling out professional development programs on five already installed and operational data analysis and reporting platforms. These Regional Data Initiatives are collaborating to share resources across consortia to support (1) facilitating the creation of an interoperability framework among the Regional Data Initiatives, the State Longitudinal Data System, and local student information systems; (2) developing common professional development programs to support data use; and (3) recommending and adopting a common set of reports for tracking student progress toward graduation and college readiness, as well as early warning signs for dropout prevention and intervention. To support individualizing and personalizing instruction with data, the Regional Data Initiatives require consortia to link data warehousing solutions with instructional support tools, several of which are already widely used. A timeline for implementing the activities is not included, however, and it is not always clear exactly how teachers at the school level will be expected to use the data and reports from the platforms as they become available to inform classroom instruction. A score in the lower end of the "high" range is provided.

(C)(3)(ii)

The state has a high-quality plan for supporting participating LEAs and schools that are using instructional improvement systems in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals, and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement. Each of the eight consortia (made up of ISDs) is required to offer teachers and administrators four days of professional development and each Regional Data Initiative has developed (and has begun to offer) professional development programs around understanding data and the use of data to inform instruction. These programs begin in Summer 2010 to complement the work already done through the state's rollout of its Data for Student Success program. The Regional Data Initiatives are employing a comprehensive program evaluation, including an educator survey collected four times over the course of 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years, as well as a building administrator survey. Training through the Regional Data Initiatives will focus on how to determine the quality of professional development based on the outcomes of that professional development. RTTT funding will enhance the work already begun by the state and will fund an additional two days of professional development statewide specifically focused on the use of Regional Data Initiatives tools in support of the non-core common assessments, the Framework for Educator Evaluations, and data to inform instruction. A clear timeline for implementing the activities is not included, however. A score in the lower end of the "high" range is provided.

(C)(3)(iii)

The state has a medium-quality plan for sharing data for research purposes through the Michigan Consortium for Education research, the statewide research collaborative described in (C)(2), and regional action research collaboratives that are part of the Regional Data Initiatives. Topics have been selected for initial regional action research. The state's plan focuses almost exclusively on state-directed research

and does not adequately describe how data from instructional improvement systems, together with statewide longitudinal data system data, will be made available and accessible to independent researchers. The research to be undertaken does not specifically address approaches for educating different types of students, and a clear timeline for implementing the activities outlined in this subsection is not provided. A score in the "middle" range is awarded.

Total	47	33
--------------	-----------	-----------

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	6
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	3
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	2
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	1

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(1)(i)

In 2009, the state legislature authorized the State Superintendent to develop a process to grant an interim certificate that authorizes an individual to teach in public schools while completing an alternative route program. A person with an interim teaching certificate must demonstrate satisfactory teaching performance for three years under that certificate and meet standards approved by the State Superintendent. The state department of education will accept applications from providers interested in establishing approved alternate teacher preparation programs in fall 2010. Candidates must have a bachelor's degree or higher, but the coursework in the alternative route appears to be limited. It is not completely clear whether non-institutions of higher education (IHEs) can become providers, but it appears that may be now the case under the new legislation.

Michigan also offers a route to alternate principal certification, with programs to be offered by state professional associations and requirements to be set by stakeholder groups under criteria set by the state boards.

For both the teacher and principal alternative routes it is not easily discernible how many of the five elements of alternative certification routes are met by the existing programs.

A score in the "medium" range is awarded for this subsection.

(D)(1)(ii)

The new alternative route for teachers is not yet in use. An informal alternative route for preparing principals has been in place for some years, but only in December 2009 did the school administrator certificate become mandatory. A more formal alternate route for principals has been proposed but not yet implemented. A score in the "low" range is awarded.

(D)(1)(iii)

The application's discussion under (D)(1) does not comprehensively address a process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortages, other than by mentioning the Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows program funded by the Kellogg Foundation and by stating that a study will be conducted. A score is the

"low range" is awarded.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	41
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	18

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(2)(i)

A 2010 state statute requires that all schools measure growth and provide teachers and principals with relevant student growth data. The state has an existing growth model, approved by the U.S. Department of Education, for measuring student progress in reading and math in grades 4-8. The state does not yet have the ability to calculate growth in high school, grades K-3, or in other subject areas other than reading and math. The state sets forth a set of activities to expand its existing system, including new Common Core Assessments provided via the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium and a new High School College Preparation Battery. In all non-Common Core areas, the state will provide seed money to consortia of ISDs and IHEs to develop summative, formative, and interim benchmark assessments in the 2010-2011 school year. The state outlines how it will use all forms of available assessment data that are valid for calculating growth to calculate growth in Common Core subjects and non-Common Core subjects. Timelines are not provided for all activities. A score in the "high" range is provided.

(D)(2)(ii)

In response to the state's new law requiring rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that use multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor, the state's teachers unions and principals associations worked together to develop a Framework for Educator Evaluations that carefully tracks the requirements for the new state law and provides a suggested mechanism for meaningful implementation of the law. The Framework includes a Michigan State Improvement Framework, a high-quality comprehensive planning and analysis tool to identify school improvement based on student outcomes, a School Improvement Plan that is required under state law for every school, and a Comprehensive Needs Assessment that identifies improvement needs based on student outcomes. All teacher and principal goals are derived from the School Improvement Plan and Comprehensive Needs Assessment, assuring that these goals have a basis in student outcomes, including student achievement growth. The exact form of the preliminary measures of educator impact on student growth will be locally bargained, however, and it is difficult to predict the extent to which the evaluation requirements of the participating LEA's MOUs will be watered down in implementation. A score in the "high range" is awarded.

(D)(2)(iii)

Recent state law requires annual evaluation for all teachers and school administrators with timely and constructive feedback required. The wait time for feedback has been reduced in recent years to six-to-eight weeks. The applicant details how data on student growth is currently provided to educators for each student individually and aggregated at the school and grade level. It is less clear in what form feedback will be provided to teachers and principals and what the timeline will be for rolling out enhanced levels of data on student achievement resulting from RTTT reforms and new assessments. A score in the "middle" range is provided.

(D)(2)(iv)

State laws regarding teacher tenure and collective bargaining have been in place in the state for many years. New state laws requiring more rigorous evaluations based in significant part on student achievement/growth data do not contradict existing law but do explicitly require the use of such evaluations to inform the full range of decisions outlined in the selection criteria for (D)(2)(iv). While the implementation of these requirements must be collectively bargained, they must also be collectively bargained within the constraints of the law, meaning that by definition, the requirements of this subsection must be met for all districts, whether they are participating LEAs or not. Because the implementation of procedures for using teacher evaluations for key decisions are locally determined, any quality assurance activities undertaken by the state must respect collective bargaining agreements. Despite the state's assurances that the requirements of this subsection must be met by all LEAs, it is not clear the extent to which collectively bargained implementation procedures will impede or water down the impact of using teacher evaluations to make key employment-related decisions. A score in the upper end of the "middle" range is provided.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	8
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	6
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	2

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(3)(i)

The state has compiled equitable distribution data and identified that during the 2007-2008 academic year, only 1.51 percent of teachers had not yet demonstrated highly qualified status. No data is yet available on the percentage of and distribution of teachers and principals who are "highly effective," as defined under RTTT. The state lays out several strategies (use of data systems to determine vacancies, recruitment to fill critical shortage areas, focus on retention of current teachers) that it will employ to approach the equitable distribution of "effective" teachers and principals. (The state sometimes uses "effective" when it should have focused on "highly effective.") While the state will promote the portability of tenure to attract highly effective teachers to hard-to-staff subjects, schools, and districts by informing districts of their options to waive tenure requirements for experienced teachers who they employ in high-need areas, the state's plan does not clearly lay out a coherent strategy for ensuring that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students. Timelines are not always provided. A score in the lower end of the "middle" range is provided.

(D)(3)(ii)

To increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, the state will use the publicly reported "Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Score" to provide an incentive for teacher preparation programs to focus on critical shortage areas, collaborate with Research I universities and the state department of energy to recruit laid off engineers and other STEM professionals into teaching, and work with agencies and universities to create innovative and alternative routes to teacher and principal certification, such as the Woodrow Wilson Michigan Teaching Fellowship. No annual targets are provided, and this section is very weak in addressing the selection criteria. A score in the "low" range is provided.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	5
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	4
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	1

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**(D)(4)(i)**

The state admits it faces a challenge in collecting good data on the effectiveness of existing and future alternate/experimental/innovative programs for teacher or administrator preparation. Its plans propose that the state's three Research I universities serve as lead co-partners for a statewide Teacher and Administrative Preparation Research Consortium that will design research that collects data on the variability across alternative and traditional teacher and principal preparation programs. Several initial topics are proposed. In addition, the state will link student achievement and student growth data to the students' teachers and principals, and to, in turn, link this information to the in-state programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the state. The student growth connection to teachers and teacher preparation institutions will be added to the performance score criteria in 2012, which is the earliest that two years of student growth will be available, and the application is not well focused on what that student growth component will look like. Timelines are identified for implementing aspects of this plan, but this section of the application has a lack of clear performance measures. A score in the "middle" range is awarded.

(D)(4)(ii)

Other than convening a task force, the state does not explicitly address how it will expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals. A score in the "low" range is awarded.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals**20****10****(i) Providing effective support****10****8****(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support****10****2****(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)****(D)(5)(i)**

The state's plans build on its considerable existing capacity at multiple levels to provide professional development to teachers and principals, and the state has already made significant use of technology as a delivery mechanism. LearnPort, the state's on-line professional development platform, allows educators to access resources and training modules any time from anywhere, reducing some time and distance limitations of traditional face-to-face professional development. The state's challenge is to provide coherence and coordination to its professional development supports in a way that leads to greater instructional improvement. Accelerate Michigan aims to streamline responsive and effective professional development for pre-service to veteran teachers and principals, based on data-derived instructional needs at state, local, and individual levels. The Accelerate Michigan Office will convene stakeholders from members of the P-20 Council that will collect data and evaluate programs against high standards on a quarterly basis. Criteria will be developed by summer 2011 to determine and specify the type of systemic professional development that will lead to a sustained increase of teacher effectiveness and student achievement. Each program in the preliminary database will be reviewed to ensure it meets the new standards and supports reform efforts. The new Framework for Educator Evaluations that is expected to be implemented in all LEAs, subject to local collective bargaining limitations, will help identify the necessary professional development for individual teachers and principals. Professional development offerings will be evaluated over time for effectiveness using much of the evidence collected through various RESPONSE activities. The state's plan addresses four strategic priorities for its planned professional development activities, but the plan lacks a consistent use of timelines for implementation of planned activities. A score in the low end of the "high" range is awarded.

(D)(5)(ii)

The state provides a weak, one paragraph description of how it will measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of teacher and principal supports in order to improve student achievement. This subsection mentions that the state will allocate resources specifically for research and evaluation and that collaborative grants will measure the effectiveness of professional development each year covered by the grant period. Research and evaluation grant recipients will submit quarterly reports, and a summary report will be provided by the state each year to support local districts in the continuous improvement of each professional development initiative. This is a bare-bones plan with little detail, and it does not contain all the elements of a high-quality plan. A score in the "low" range is awarded.

Total	138	70
--------------	------------	-----------

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)		
(E)(1)		
Recent legislation authorizes the State Superintendent to place persistently lowest-achieving (PLA) schools, including charter schools, under the supervision of the State School Reform/Redesign Officer, who 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. Although the state superintendent has the authority to nominate appointees for the position of Emergency Financial Manager to the Governor for appointment of up to one year, renewable annually, if a school district has a financial emergency as defined by state statute, the state does not appear to have legal authority to intervene directly in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	36
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	31
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(E)(2)(i)		
State statute provides for the identification of PLA schools using a set of business rules created to allow a ranking of all schools in the state. The business rules for ranking schools is awaiting approval from the U.S. Department of Education. Once approved, a list of schools identified as PLA will be created. High schools will be included if they have a four-year graduation rate below 60 percent for the last three consecutive years. The rank order of all schools will include the .5 percent of schools not eligible for Title I funds. Full points are awarded for this subsection.		
(E)(2)(ii)		
Accelerate Michigan includes a wide range of supports that will be offered to all schools and targeted for introduction in struggling schools. The state will include some of the strongest elements from the current statewide system of support and will implement the new turnaround models in the lowest-achieving schools in the state with federal Title I School Improvement Grants. All schools identified as PLA will be required to implement one of the four turnaround models. The state department of education will generate a list of approved external providers (including ISDs) to work with schools implementing all models other than closure. Districts with eligible schools will submit a turnaround grant application, and if		

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
(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)		
(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.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	28
(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
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<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>		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<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>		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	366
--------------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Michigan Application #3150MI-6



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	52
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	37
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Accelerate Michigan, the state's reform agenda for Race to the Top, presents a compelling vision of where the state has been and where it wants to go. The state is honest about its deficiencies and clear on its strength; this insight informs the state's reform agenda.

The goal of the state's reform agenda is to "accelerate [its] progress toward a knowledge-based economy." The state's decision to "accelerate" current efforts reflects the state's belief it is on a successful path to reforming schools and improving student achievement and a desire to use their Race to the Top grant, if awarded, to more quickly advance and implement the plan already in place. However, the idea the state is making significant and meaningful progress on its reform goals is not fully supported by, for example, the state's NAEP data or narrative. The state has not made much progress increasing student achievement and in some cases (e.g., cohort graduation rates) has taken a step back. Hence, while Accelerate Michigan clearly describes what Michigan can do with a "start-up grant" of \$400 million dollars, it is not clear what will be the pace of progress if the state is not awarded a grant.

The state's theory of action, building collective capacity, is rooted in the culture and strength of the state; consequently, it reflects a clear and credible path by the state to achieve its goals. They seem to have researched options and decided on a model that addressed the state's most prominent challenge: state, lea, and school capacity "is unevenly distributed, inadequately shared, and poorly focused."

The state's narrative provides a list of initiatives that are currently underway (e.g., Project Relmagine) or have happened (e.g., its Unique Identifier Code for students and educators). Collectively, these initiatives effectively illustrate a fuller picture of how Accelerate Michigan, the reform agenda, translates into practice on a state, district, and local level. The state's narrative also makes a strong case for how their Race to the Top grant, if awarded, will strengthen, improve, and/or accelerate current efforts. For example, while the state has a robust data system, it does not have a "mechanism that makes data and analyses accessible and useful to educators in their work." Through Race to the Top, Michigan will address this challenge. In sum, the state has a solid foundation in place and desires to use Race to the Top funding to build, refine, understand, and expand what works.

In addition, the state offers a great description regarding the interconnectedness between its theory, its instructional support system, and to a lesser extent its framework for evaluating educators. Accelerate Michigan's theory of change places teachers squarely at the intersection of reform via the implementation its Responsive Instructional Support System. Michigan's plan for leveraging its research universities is equally impressive.

Michigan's inclusion of schools with the "greatest disparities in achievement" in its school improvement work is

smart policy. The state plans to use its RESPONSE framework to provide "more intensive and rigorous support to LEAs with the lowest achievement;" this should allow the state's RESPONSE framework to create tailored solutions for LEAs and schools in most need of reform.

The state has ambitious goals and attempts to transform these goals into measurable objectives. The outcomes are striking. In terms of the state's goal to raise achievement levels for all students, successful implementation of Accelerate Michigan will lead to a 20% increase in student achievement by the end of the Race to the Top grant program. Further, the state ties its college readiness narrative back to its assessment narrative by "adopting college ready cut scores." The state plan to pursue this strategy even though it will cause a drop in proficiency rates in the short term because it will provide a more accurate look at student performance in the long term. This decision increases belief and confidence that the state's plan strongly reflects a commitment to dramatically improving student performance and the other four education areas described in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The state's strategy is not without a few drawbacks. The application does not include an implementation date for the new cut scores take, nor does the application use its college ready cut scores to measure its effectiveness closing the achievement gap.

The state plans to increase its high school graduation rate by four percentage points; however, it does not communicate how many students have graduated from high school; the state only provides the percentage of high school graduates. Thus, the extent to which the state has an ambitious yet achievable goal, overall and by student subgroup, for increasing high school graduation rates is un-assessable. Further, the Superintendent's Dropout Challenge may lead - without an infusion of Race to the Top dollars - to a four percentage point increase in graduation rates. The state's narrative does not include its current college success rate. The goal to increase college success by 10% seems reasonable, since the state will need a full year to know its college success rate; hence, the ability to know what works and course correct will happen during the latter part of the grant.

The goals of the state, described above, with the commitment of a significant number of LEAs, described later on, work together to ensure that the state's plan will have broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its goals, overall and by student subgroup, for increasing student achievement and decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups, increasing high school graduation rates, and increasing the number of college freshmen who complete at least a year's worth of college credit.

The state's memorandum of understanding is very similar to the sample MOU provided by the United States Department of Education; however, the state's MOU includes two additional clauses related to collective bargaining. While the state's MOU is strong as evidenced by its alignment to the sample MOU, the inclusion of these clauses may limit its efficacy. LEAs overwhelmingly support Accelerate Michigan. Every element receives 100% participation. The state's preliminary scope of work is detailed, outlining activities to be provided by the state and district. However, section (D)(2) in the is particularly state's preliminary scope of work vague as the state does not include meaningful approaches for using student achievement data to inform decisions.

The state's plan received unanimous support from LEA superintendents and local school board presidents, and 83.4% from local teacher's unions. This is significant comprehensive support that should go a long way in the state's efforts to implement Accelerate Michigan in its 737 participating districts. The number of participating LEAs represents 87% of all LEAs in the state. The state has made a strategic choice to increase participation from local teacher's union leaders. According to the state's discussion of its Phase 1 application within its current plan, Accelerate Michigan, current union support is a stark contrast to the state's first application, which garnered only 8% of local union support. Participating LEAs represent over 90% of all students in poverty. This is tremendous, and if the state, intermediate school districts, districts, and schools can build its "collective capacity," these students should see a dramatic increase in achievement that will reverberate throughout the state.

The Responsive Instructional Support System knits various efforts together under a cohesive umbrella. The emphasis on instruction places educators and to lesser extent principals in the driver seat, so the absence of a commitment to increase significant student achievement in a meaningful way reflects a gap between the goals of the plan and how the plan might be operationalized in the field.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	25
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Michigan identifies strong leadership at all levels either in detail or by describing the state's organizational structure. The state provides an overview of the "dedicated teams" that will lead plan implementation in Appendix A.5.

Overall, the state's plan offers cursory descriptions of its activities. For instance, in the state's description of how it will disseminate and replicate effective practices statewide, it explains LEAs will be provided "easy access" to best practices that have been vetted by experts. However, the state does not describe what entails "easy access," which could mean utilizing a popular conference, creating a web portal, conducting site visits, etc. This lack of detail may mean the state has not thoroughly thought through its implementation plan.

This section also asks the state to address how participating LEAs will be held accountable for progress and performance. The state clearly expresses a plan that both supports and holds accountable participating LEAs. However, the activities the state plans to use to provide support and accountability are more support than accountability. That is "professional development, active learning communities, and knowledge management structures" are effective support mechanisms, yet they are not effective accountability structures. In fact, the state's narrative provides very little information on the actual accountability structures it has in place or will establish.

The state mentions for the first time in its application the creation of the Accelerate Michigan Office, the team that will be responsible for monitoring LEA progress implementing elements of its Race to the Top application. To this end, the office will be tasked with evaluating and, when necessary, ceasing ineffective practices and disseminating effective practices. While the state may have the authority to stop what is not working, what is also being evaluated is whether the state has the ability to take such dramatic steps when necessary to ensure every participating LEA implements Accelerate Michigan with fidelity. Given the state's history of local control, an evaluation of the state's ability to stop ineffective implementation is paramount. To this end, the state explains "for those districts not demonstrating progress and performance, their intermediate school districts will intervene with a deeper level of support." The narrative continues on to explain that "the state has the authority to further intervene through less drastic measures such as offering support, and through more drastic measures such as withholding funding, replacing key district personnel, and taking over schools." Taken together (what the intermediate school district *will* do and what the state *may* do), the state's application does not provide a clear plan of action for supporting participating LEAs in successfully implementing the education reform plans it has proposed, through such activities as "ceasing ineffective practices."

Also, the state asserts it will provide LEAs that are performing poorly with additional district support. The idea of providing additional support to LEAs whose performance is inadequate does not square with the state's theory of change (building collective capacity). Whereas, the application of the state's theory of change should mean LEAs receive less not more support. And, LEAs not meeting the minimum performance threshold could conceivably receive a "deeper level of support;" however, to be consistent with the state's plan to build collective capacity, these LEAs would eventually need to make a transition, acquiring more autonomy and receiving less intervention. The state's narrative does not resolve this tension.

The state requests the maximum amount of money for its plan, so it would have been helpful if the state discussed its grants management system or experience managing a grant of similar size. Further, it would be helpful to know the extent to which the districts and schools under Project ReImagine are also participating LEAs. It is also unclear why the head of the Accelerate Michigan Office does not report directly to the Superintendent, but the Deputy Superintendent, overseeing all education services. Taking seriously the state's narrative that Accelerate Michigan will transform and impact every team in MDE, then it would seem the point person, who according to the state, is responsible for "building the capacity of the Michigan Department of Education, collaborating across the agency and with external partners" would be a Deputy Superintendent rather than an State Office Administrator. As a point of reference, the state will have a Deputy Superintendent lead its

newly created State School Reform/Redesign Office; this person will be responsible for "overseeing the turnaround and redesign of the persistently lowest achieving schools in the state." The decision to have a Deputy Superintendent implement the state's turnaround efforts (i.e., (E)(1)) and not have a Deputy Superintendent implement the entire application (i.e., Accelerate Michigan) may reflect a lack of thought by the state as to how to integrate Accelerate Michigan Office into MDE.

The state does a quality job of identifying where its potential Race to the Top dollars will support and align with existing efforts, such as its through its State Longitudinal Data System grant and School Improvement Grant grant. The state's budget items supporting teachers and leaders seem to be unbalanced towards research. For example, the state plans to provide "significant funding" to universities to "focus on shortage area research and models of assuring adequate; funds to research equitable distribution and the incentives necessary for attracting talent;" and funds to research "the effectiveness of existing and future educator preparation programs." In fact, later in the state's application it writes, "The state has invested in research designed to identify shortage areas, such as mathematics and science, and to bring postsecondary institutions together to develop solutions." While research is critical and important, the decision to focus a significant amount of new funding towards research seems to be a way for the state to put off important issues like those highlighted in (D)(2)(iv). After examining the budget, it is impressive the number of staff members in place; this should mean the state can quickly shift to implementation if a grant is awarded.

The state's view of Race to the Top as "start-up cost" combined with a Governor and legislature "willing to make the hard decisions necessary to implement change" gives confidence that the state will continue its reform efforts after the grant period has ended.

The state's teachers and principals fully support this application as evidenced by signatures on the MOU as well as their letters of support. In fact, letters of support from statewide teacher organizations express a genuine appreciation for the collaborative process the state undertook in developing its Phase 2 application. In addition, the number of local unions that have signed on is significant. In addition, Accelerate Michigan is supported by key stakeholders across the state. The letters of support include submissions from the private sector, parent groups, government, and higher education, etc. Hence, the state receives high points for (A)(2)(ii).

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	19
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	15

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state's application clearly highlights how its efforts over the past several years have supported and advanced the four education reform areas. The state's work regarding Standards and Assessments have been nationally recognized and covers K-12. To date, the state has 10 of the 12 elements described in the COMPETES Act. Unlike the specificity in the aforementioned areas, the state has not done much in advancing principal effectiveness. It has made some progress regarding teachers, for example, ensuring all teacher preparation programs are accredited. The only piece of measurable data the state includes for evaluating if it has made progress over the past several years in making improvements in teacher effectiveness is the following data point: ninety-six percent of Michigan's teachers are highly qualified. This measure addresses an input (qualifications), but it does not answer the question of an output (effectiveness). Consequently, the state's answer to whether it has demonstrated significant progress in this particular reform area is not compelling. The state's statewide system of support seems to be helpful in turning around poor performing schools.

The state's narrative describes Michigan as increasing student achievement over time and narrowing the achievement gap between whites and students of color based on data from its state assessment. This narrative is not supported by the state's performance on NAEP. And while Michigan's reservations regarding the utility of NAEP scores are understandable, these scores, in the content of its application, are valid and must be taken into consideration. In doing so, the scores illustrate a state that has seen a decline or minimal improvement in student achievement. For example, NAEP reading scores for fourth graders was 219 in 2003 and 220 in 2007, and reading scores for eight graders during the same period decreased. In regards to closing the achievement gap, in fourth grade reading, for example, the data shows are Asians and whites plateauing, and African

American and Hispanic students making some gains. While tension between the two data sets is evident, overall the state's performance is not good. The state's performance on the ACT is poor - less than 15% of 11th graders are college ready. This further cements the idea that the state is not doing an effective job increasing student achievement. The state does describe some of the initiatives it has put in place, such as the Dropout Challenge, to reverse its downward trend in achievement; however, the section as a whole does not provide a clear description of the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed to it.

Total	125	96
-------	-----	----

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The state's participation in (1) the American Diploma Project Network and (2) the Common Core State Standards Initiative Consortium is evidence that Michigan is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards.</p> <p>According to Appendix B.5, 51 states and territories have joined the Common Core State Standards Initiative for English-language arts and mathematics as of September 1, 2009. According to the state's application, 35 states have signed on to the America Diploma Project.</p> <p>The state articulates a high quality plan for adopting a common set of K-12 standards by August 2, 2010. This assertion is based on the state's past history implementing standards, its review of how Common Core Standards align with its current state standards, engagement of statewide stakeholders, and a clear timeline for adoption that aims to complete the process more than 30 days before Race to the Top's August deadline.</p>		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The state's participation in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium is evidence that Michigan is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments. The application states that "32 states are committed to the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium." Michigan has signed up as a Governing State and will have an "active role" in developing the assessment system.</p>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	14
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The state has a quality plan for supporting a statewide transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessment. Michigan divides its work into four activities: (1) rolling out standards; (2) aligning standards with postsecondary expectations; (3) providing instructional practices, tools, and assessments; and (4) providing targeted resources and professional development to improve all teachers' capacity to teach the standards which form the backbone of state assessments.</p> <p>According to the state's plan, it will rollout Common Core Standards sometime in October. This rollout date aligns with the state's expectation to have its Common Core Standard approved in June. To this end, the state</p>		

plans to hold rollout sessions, yet it is very vague on how this happens. For example, it is not clear a) if MDE will meet with each LEA, b) if every educator will be required to attend the rollout session, c) if there is a plan/process for sharing the transition to the Common Core Standards with every educator, etc.

The state's ability to align its standards with postsecondary expectations is a strength. The state's revamped high school graduation requirements are extremely rigorous, and, according to the state's narrative, they align with its to-be-adopted ELA and mathematics Common Core Standards. MDE has conducted an internal evaluation that confirms the alignment. Because of the state's internal work, it is unclear why the P-20 Council is tasked with further evaluation since implementation will happen in September 2010, and it is also unclear what is meant by the taskforce "mak[ing] recommendations for continued implementation support."

The state also explains how:

The P-20 Council will be expanded to investigate the content standards and assessments in non-common core areas and to make recommendations regarding the extent to which those standards prepare students for college entrance and placement requirements.

In another place, the state describes a process and provides a timeline for developing assessments for non-common core subjects. This is somewhat confusing because if the state does not know if assessments in non-common core area impact college readiness then it should not be investing time, resources, and money to developing corresponding assessments. Assessment should come only if the state determines there is value in the non-common core areas.

The state's third activity, providing instructional practices, tools, and assessments, is divided into four subcategories, and an evaluation of each subcategory is below.

The state touts its Teaching for Learning website as a way to deliver content to educators. However, the state does not include any type of usage goals, so it is not clear how the state expects the tool to be utilized. In fact, the state's entire section lacks measurable performance goals. The state is depending on its "expert" teachers to deliver content for the website (in addition, to a number of teams). The use of expert teachers is conceivably a good thing; however, the word expert could mean many things and the state in its application does not provide a definition. Within this context, an "expert teacher" could be a tenured teacher, mentor teacher, teacher of the year, national board certificated teacher, etc. In addition to the absence of a clear understanding of who can contribute content, the state does not explain how it will evaluate content for the site.

The state's commitment to developing model instructional units should benefit educators across the state. Again, the state does not discuss any goals for educator usage. Also, it is not clear why the state plans to only develop model instructional units for "particularly difficult content standards" without a sense of what standards the state believes are particularly difficult.

The state's narrative on implementing a balanced assessment seems to be a defense for not using student achievement as a significant factor in evaluations. The state's "fair and valid educator evaluation system" seems to have been initially developed exclusively by teacher and principal unions with the state merely endorsing the end product. This is a curious approach as it illustrates a state that encouraged a collaborative process, participated in a collaborative process, yet when it came to addressing section (D)(2), the state opted to give deference to its unions. While it is an understandable output of the state's local control culture, what is troubling is the absence of stronger guidance regarding teacher and principal evaluation and the omission of the phrase "significant factor" with regards to student achievement's role within teacher and principal evaluations.

While the state argues that assessment is "one component of improving instruction," its explanations of other factors are not compelling. Specifically, the decision to allow educators, in accordance with its Framework for Educator Evaluations, to "identify goals and then identify appropriate measures of obtaining those goals" is a poor strategy. The plan does not ensure the goals the educator identifies are matched with the tools the educator will need to be effective in the classroom. Nor does the plan explain how it will provide support to educators who will inevitably lack the capacity to effectively utilize this instructor driven approach. Also, the state's decision to allow LEAs and schools to use student achievement data "whenever appropriate" is subjective

and may lead to an uneven use of student achievement data by LEAs and/or schools within the same LEAs as some educators will invariably attempt to circumvent the state's desire to use student achievement data.

On the credit side, the state's exploration of ways to impart student growth into its high schools via commercial products that aligns with college and career readiness is a smart stopgap as it waits for the SMARTER assessment to be developed. Of note, the state's implementation of SMARTER will not begin until the end of the Race to the Top grant cycle. Although the process begins in 2014, the state does not explain when full integration can be expected or how the "phased approach to develop annual summative and interim benchmark assessments" will happen. The state's desire to create a balanced system of assessments is understandable, but its timeline for getting there is ambitious.

Total	70	64
-------	----	----

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The state's application asserts they have a statewide longitudinal data system that includes 10 of the 12 America COMPETES Act elements. And, according to the state's narrative, it also does not meet element (4), since the "full data exchange for state analysis will be available Dec. 2010."		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The state writes extensively regarding how it will make data more robust and accessible via the development of its educational data portal and increase engagement between the state, LEAs, and Michigan's research institutions. This reflects a high-quality plan to ensure that data from the state's statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to key stakeholders, such as parents, students, teachers, principals, LEA leaders, community members, unions, researchers, and policymakers.		
The state also provides an explanation of how the "state-level data" will lead to the continuous improvement of efforts on a state level. The state provides an example of how it will use the data to "monitor progress on core system wide goals." This seems to adequately address the criteria's request that the state's plan discuss what impact the data will have on overall effectiveness (policy, operations, management, resource allocation). The plan, however, lacks an articulation of how the data will be used to "inform and engage" parents, teachers, and students, and support decision makers on the school- and community-level.		
The state plans to address data use in June 2011 according to its timeline; however, the state does not expand on its plan to develop analysis tools and reports.		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	11
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	3
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	4
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The state's plan for increasing teacher's use of local instructional improvement systems is straightforward. The state will require participating LEAs - all 737 districts - to participate in their Regional Data Initiative. Further, through the state's Regional Data Initiative, districts are able to create common reports, professional development programs, and data exchange frameworks to ensure that understanding and use of the system is consistent across districts. The state, however, does not describe how teachers will be trained to use the		

system. It also seems the state does not plan to provide funding to assist charter schools in participating in its RDI or developing a local instructional improvement system.

The state tackles professional development by requiring schools give their teachers and administrator four days of professional development. The state's decision to evaluate professional development according to outcomes (i.e., changes in data in areas where professional development should have an impact on improving instruction) should help ensure that professional development that works continues and ineffective programs end. However, the process does not include timelines, so it is not clear how and when the state's plan will be implemented. The state may be limited in providing this information, since, according to their narrative, many of its initiatives are still in the planning stage.

The state will leverage its federally funded Michigan Consortium for Educational Research to share data with researchers at Michigan State University and the University of Michigan. This is smart because it maximizes other funding streams and builds on a solid infrastructure. Further, the state's goal to have each consortium collaborate with a "research partner" should ensure that LEAs get feedback and analysis on an area that makes the most sense for them. On the other hand, it may also limit the potential to advance and support new research programs and projects outside of a partner's scope.

Total	47	32
-------	----	----

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	5
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	2
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	2
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	1

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state refers to recently passed legislation as evidence MDE has the legal authority to allow alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals. The state plans to begin accepting applications for entities interested in providing a teacher preparation program in fall 2010. Michigan does not seem to have a similar program in place for principals. Of note, the state describes House Bill 5596, 2009 Public Act 202, Michigan Revised School Code, Section 1531i as the single piece of legislation that confirms its ability to provide alternate routes; however, the state does not include the actual legislation in its application. The absence of the legislation makes it impossible to evaluate the legislation against the state's narrative. Since the state does not provide the "legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that [confirms it] allow[s] alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education," it receives low points for (D)(1)(i).

The application asks Michigan to list the alternative certification programs operating in the state under the state's alternative routes to certification, and for each: the elements of the program, the number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each program in the previous academic year, and the total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous academic year. The state does not clearly provide the aforementioned information; hence, the state receives low points for (D)(1)(ii).

The narrative lists a number of programs that will come online, such as the Innovation in Teacher and Administrator Preparation Consortium and Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows program, but does not discuss alternative routes currently operating in the level of depth the application requests.

In (A)(3)(i), the state's says it "has invested in research designed to identify shortage areas, such as mathematics and science, and to bring postsecondary institutions together to develop solutions." However, the state's response in (D)(1)(ii) to whether it has a process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of

teacher and principal shortage describes a state that does not currently have a process for identifying shortage areas. One of the state's two assertions is spurious.

In terms of the criteria, the state must illustrate its process regarding teacher and principal shortages. The state does not have a process for either group. Moreover, based on its narrative, the state is aware it is lacking a process, and it plans to use "funds to conduct consequential validity studies on alternate preparation, teacher shortages and models of effective incentives." While this strategy does not answer the question outlined in the criteria, since the prompt is asking the state to describe what is already in place, the plan does have a strength. That is it is affirming to see the state thinking through how to understand its teacher and principal shortage landscape and how to create a model for placing educators in hard to staff subject areas.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	33
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	5
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	12

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state's plan creates a clear approach for measuring student growth for its common core subjects and non-common core subjects. The state's plan seems to smartly build on the current structure that is in place i.e., a growth model for 4-8 for reading and mathematics and add capacity in the grades that are missing, in particular growth models in high school.

The state's education labor group came together to develop an evaluation system that includes student growth. The much touted Teacher Evaluation Framework provides a clear and compelling set of principles to assist LEAs in the development of their specific evaluation process.

Since Michigan is a local control state, its plan does not provide a mandate for how educators will be evaluated "using a multiple rating category." The framework endorsed by the state, instead, gives guidance regarding how an LEA might consider evaluating their teachers and principals. The guidance offered does include an evaluation process with a multiple rating category. However, the state is hesitant to include student growth as a significant factor. The concerns outlined in the proposal are valid and understandable, yet the state's endorsed solution that the use of student growth is "strictly formative for a minimum of three years in which an educator is being evaluated in a particular evaluation system" attempts to codify an overreach the creators of the Teacher Evaluation Framework. Further, this language does not reflect a thoughtful way to use data to inform practice and evaluation. Consequently, due to collective bargaining, it is unknown how each LEA will operationalize the framework. Some may stick close to the thoughtful guidance provided; others may jettison key concepts if an agreement cannot be reached. Inherent to the local control culture of the state, LEA level outcomes are unknown.

Through the documented involvement of teacher and principal labor groups and the state's culture of local control, the plan illustrates a collaborative planning process between the state, teachers, and principals.

The state's success revising its law to mandate all teachers be evaluated annually reflects a commitment by the state to change its culture. However, as mentioned previously, due to the state's understandable deference to LEAs in developing an evaluation process that is subject to collective bargaining it is unknown if the process for LEAs and schools will include student-level, classroom-level, and school-level growth. The state is primed to do its part and make much of the data available, and while the outstanding question may be whether districts do their part and make it evaluative, the narrative articulated by the state gives confidence that LEAs will likely participate in earnest.

The (D)(2)(iv) section must be evaluated according to the extent the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to *ensure* that participating LEAs use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions. The framing of this criteria unfortunately puts the state in a

precarious position. The state seems to understand this challenge, saying in their application: "The implementation of these procedures for using the evaluations for key decisions are locally determined, any quality assurance activities undertaken by the state must respect collective bargaining agreements." In essence, the state cannot ensure that every participating LEA will use an evaluation process that aligns with what MDE has endorsed nor can the state describe what each participating LEA will do. Further, it seems the state cannot ensure use; hence, it does not/cannot include annual targets for this section. The lack of annual targets also make it difficult to evaluate the extent to which the state and its LEAs are committed to the plan.

The state endorsed Framework for Educator Evaluation reflects a starting point for conversations that will take place across participating LEAs. The document is likely to be useful as LEAs and local unions come together to address this issue. The legislation referenced in the application that mandates student achievement data be used important; however, since the legislation does not mandate achievement is a significant factor, LEAs will have latitude in how they plan to implement the law. As a result, until these conversations and negotiations take place, implementation is unknown. Hence, the state lacks a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets for using evaluation to inform decisions as outlined in (D)(2)(iv).

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	15
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	11
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	4

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state's description of its partnership with the Center for Educational Performance and Information to twice annually monitor, evaluate, and identify areas of teacher shortages represents a high quality plan for identifying inequities in distribution. In terms of the state's plan to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals, its plans to conduct research that will "inform equitable distribution efforts." The state's data driven approach is laudable; however, the narrative does not explain how the research findings will inform the state's efforts. The state writes extensively about the structures that are already in place, which affirms that it has a strong foundation to conducting researching and utilizing its new ability to link student and teacher data.

The state has a robust plan for increasing effective teachers in hard-to-staff areas. The state provides a carrot and stick mechanism, holding preparation programs accountable to their commitment to produce effective teachers to serve in some of the most challenging environments and providing them with an incentive (more points on their performance scorecard). The state even considers how to maximize its teacher and principal shortage data, so it has a meaningful impact on increasing the number of effective teachers in hard to staff areas. The level of detail included in this section combined with the state's decision to collaborate with other agencies and universities describes a state well suited to transform data into action. Also, the state's clear understanding of the necessity of pairing teacher incentives with school culture and tackling both also reflects a thorough understanding of its unique landscape and keen ability to create a process that has a high likelihood of success.

The criteria asks states to "include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties" for each element. In regards to the State's Great Teachers and Leaders section, the state seems to embed some of these requirements throughout their plan which make it difficult to gain a clear understanding of what the state wants to do, when they want to do it, and who is responsible for doing it.

For example, it seems the state does not establish performance goals related to (D)(3)(i) and (D)(3)(ii) nor does the state include a timeline most likely because the plan lacks performance goals for (D)(3)(i) and (D)(3)(ii). In relation to (D)(3)(i), the state does include a number of activities that will help them ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals, and MDE in coordination with other departments seem to be responsible for implementation. Additionally, the state as mentioned above does include a robust plan for increasing the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching in hard-to-staff subjects, and MDE, its Office of Professional Preparation Services, other agencies and universities, and Regional Educational Laboratory-Midwest makes the parties responsible for implementing this section of the state plan. Because the state does not include performance goals and clear timelines, its plan can only be evaluated in terms of the activities included and

responsible parties listed.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	6
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	4
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	2

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state recently acquired the legislative authority "to link teacher codes to student unique identification code and ultimately back to teacher preparation institution codes." The state's decision to link student growth to a teacher and where applicable their respective teacher preparation program at the earliest time possible seems to reflect a commitment on the state's part to maximize data collection efforts with an understanding (and then) improvement of teacher preparation programs. The state's writes in its narrative that it will use its teacher preparation program to create its principal performance to preparation program. The challenge, however, is the state, by its own admission, does not have a "clear plan" for teacher preparation; hence, it is a bit premature for the state to replicate a model that does not exist, yet.

While the state asserts that it has "established strategies for publicly reporting the effectiveness of its teacher preparation institutions," the narrative does not provide a clear rollout plan or measurable objectives. It is unclear how said data will fit into the state's current scorecard, when the report will be published, or how it will reach segments of the population with limited to no internet access or families where English is not spoken in the home.

The state cannot develop a high-quality plan for expanding quality paths to licensure because MDE does not have the data necessary to inform practice. In the words of the state, "Michigan has done less well in collecting good data on the effectiveness of existing and future alternate...programs for teacher or administrator preparation." Since the state does not have quality data regarding teacher preparation effectiveness, it smartly focuses first on collecting quality data.

The section does discuss how it will expand high quality programs although the response is underwhelming. The scope of the state's answer is "research will be able to contribute significantly to discussions."

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	11
(i) Providing effective support	10	8
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	3

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state is starting the process from an excellent position. Michigan has the "capacity" to implement, but lacks "coherence." This allows the state to clearly tie their plan to its theory of change and evaluation system. This section is compelling and the narrative is coherent.

The state's evaluation of professional development is based - not on hours spent in training or solely on participant reviews - its ability to "increase student achievement and decreased achievement gaps." This is smart policy as its ties professional development to a clear meaningful outcome: student achievement.

The state also plans to leverage the already in place P-20 Council. This group will provide monitoring and coordination towards the goal of evaluating and improving professional development. It is not entirely understood why the state has made little progress to date developing its professional development framework. Nonetheless, the state expects this process to be completed by summer 2011, which does not seem like an ambitious timeline, since many of the stakeholders are already place and the state is primarily drawing from a "review of the existing literature" regarding professional development. Nonetheless, the state's strategy to actually apply its newly developed framework to existing organizations providing professional development should help the state determine a baseline of provider effectiveness.

The state's decision to make itself available to help LEAs and schools determine their professional development needs combined with the development of its evaluation framework (which requires educator's develop an Individual Professional Development that is in part based on "school-wide areas of concerns") should work in tandem to ensure that schools and educators - to the benefit of the students - receive focused tailored professional development opportunities.

Michigan's strategy to link its professional development to its requirement that educators earn continuing education units is strategic as it leverages an existing policy currently being adhered to by educators. However, it is not clear when the state will or how the state can revise their continuing education framework, so it better aligns with the type of professional development included in the section's criterion. While the codification of a promising practice is a smart way to ensure it is in place after the grant period ends, the absence of an activity timeline undercuts the state's assertion that it will succeed at changing the current structure.

Further, the state's plan to resource dedicated staff (i.e., internal coordinators) should help ensure the state's goals are implemented with a high degree of precision. The activities as outlined in the state's plan should help the state achieve its goal on "changing the culture" of Michigan's education system.

The narrative states that Michigan will award grants for research and evaluation to measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of its professional development efforts in order to improve student achievement and have each grantee submit a report. This plan seems weak as it lacks an accountability structure to ensure recommendations are implemented, an oversight structure to ensure the educator/practitioner voice is represented in the evaluation process, and a process that ensures data is accurate, relevant, and delivered in a timely manner. Lastly, the state does not provide a timeline that describes how it will implement (D)(5)(ii). These deficiencies lead to the state receiving a medium low score for section (D)(5)(ii).

Total	138	70
-------	-----	----

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)		
The state writes, "Michigan law gives the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Michigan Department of Education's chief executive officer, far-reaching authority to intervene in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status." After evaluating the law, Michigan has the full legal authority to intervene directly in the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools; it does not, however, have the authority to intervene in LEAs in corrective action status. It seems the state can only intervene in LEAs for non-academic reasons, such as a financial emergency. The state's narrative is not consistent with its law.		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	36
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	31
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The state seems to have a high-quality formula for identifying its lowest-achieving school and dropout factories as evidence by the business rules it created and applied from its School Improvement Grants School.		
Turning around low-performing schools seems to have become a routine process for MDE. Given its work in Detroit Public Schools or supporting the 150 schools that have not made AYP for four consecutive years, the state demonstrates considerable experience in this area, and it shows in its narrative. The state outlines a clear process for identifying schools, making their names public, and systemically working with each school to		

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
(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 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.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	0
(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

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
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.		
Total	55	15

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<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>(i) offer a rigorous course of study in STEM</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>(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</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>(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</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>		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <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



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1



Michigan Application #3150MI-5

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	65
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	45
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	15

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A.1.i. The state has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda entitled "Accelerate Michigan." Its goal is to use Race to the Top funding to accelerate progress toward a knowledge-based economy and culture and to increase a collective capacity that crosses and connects all levels of the educational system. One of the mechanisms which Michigan will use to align assessments, data use, and professional development is called the Responsive Instructional Support System (RESPONSE). By means of RESPONSE, all levels of the system, from school to the State Department of Education, will focus their resources on supporting a cycle of improvement within the classroom. A new Framework for Educator Evaluations will provide support from leaders of the state's unions, and administrator and school board associations. This collaboration will help lay out principles for an evaluation process for all teachers, principals, and central office administrators. Accelerate Michigan plans to increase student achievement, reduce achievement gaps, increase high school graduation rates, and the number of students successfully completing one year of post-secondary education or technical training. All of the 737 participating LEAs have signed on to implement each element of the State Reform Plan.

By means of Accelerate Michigan, the State has established a clear and concise path to achieving the goals of Race to the Top.

A.1.ii a Educators in Michigan at both the state and local levels recognize the opportunity that Race to the Top represents. Stakeholders were pleased to have unions, associations, state department policy leaders, and university researchers actively engaged in the application process. The Michigan Department of Education asked for the assistance of the State's institutions of higher learning. Working groups of K-12 stakeholders, including members of the Michigan Legislature and State Board of Education, statewide professional associations, the Michigan Department of Education senior staff, and leading university researchers were convened to consider research-based initiatives as they began to plan. The result was a coherent, collaborative approach to school improvement and student achievement. Prompted by the eligibility requirements of Race to the Top, the bipartisan legislative package signed into law in January 2010, affects several key issues related to effective implementation of Accelerate Michigan in the four reform areas identified in the Race to the Top selection criteria.

A.1.ii.b In the Preliminary Scope-of-Work Exhibit, responsibilities for the State and for participating LEAs/ Public School Academy/and Intermediate School Districts are presented. These responsibilities cover all the elements included in the Race to the Top Reform. Each LEA has agreed to comply with these responsibilities.

A.1.ii.c The number of participating LEAs with all applicable signatures is as follows: LEA Superintendents

(or equivalent) 737, Number of Signatures Applicable 737, Percentage Applicable 100%; President of Local School Board (or equivalent) 737, Number of Signatures Applicable 737, Percentage 100%; Local Teachers' Unions Leaders (if applicable) 448, Number Applicable 537, Percentage Applicable 83.4%. Both the number and the composition of the participating LEAs guarantee that Accelerate Michigan will have broad statewide implementation and impact to allow Michigan to reach its goals of significantly improved student achievement for all with special emphasis on accelerated improvement for the lowest achieving students. There was extensive collaboration with stakeholder groups in the development of the present application, and both the Michigan Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers-Michigan pledged their support. As a result 83.4% of Memoranda of Understanding now include union support, considerably strengthening the State's ability to implement innovative reforms.

Evidence provided by the State's response to Criteria A.1.ii defines the strong commitment of the participating LEAs to the effective implementation of Race to the Top reforms.

A.1.iii The 737 participating LEAs represent 3,386 schools, with enrollment of 1,446,119 K-12 students, and 689,598 Students in Poverty. The percentage of participating LEAs is 86.9%; of Schools, 89.8%; of K-12 students, 89.3%; and of Students in Poverty, 92.9%. Broad statewide impact which will allow the State to reach its goal will: a) increase student achievement in mathematics and reading by 20% in four years and 50% in ten years based on current proficiency standards; b) reduce the achievement gaps in both subject areas by 25% in four years and by 75% in ten years based on current proficiency standards; c) increase student achievement and decrease achievement gaps as measured first on state assessments and then by the National Association of Educational Progress (NAEP); d) increase the high school graduation rate to 80% in four years and reach and maintain a 90% graduation rate by 2020; and e) increase the number of students successfully completing at least one year of post-secondary education or technical training by 10% in four years and reach and maintain a 50% successful completion rate by 2020.

The data provided by this response are an overview of the efforts of the State to reach its ambitious but achievable goals. Movements to reduce, increase, decrease, complete, and maintain underlie the extensive planning undertaken to achieve attainable goals.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	30
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A.2.i.a Michigan is fortunate to have strong leadership at the state, regional, and local levels who are dedicated to implementing education reforms that the State has proposed. During recent severe economic times, the Governor and the Michigan legislature have been constantly challenged to protect education funding. The State Board of Education called for and adopted grade level and course content standards, and new school graduation requirements. The State Superintendent is a strong proponent of Race to the Top. Michigan educational leadership also benefits from the Education Alliance of Michigan which is an independent non-profit organization made up of executive directors of the statewide teacher unions, and administrator, parent, postsecondary, and school business official associations. This alliance has met continuously for over a decade and has established working relationships across stakeholder groups that enable it to exchange ideas and develop education policy recommendations that improve the design and delivery of education at all levels from infancy through adulthood. At the regional level, Michigan has a system of 57 intermediate school districts or regional education service agencies that provide a range of instructional, professional development, and other services to the local districts in their area. These regional entities have recently organized into eight clusters which have associated themselves with Michigan's regional public universities to form regional research consortia. At the local level, Michigan has a long history of local control of its schools' strong union representation of instructional staff.

A.2.1.b A range of initiatives will support participating LEAs. The Accelerate Michigan will use RESPONSE including the Teaching for Learning Framework to guide the support and resources available to districts, by providing LEAs with easy access to best practices. Districts will be supported and held accountable for the progress and performance of their students through a series of activities including professional development and active learning communities. Teachers and administrators will have access to information on how their students are progressing. Job-embedded professional development will be provided to support the use of differential instructional strategies enabling teachers to teach all students. The Accelerate Michigan Office will be responsible for monitoring LEA progress on initiatives. For districts not demonstrating progress and performance, their intermediate school district will intervene at a deeper level of support. In addition, the State has the authority to intervene when needed.

A.2.1.c Accelerate Michigan's plan to provide effective and efficient operations and progress for implementing its Race to the Top grant will require a commitment to streamlining operations and coordinate all reform initiatives. It will also be involved in building the capacity of the Michigan Department of Education in collaborating across the agency and with external partners. The Accelerate Michigan Office will use open and transparent reporting on the benchmarks and achievements of each element of the plan, plans for state reform legislation, and the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Plan. It will collaborate with the offices within the agency that are leading each of the four reform areas.

A.2.1.d In addition to the Race of the Top funding, Michigan is using state funds to support 21st Century Small High Schools, the Middle Colleges initiative which provides dual enrollment opportunities in health and STEM careers, Math and Science centers that support districts in STEM-related professional development activities, and Michigan Virtual University. Michigan's Race to the Top application and budget narratives identify critical areas of need for funding. The state views Race to the Top as providing a one-time start up fund for the development and institutionalization of several key functions in the Michigan Department of Education.

A.2.1.e Michigan is viewing the Race to the Top funding as start-up costs, not operating costs for the critical initiatives that need to be put in place. Some of the projects will produce efficiencies that will allow the state ultimately to spend less money on data reporting and compliance monitoring, and allow the savings to support classroom instruction. State legislators have passed legislation needed to implement the reform process and it is anticipated that they will make the hard choices necessary to continue to fund education at the levels needed to carry out Accelerate Michigan.

The extent and depth of these initiatives are evidence that Accelerate Michigan is building a strong statewide capacity to implement, and sustain proposed plans.

A.2.ii.a Accelerate Michigan has the broad support of teacher unions at both the local and state levels, as well as statewide associations representing Michigan's elementary, middle, and high school principals. The Michigan Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers-Michigan, Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association, and the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals have publicly supported and submitted letters concerning that support. Representatives from these organizations were actively involved in Phase 2 planning groups, side-by-side with representatives of superintendent and school board associates. The Network of Michigan Educators representing "the best of the best" (former teachers of the year) has also submitted a letter of support.

A.2.ii.b In writing this application, Michigan had extensive contact with a wide range of stakeholders. The Council of Michigan Foundations has played a key leadership role in garnering much needed resources from foundations throughout the state so that it could develop a plan that would result in sustainable improvements for its education system. The Kalamazoo Promise represents the commitment of a group of anonymous donors to a city that has seen better times. Students who are eligible receive grants that cover all or a portion of their tuition fees at a Michigan public university or community college. To date, more than 1,500 graduates have shared more than \$17 million dollars. Michigan's legislative leadership engaged in difficult negotiations to ensure that appropriate legislative changes were passed in order to align state law with Michigan's Race to the Top plan. They listened to stakeholders, debated among themselves, and

passed major education reform legislation that puts students-and their teachers-at the center.

As a state, Michigan coalesced behind its education reform, plan and agenda. The plan enjoys the widespread support of organizations, institutions, and leaders throughout the state as can be seen from the letters in Appendix A.6.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	28
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	23

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

A.3.i All Michigan standards are defined by specific content expectations that articulate what students should know and be able to do by grade, subject, or credit. Student knowledge of K-8 standards is measured by the Michigan Educational Assessment Program. Examples of progress made in each of the progress reform areas follow. School expectations are measured by the Michigan Merit Exam, which combines several tests into one and provides all students with both a free college entrance examination (the ACT) and measures of workforce readiness. Michigan's English and language arts and mathematics assessments have been fully approved by the U.S. Department of Education as meeting all Elementary and Secondary Education Act requirements. Since adopting more rigorous standards, mathematics assessment scores have increased each year. The Michigan Department of Education has the systems capacity to address 9 of the 12 elements described in the America COMPETES Act. Efforts will be made to ensure that the remaining elements are addressed and accomplished. The Michigan Department of Education's longitudinal data capacity is focused on PK-12, and recent efforts have moved the state toward the deployment of processes and systems that focus on connecting postsecondary and workforce data. Using Title 1 funds, the Michigan Department of Education provided a multi-layered support to Title 1 schools that have not made Adequate Yearly Progress for at least three consecutive years for academic reasons. Over this period nearly 300 schools have been able to meet their Adequate Yearly Progress goals.

The State's response to this criterion is a comprehensive summary of the initiatives taken to make progress over the past several years in each of the reform areas.

A.3.ii a.b Michigan has analyzed trends in achievement gaps over the last five years in which the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (grades 3-8) has been based on the same content standards and over the last three years in which Michigan Merit examinations (grade 11) have been based on the same content standards. Tables were prepared which indicate gains in Percent Proficient for 2005-2009 by Subject, Grade, and Student Group. Measures of college readiness are based on ACT's college readiness benchmarks. The table indicates that approximately half of Michigan's 11th graders are college ready in English, with approximately a third in reading, a quarter in mathematics, a fifth in science, and a sixth in all four subjects. All these data together indicate that achievement is generally improving over time (with particularly strong gains in mathematics and in lower grades), and the achievement gaps are generally narrowing over time (with particularly strong closures in mathematics and in lower grades). These exceptions to trends of increasing achievement and narrowing achievement gaps need to be reversed. In addition, where gains are being made and gaps are narrowing, those trends need to be accelerated. Finally, while achievement is indeed trending upward and gaps are generally narrowing, there remains an urgent need to improve Michigan's public education system to improve outcomes for students.

A.3.ii.c In 2007, Michigan began calculating graduation rates by using a cohort methodology that provides more accurate results. Graduate rates from each year 1999 through 2009 decreased from 81.4% in 1999 to 75.2% in 2009. The Superintendent of Education issued a Superintendent's Dropout Challenge whose goal was to positively impact 40,000 to 60,000 students deemed to be at risk of dropping out of school. In

response to the challenge, more than 1,100 schools are implementing intervention strategies. The Michigan Department of Education has established a Dropout Challenge website and secured partnership commitments with several agencies to provide a comprehensive series of professional development opportunities, information, and resources.

Criteria A.3.ii.a,b,c provide an extensive presentation of initiatives undertaken to improve student outcomes. Progress can be seen in so many venues. However, when presenting information pertaining to a decrease in the high school graduation over a period of years, it seems that there needs to be an increase in actions taken to address this situation.

Total	125	123
-------	-----	-----

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

B.1.i Michigan has joined three consortia: 1) the Common Core States Standard Initiative Consortium, 2) the American Diploma Project Network, and 3) the Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER) Balanced Assessment Consortium. The Governor, the State Board of Education, the Michigan Department of Education, and the Legislature, in coordination with education partners, are fully committed to the adoption of the Common Core State Standards, including the College and Career Readiness Standards and the Common Core K-12 Standards which will be internationally benchmarked. Fifty one states and territories make up the Common Core State Standards Consortium. As one of the 35 states that have signed on to the American Diploma Project, Michigan is committed to strengthening and improving its high schools to this end. Michigan is also committed to serving the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium of 32 states as a governing state and to implementing assessments in both English language arts and mathematics.

Michigan is to be commended for its membership and active participation in three consortia whose goals foster its commitment to adopting a common set of high- quality standards.

B.1.ii The adoption of the Common Core State Standards provides an opportunity for Michigan to build upon its momentum in implementing increasingly rigorous, internationally benchmarked, and evidence-based standards. Michigan is currently in the process of updating standards and content expectations for visual, performing, and applied arts in collaboration with institutions of higher education and national content organizations. It has already developed, as part of the College Career Readiness agenda, guidance for standards in content areas. Michigan has revised the Common Core Standards for consistency with Michigan standards and content expectations in mathematics and English language arts. Other non-Common Core content areas such as health, physical education, and online learning experiences have recently been updated or developed. It has invited stakeholders to comment on the draft of Common Core Standards and has presented an analysis of the consistency of Common Core standards with Michigan standards and content expectations to the State Board of Education. The Common Core Standards will be presented to the State Board of Education for consideration on June 5, 2010. The Michigan Department of Education will submit an amendment to this application the the United States Department of Education no later than June 30, 2010 providing evidence of the State Board of Education's adoption of the Common Core Standards.

Michigan has planned carefully for the adoption of the Common Core Standards as evidenced by three related Appendices. The State realizes the importance of this application in that it will help Michigan accelerate toward full adoption, and most importantly, toward increased student achievement through the implementation of rigorous common standards throughout its education systems.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

B.2.1.ii As a governing state, Michigan will lead the development and implementation of the next generation of large-scale assessments through participation in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium. SMARTER prioritizes assessments that are grounded in a thoughtfully integrated learning system of standards, curriculum, assessment, instruction, and teacher development. In addition, the Consortium of 32 states plans to build a system of assessments that includes: common summative and interim benchmark tests in English language arts in mathematics; formative assessment processes, tools, and supports; focused professional development; reporting systems that provide first-hand evidence of student performance; and using technology to deliver the assessments and provide results as quickly as possible. This type of assessment is critical to support the successful implementation of Michigan's collaboratively developed Framework for Educator Evaluations. Michigan will collaborate fully with the SMARTER Balanced Consortium states to classify the Common Core Standards according to depth of knowledge ranking to guarantee that corresponding assessments contain comparable portions of items. The consortium work also entails ensuring that each assessment is fully aligned to college and career readiness standards and benchmarks. Michigan believes that focusing its resources on one coherent consortium-based effort will result in the highest quality assessments for students, as well as the greatest opportunity for stakeholder involvement, investment, and eventual adoption.

Michigan's participation as a leader in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium attests to the State's commitment to improve the quality of assessments aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	20
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

B 3. Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high quality assessments will be provided by Michigan's Responsive Educational Support System (RESPONSE). To support the standards and assessment components of RESPONSE, there are several initiatives which will be described briefly. 1) Rollout. Michigan has extensive experience with the adoption, implementation, and rollout of standards and assessments, in the form of both knowledge of how to do these things and the infrastructures to support these activities. To facilitate the rollout of the Common Core Standards, Michigan will announce the adoption of the Common Core Standards and dates and location of roll-out sessions in June, 2010. The sessions will begin in October, 2010. 2) Alignment of Enhanced Standards with Postsecondary Transition. Michigan content specialists have determined that the draft of Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies and Science and the draft Common Core Standards for Mathematics are consistent with the Michigan Merit Curriculum requirements. 3) Development and Dissemination of Instructional Materials. The materials, practices, and assessments critical to support and inform instruction are provided through the Teaching for Learning website, the use of instructional surveys, the provision of model instructional units, and the implementation of balanced assessment. 4) Development and Implementation of High Quality Professional Development. The state is shifting from focusing on the subject matter content to be taught to the strategies and tools necessary to most effectively teach that content. RESPONSE provides a mechanism by which the state can be responsive, and can target

resources and supports for those districts, schools, and teachers who need them most. 5) Engaging in Other Strategies. These include the P-20 Council whose stakeholders represent the spectrum of needs and experiences of students on the pathway from K-12 to college and beyond. The Math and Science Centers network and Michigan Virtual University will assist teachers in targeted LEAs and struggling schools in integrating Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) content across disciplines to prepare students to be globally competitive in these fields of study.

The range and depth of the initiatives described in this response to Criteria B.3 give a comprehensive view of the degree to which the State's collaboration with participating LEAs has formulated a high quality plan for supporting a statewide transition to K-12 standards and high quality assessments tied to these standards.

Total	70	70
-------	----	----

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	18

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

C.1 Michigan has a statewide longitudinal data system that has incorporated 9 of the 12 essential elements outlined by the America Competes Act and is well on the way to completing the other three. The completed elements are as follows: 1) Statewide Student identifier, 2) Student level enrollment, demographic, and participation data, 3) Student-level graduation, transfer, and dropout rate, 5) Audit systems to address data quality, validity, and reliability, 6) Yearly assessment record of students, 7) Information on students not tested, 9) Student level transcript data, 10) Student level college readiness scores, 11) Successful student transition to high education with remediation information.

Element 4-Ability of PK-12 and higher education systems to communicate is completed for PK-12 and in progress for postsecondary. Element 8-Teacher identifier system linked to students will be developed according to a designated time frame. Element 12-Other information necessary for success in higher education is developing new processes and systems to accomplish this. The application states that Michigan's lack of a student teacher link (Element 8) is not related primarily to technical issues, but rather to statewide debate over the importance of implementing this link at the state level. Race to the Top has provided a critical opportunity for Michigan to focus attention on this need. Michigan has also made significant strides toward collecting data that provides other information necessary for success in higher education (Element 12).

The State is commended for the explanations given concerning the implementation of each of the 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	5
----------------------------------------------	---	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

C.2. Michigan has focused on providing and extending access to and support for the use of data by four key stakeholder groups: educators, the state department of education, and other state agencies; the research community, and students, parents and the interested public. Michigan plans to give particular attention to strengthening state and LEA collaboration with major research universities. This will help establish systems whereby relevant information on research-based instructional practices can be disseminated to K-12 teachers. Working with the state, a consortium of Intermediate School Districts built a reporting system that translates state-collected data into actionable reports to inform instruction at the district, building and classroom levels. Over the past four years, the Regional Educational Laboratory-Midwest has been providing technical assistance to the Michigan Department of Education. This assistance

utilizes longitudinal data from the registry of Educational Personnel, student data, and student demographic data to answer key questions generated by the state regarding Michigan's instructional workforce. Results will be put into context and will initiate conversations about the use of data for decision making and local improvement efforts.

Michigan's response to this Criteria confirms its efforts to ensure that data will be accessible and used to inform, not only key stakeholders, but also students, parents, and the interested public.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	16
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	4
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6

(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

C.3.1 Two data systems are already in place: Data System for Students and Regional Data Initiatives. Regional Data Initiatives are data warehouse systems that provide data aggregation and analysis tools by which education data is utilized. In 2009, the Michigan Department of Education released a competitive grant entitled "Improving Instruction through Regional Data Initiatives." Responding to this grant, all 57 of Michigan's intermediate school districts self-organized into eight consortia for rolling out professional development programs. Under the eight regional consortia, 98 percent of districts and 45 percent of charter schools have signed up to gain access to classroom-level, instructional improvement systems. Additional initiatives include Framework for Educator Evaluations and professional development related to the use of data to inform instruction.

This response focuses on the utilization of Data for Student Success and Regional Data Initiatives. It also links them with the Responsive Instruction Support System, the Framework for Education Evaluation, and professional development. The fusion of these initiatives provides a key component of a high-quality plan.

C.3.ii Professional development around the use of instructional support will be delivered through the Regional Data Initiatives. Each of the eight consortia is required to offer teachers and administrators four days of professional development which address understanding data and using it to inform instruction. In order to measure the new round of development activities in terms of changes in instructional practice at the classroom level, a comprehensive program evaluation is being administered and sent to building level administrators and classroom teachers. The impact of measuring professional development includes training teachers and principals on how to determine the quality of professional development based on outcomes.

The goal of Criteria C.3.ii is to support participating LEAs by providing effective professional development. Only two initiatives were described. More information about extending and expanding professional development is needed.

C.3.iii Michigan is already sharing data for research purposes with the Regional Educational Laboratory-Midwest, the Michigan Consortium for Educational Research, and the Regional Data Initiatives. The eight Regional Data Initiative consortia each identified a Michigan teacher preparation institution as a research partner to give the consortia the ability to conduct action research using formative and summative data shared across the initiative. Work on the regional action research has begun with the selection of research area by each consortium and its research partner. Among the topics selected for research are impact of early childhood interventions on school readiness, data elements needed to provide a complete picture of postsecondary readiness, development and impact of interim assessments across a region, and impact on student achievement by the use of assessment data. Michigan plans to accelerate efforts to bring together the research partners from the regional data initiatives, state universities, and the private sector to

investigate and report on areas of critical importance in the delivery and overall improvement of instructional practices and academic achievement.

Michigan's plan to share data for research purposes is underway and its realization of what is still needed reflects commitment to its goals.

Total	47	39
-------	----	----

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	6
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	2
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	2
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	2

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D.1.i In Michigan, legislation permits alternative certification routes which operate independently of institutions of higher education. There are five elements which define an alternative route. Only one of these elements is indicated in the narrative (Are selective in selecting candidates).

The following information summarizes Michigan's response to this criteria. Michigan is committed to creating and enabling innovation in teacher preparation, both within colleges and schools of education and through other agencies, insofar as that will lead to the preparation of more and better teachers. Using funds which were awarded through a Teacher Quality Enhancement grant in 2002, the state built an infrastructure for reforming its teacher preparation system, improving teacher induction, and mentoring and expanding alternate route programs offered by teacher preparation institutions. Michigan State University was awarded a sub-grant to administer this program. The State Department of Education has continued this commitment to innovation within universities by inviting programs to submit alternative certification programs in all areas. Michigan's Research I universities are models for some of these experiments. The Michigan legislature has enhanced the state's ability to offer alternative preparation programs that meet the needs of both school districts and potential teacher candidates by providing that the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall develop a process to grant an interim teaching certificate that authorizes an individual to teach in public schools while completing an alternate route program. The emphasis of this legislation was to streamline the process for implementing alternate, innovative, and high quality programs. Approved programs require candidates to pass both the Michigan Test for Teacher certification in basic skills and appropriate subject area examinations prior to acceptance into the alternate route program. The law became effective in January, 2010, and the Michigan Department of Education will accept applications from providers interested in establishing approved alternate programs beginning in fall 2010.

The application does not provide sufficient information concerning alternate routes in practice at this time.

D.1.ii The State Department of Education has continued its commitment to innovation within universities by inviting programs to submit alternative certifications programs in all areas. There are three Research 1 universities: Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, and Wayne State.

The only alternative route program that was clearly mentioned was the University of Michigan's recent agreement to offer an alternate route preparation program for at least 75 Teach for America corps members to teach in schools in the Detroit area.

D.1.iii Michigan is also committed to encouraging existing programs to recruit the best people in its schools, especially in urban and rural areas that need them most, and in areas that are hard to staff. Funds

will be used to conduct consequential validity studies on alternate preparations, teacher shortages, and models of effective incentives that will inform policy development. In Michigan, the administrative license was eliminated by legislative action in 1995. School leader positions, by state law, were open to anyone who met the local district's requirements with or without the benefits of an administrator program or license. Michigan's universities continued to offer graduate programs in educational leadership. Legislation passed in 2006 reversed this situation by establishing a voluntary administrator certificate which could be required by employers. Legislation passed in December, 2009 made the school administration certificate mandatory for any Michigan educational leader with primary responsibility for administering instructional programs.

The application narrative does not directly address a process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortages and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortages.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	46
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	10
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	20

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D.2.i The Michigan Department of Education has developed a student growth model for measuring progress in reading and mathematics. This model is in operation for the current Michigan assessments. It will be reviewed, enhanced, and/or replaced as new assessments are implemented' and enhancements will be made over time with existing assessments growth measured by looking at the transition from year to year. In order to calculate valid measure of student growth, it is necessary to have yearly measurements of student achievement in each subject. Michigan is proposing two major activities to provide this data: New Common Core Assessments (summative and interim benchmark), and a New High School College Preparation Battery. The Common Core assessment will be provided by the SMARTER Balanced-Assessment Consortium if that consortium is funded and through another consortium if not. New locally designed assessments for use by any LEA will develop summative, formative and interim benchmark assessments in non-Common Core subject areas, grades, and/or specialty areas beginning in 2010-2011. This will provide a much more diverse body of assessments across all subjects.

Michigan will gradually replace previous assessment instruments as new assessments are implemented. A timeline is needed to indicate how this will be done.

D.2.ii Four major organizations came together to develop a Framework for Educator Evaluations in response to Michigan's new law requiring teacher and administrator evaluations. The Framework carefully tracks the requirements of Michigan law and provides suggested mechanisms for meaningful implementation of the law. The Framework is available in Appendix D 3 in its entirety. The Framework includes not only teachers, and principals, but expands to district and intermediate school district superintendents, central office staff, as well as state staff and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction has indicated his commitment to use the framework for his evaluations. The framework includes a provision signaling a two-way commitment between leaders and teachers that not only will teachers and leaders be evaluated by the supervisors, but that leaders' goals against which they are evaluated must include the provision of support and resources to employees to enable them to meet their goals.

Michigan has designed and plans to implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals. A time line is needed to indicate the progress in developing these systems.

2.iii Michigan law has long required evaluations for probationary teachers. Starting in January, 2010, it also

requires annual evaluations for all (including tenured) teachers and school administrators, with timely and constructive feedback required. The law also specifies that multiple performances rating categories must be used which take into account data on student growth as a significant factor. The law applies to all districts in the state, whether or not they participate in Race to the Top. Initiatives which will provide mechanisms for providing annual evaluations include the Framework for Educator Evaluations, the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium, and the RESPONSE system. Focusing Michigan Department of Education attention and resources on rapid turnaround has reduced the wait from the time assessments are completed to the time results are returned to educators.

Michigan is to be commended for the number and quality of provisions used to conduct annual evaluation of teachers and principals

D.2.iv The RESPONSE system is an ongoing mechanism of instruction, assessment, analysis, and targeted intervention. Michigan is implementing annual educator evaluations as part of a system-wide realignment to focus intently on improving instruction through the targeted use of quality data in order to improve student achievement outcomes and close achievement gaps. New laws regarding teacher tenure and collective bargaining describe more rigorous evaluations based on student achievement/growth. These new laws explicitly require the use of evaluations to inform decisions regarding: the effectiveness of teachers and school administrators, promotion, retention, the development of teachers and school administrators, whether to grant tenure or full certification, or both, to teachers and administrators, and removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and school administrators.

New laws require the use of evaluations to inform decisions. A number of key decisions regarding teachers and principals was presented in Michigan's response to this criteria but the process for using evaluations to inform these decisions was not discussed.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	19
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	12
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and speciality areas	10	7

(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D.3.i The priority of the state is to ensure that students in high-poverty and high-minority schools have equitable access to effective teachers. The definition of high-poverty and high-minority schools is in accord with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Michigan plan focuses on identifying shortage areas, recruiting and preparing teachers and administrators and keeping them. The process is initiated by collecting the Registrar of Educational Personnel twice annually in order to monitor evaluations, and to identify areas of teacher shortage. An annual list of teacher shortages is then prepared. Effectiveness is a new criterion by which teachers and principals will be evaluated. Michigan has a teacher identifier system in place and will expand it to link student achievement and growth data to specific teachers and schools, thereby linking these data to principals. Data systems utilized by the state can determine whether effective teachers are equitably distributed in schools and will allow determination as to effectiveness of principals staffing high and high-minority schools. Once data is available, Michigan will target efforts on ensuring that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have access to highly effective teachers and principals.

It would seem that utilizing data already attainable will help to provide student access to effective teachers and principals.

D.3.ii In order to attract qualified candidates, the Michigan Department of Education directs teacher preparation institutions to prepare teachers in areas of shortage by implementing the "Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Score and Corrective Action Plan." One of the criteria in the performance score awards points to teacher preparation institutions that respond to state needs by preparing more teachers in high-need or shortage areas such as mathematics, science, world languages, and special education. In

order to use the teacher and principal shortage data to adequately recruit and prepare teachers and principals to fill these critical shortage areas, Michigan plans to take the following steps: Promote the portability of tenure to attract highly effective teachers to fill these shortage areas; Collaborate with Research I universities to recruit laid off engineers and other professionals into teaching; and Work with agencies and universities invested in administrator and teacher preparation to create innovative and alternate routes to certification.

Ensuring equitable distribution of hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas is a great concern. A timeline concerning the implementation of initiatives is needed.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	9
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	5
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	4

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D.4.i Michigan proposes that the State's three recent Research I Universities serve as co-partners for a statewide Teacher and Administrator Preparation Research Consortium which will design research that collects data on program effectiveness. Research on the effects of teacher and administrator preparation in Michigan, designed with the Michigan Department of Education, will provide the state with additional data sources for data triangulation linked to measuring PreK-12 student performance and teacher performance. Calls for rigorous, systematic, and longitudinal inquiry into administrator preparation programs convey equal urgency. Research will be undertaken to determine effectiveness of various approaches to preparing administrators in managing instructional programs. The data for each credentialing institution will be publicized.

Initiatives to link student data to credential programs are in the planning stage. The timeline indicating their implementation is insufficient.

D.4.ii The Michigan Department of Education is establishing strategies for publicly reporting the effectiveness of its teacher preparation institutions. The "Teacher Preparation Performance Score Report and Corrective Action Plan" uses a set of criteria to assess institutions and derive a score that identifies them as exemplary, satisfactory, at-risk, and low performing. Michigan realizes that, in order to make critical, high stakes decisions, a careful and well-designed system must be in place, and for this purpose, Michigan's proposal in its Race to the Top application has requested funds to undertake a series of relevant initiatives. .

Much more planning is needed to expand effective credentialing programs and to formulate a comprehensive timeline.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	16
(i) Providing effective support	10	10
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	6

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

D.5.i Michigan aims to build a quality professional development infrastructure by supporting the preparation of a cadre of professional development leaders to carry out their functions, including using data to improve and close programs as appropriate. The system will streamline responsive and effective professional development for pre-service to veteran teachers and leaders based on data-derived instructional needs at state, local, and individual levels. In order to monitor, coordinate, and continuously improve professional development, the Accelerate Michigan Office will convene a cross-functional professional development team of stakeholders drawn primarily from members of the P-20 Council who will collect data and use

existing high standards to evaluate programs. The Michigan Department of Education will develop criteria, based on the results of high quality and rigorous reviews of existing research literature to determine and specify the type of systemic professional development that will lead to a sustained increase of teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

Aware of its limitations and acknowledging them, Michigan is proposing a plan to provide effective support to teachers and principals. The measures described can lead to instructional improvement.

D.5.ii In order to ensure that each initiative articulated in the budget narrative for this section is making a substantive impact on student achievement and closing achievement gaps, the state will allocate resources specifically for research and evaluation. Each collaborative grant to support these efforts will be measuring the effectiveness of professional development each year covered by Race to the Top. Research and evaluation grant recipients will be required to submit quarterly reports to the Accelerate Michigan Office documenting the implementation of grant goals. At the end of each year, the reports will be required to include summary information and recommendations on how the Michigan Department of Education can support local districts in the continuous improvement of each professional development initiative.

The information provided in response to this criteria was not sufficient.

Total	138	96
-------	-----	----

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

Michigan law gives the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State's chief education officer, far reaching authority to intervene in the the lowest achieving school and LEAs that are in improved or in corrective action status. The Superintendent also has the authority to provide technical assistance to any school that is unaccredited. In Michigan, standards for school accreditation are based primarily, but not solely, on student achievement. Recent legislation accelerates intervention through a new statute which authorizes the state superintendent to place the persistent lowest-achieving schools (as defined by Race to the Top and School Improvement guidelines) under the supervision of the State School Reform/Redesign Officer. The officer 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. If an authorizing body for a charter school does not engage in appropriate continuing oversight of its charter schools, the state may revoke authorizing privileges.

Behind the data explaining how intervention takes place in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs are guidelines and procedures. The data indicate that Michigan works continually to improve the State's system of support and intervention.

(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)

E.2.i Accelerate Michigan demands a concentration of efforts on those schools that are the lowest-achieving schools in the state. A set of business rules was formulated to allow a ranking of all schools in the state. A proposed state statute provides for the identification of persistently lowest achieving schools by the use of a set of business rules which were formulated to allow a ranking of all schools in the state. (The

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
(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)

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.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	28
(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.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
-----------------------------------------------------------------	----------	----------

(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
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15

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
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <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>		
Total		0
Grand Total	500	436