



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the State Board of Education

FROM: Jeremy M. Hughes, Acting Superintendent 

DATE: February 22, 2005

SUBJ: CONSEQUENCES FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

One of the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) is for the Michigan Department of Education to develop and implement “a single, statewide State accountability system that will be effective in ensuring that all local educational agencies, public elementary schools, and public secondary schools make adequate yearly progress” and for that system to “include sanctions . . . the State will use to hold local educational agencies . . . accountable for student achievement and . . . adequate yearly progress (AYP).” (Section 1111) Schools that do not receive Title I funds are not required by NCLB to implement the Title I funded consequences such as school choice and transportation and the provision of supplemental educational services. However, non-Title I schools are subject to any consequences in the statewide accountability system.

The current accreditation system, Education YES!, is structured to provide each school with either a grade or an unaccredited status. The grade a school receives is affected by the school’s AYP status with the intent of linking the accreditation system with the NCLB accountability requirements. Education YES! does not specifically address the consequences for non-Title I schools that do not make AYP.

The current State School Code provides some authority for MDE to impose consequences on any school that is unaccredited for three consecutive years. (MCL 380.1280) The state statute also confers on the Department the responsibility for providing technical assistance to schools that are unaccredited.

The Department provides technical assistance to non-Title I schools through district and regional efforts, professional development activities, and through the state’s professional educational organizations.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

To bring the state into full compliance with NCLB and to align the state and federal accountability systems, staff have proposed a twofold solution – specifying the consequences that will be required of non Title I schools and requesting changes to the State School Code to update the accreditation language and align accountability measures. The following table outlines the recommended consequences for non-Title I schools that are identified for improvement after not making AYP for more than two consecutive years.

School Improvement Phase	Title I Schools	Non-Title I Schools
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choice and Transportation • 2 year plan 	Develop and Implement School Improvement Plan
II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplemental Services • Choice and Transportation • 2 year plan 	2 nd Year of School Improvement Plan
III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corrective Action • Supplemental Services • Choice and Transportation 	Choose from specific Corrective Action options
IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for Restructuring • Supplemental Services • Choice and Transportation 	Plan for Restructuring using cost neutral options
V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Restructuring • Supplemental Services • Choice and Transportation 	Implement Restructuring Plan

The requirement for a continuing school improvement plan currently exists in the Revised School Code. (MCL 380.1277) The proposed accountability measures would include the following:

Phase 1: Develop and Implement School Improvement Plan

- A review through the ISD/ESA and MDE partnership
- Professional Development specified in the plan
- An assurances process with a sign off by the ISD/ESA

Phase 2: 2nd Year of School Improvement Plan

- Submit a progress report detailing the results of the implementation efforts

Phase 3: Choose from specific cost-neutral Corrective Action options

- Replace staff
- Curtail school-based decision-making authority
- Restructure school operations
- Substantive curricular change, such as block scheduling in content areas

Phase 4: Plan for Restructuring using cost neutral options

- Replace staff, may include the Principal
- Suspend school-based decision-making authority
- Suspend the office of the Principal
- Implement alternative governance with a school Governing Board or School Improvement Team

Phase 5: Implement Restructuring plan

This information is being presented to the State Board of Education for their information and discussion. After gathering input from schools and school districts, this item will be brought back to the Board for approval.