



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING

RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

January 22, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Presentation on Public School Academy (PSA) Authorizer Performance Metrics

The report (Attachment A) on PSA Authorizer Performance Metrics has been prepared in response to a request from the State Board of Education (SBE).

Michigan Department of Education staff requested the assistance of the Michigan State University's Education Policy Center (MSU EPC) to compile data and prepare the report, which compares the performance of large PSA authorizers using the same business rules for the state's Top to Bottom school list.

In addition, MDE staff prepared a chart and several graphs that illustrate the number of Priority, Focus and Reward schools by authorizer (Attachment B).

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

JOHN C. AUSTIN – PRESIDENT • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH – VICE PRESIDENT
DANIEL VARNER – SECRETARY • RICHARD ZEILE – TREASURER
MICHELLE FECTEAU – NASBE DELEGATE • LUPE RAMOS-MONTIGNY
KATHLEEN N. STRAUS • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

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

**Education Policy Center
Michigan State University
A Comparison of Michigan's Charter School Authorizers**

By Liyang Mao and Bettie Landauer-Menchik, Education Policy Center, Michigan State University

Purpose

This study compares the performance of the large charter school authorizers in Michigan by using Michigan's 2011-12 School Ranking Business Rules, i.e. the rules used for the state's school top to bottom list. Large authorizers are defined as those with three or more schools. Part I ranks authorizers by the Top to Bottom rules. Part II compares the growth rates of authorizers using Michigan's rules in order to make a reasonable comparison to the CREDO report. Part III of this study compares subgroup performance by authorizer using the Top to Bottom ranking rules.

The eleven charter authorizers included in this study have authorized at least three schools in the state.

- | | |
|--|--|
| • Bay Mills Community College (BMCC) | • Lake Superior State University (LSSU) |
| • Central Michigan University (CMU) | • Northern Michigan University (NMU) |
| • Detroit Public Schools (DPS) | • Oakland University (OU) |
| • Eastern Michigan University (EMU) | • Saginaw Valley State University (SVSU) |
| • Ferris State University (FSU) | • Wayne RESA (WRESA) |
| • Grand Valley State University (GVSU) | |

Three authorizers account for almost two-thirds of full academic year (FAY) charter school students taking Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) test: Central Michigan University (CMU), Grand Valley State University (GVSU), and Bay Mills Community College (BMCC). CMU, GVSU, and Saginaw Valley State University (SVSU) account for 45% of high school students taking the Michigan Merit Exam (MME).

Part I: Applying Michigan's Top to Bottom Rules for Authorizers

Part I of this study created a top to bottom ranking for the eleven large authorizers based on the MDE's 2011-12 School Ranking Business Rules. Ranking calculations for the "all students group" are based on MEAP or MME test and do not include students who took MEAP-Access or MI-Access. Only Full Academic Year (FAY) students were included.

The ranking is based on *student achievement*, *student growth over time*, *authorizer improvement over time*, and *achievement gaps* across all five tested subjects (mathematics, reading, science, social studies, and writing), as well as the graduation rate for authorizers with graduating students.

Disclaimer: The content of this paper represents the work of the authors and does not necessarily represent the views of the Education Policy Center or Michigan State University

Specifically, authorizers were rank ordered using a proficiency index (weighted average of two years of achievement data), a progress index (two or four years of achievement data), and an achievement gap index (weighted average of two years of top/bottom 30 percent of students' achievement data). Authorizers with graduating students also had graduation rate and graduation rate improvement variable included in their ranking calculation.

Achievement is weighted more than improvement or achievement gaps. This is because the focus is on persistently low-achieving schools. Weighting achievement 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 improvement and/or increase their improvement to a degree that will lead reasonably quickly to adequate achievement levels.

Table 1 shows the number of full academic year students (FAY) from the most recent MEAP and MME tests.

Table 1: Number of Full Academic Year Students by Authorizer for MEAP 2011 and MME 2012

Number of FAY student tested in MEAP 2011						Number of FAY student tested in MME 2012					
	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies		Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies
BMCC	11,426	10,085	10,059	3,389	3,143	BMCC	350	350	348	350	354
CMU	16,940	14,652	14,609	4,870	4,779	CMU	843	846	850	847	843
DPS	994	820	817	276	256	DPS	131	138	138	134	137
EMU	2,098	1,881	1,879	630	571	EMU	61	63	66	62	62
FSU	4,754	4,057	4,056	1,344	1,338	FSU	335	340	348	342	339
GVSU	12,913	11,223	11,208	3,780	3,711	GVSU	495	502	503	496	500
LSSU	2,970	2,539	2,536	868	805	LSSU	176	176	175	176	176
NMU	1,575	1,366	1,356	446	444	NMU	27	27	27	27	27
OU	3,434	2,983	2,989	1,023	960	OU	128	128	128	128	128
SVSU	6,341	5,338	5,328	1,770	1,857	SVSU	732	735	734	734	737
WRESA	756	640	642	187	224	WRESA	217	224	226	219	218

Three authorizers account for almost two-thirds of charter school students taking MEAP: CMU, GVSU, and BMCC. CMU, GVSU, and SVSU account for 45% of high school students taking MME.

Table 2 shows the ranking for the authorizers using the same methodology as the state's top to bottom ranking. The ranking is based on *student achievement*, *student growth over time*, *authorizer improvement over time*, and *achievement gaps* across all five tested subjects (mathematics, reading, science, social studies, and writing), as well as the graduation rate for authorizers with graduating students.

Table 2: Ranking of Authorizers using the State Top to Bottom Rules

Authorizer	MEAP z-scores					MME z-scores					Graduation Rate Index	Authorizer Performance Index
	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies		
GVSU	1.69	1.68	1.50	1.30	0.33	0.83	1.54	0.65	1.04	1.29	1.09	1.18
LSSU	0.48	0.70	0.28	0.50	0.21	1.55	0.77	1.02	1.18	1.33	0.44	0.77
CMU	1.48	0.98	0.72	-0.36	1.25	0.33	0.88	0.66	0.88	0.82	0.14	0.70
OU	-0.47	0.07	0.41	0.54	1.15	0.34	-0.39	0.62	0.10	-0.68	0.50	0.20
WRESA	0.37	0.52	0.21	0.35	-0.37	0.31	0.07	0.27	0.35	0.79	-0.92	0.17
SVSU	-0.65	-0.51	-0.59	-1.07	0.45	-0.12	0.34	0.44	0.61	-0.04	0.41	-0.06
BMCC	0.45	-0.08	0.61	-0.53	0.57	-0.66	-1.80	-1.13	-0.67	-1.22	0.90	-0.31
FSU	-0.59	-0.75	0.49	-0.65	-0.70	-0.29	0.14	-0.48	-0.48	-1.01	0.18	-0.37
NMU	-0.17	0.28	-2.04	-0.02	0.28	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-1.02	-0.40
EMU	-1.20	-1.90	-1.31	-1.72	-1.01	-0.03	-0.29	0.17	-1.50	-0.15	0.55	-0.75
DPS	-1.40	-0.98	-0.27	1.65	-2.17	-2.25	-1.28	-2.22	-1.52	-1.13	-2.27	-1.27

The MEAP and MME subject areas show the z-scores for each content area and the graduation rate. The last column is the Authorizer Performance Index. The Authorizer Performance Index shows the rank order using a proficiency index (weighted average of two years of achievement data), a progress index (two or four years of achievement data), and an achievement gap index (weighted average of two years of top/bottom 30 percent of students' achievement data). Authorizers with graduating students also had graduation rate and graduation rate improvement included in their ranking calculation. Scores that are positive show those authorizers that rank above the average across the eleven authorizers. GVSU ranks highest among the listed authorizers followed by LSSU and CMU. Scores that are negative show those authorizers below the average of the eleven authorizers. EMU and DPS rank lowest.

Part II: Michigan's Growth Model compared to CREDO's

Tables 3 and 4 are provided to show a reasonable comparison with the CREDO results ***IF*** the CREDO study had used the same methodology that Michigan uses to evaluate growth. Michigan uses FAY students in its growth measure. ***CREDO does not use FAY data in its study and uses a different definition of growth than Michigan does.*** CREDO includes students matched to comparable Traditional Public Schools (TPS) students with similar demographics. For example, Black students who receive free and reduced price lunch in charter schools in Detroit are compared to similar students in TPS in Detroit.

Table 3 shows the cumulative growth/progress of students in math for the last three years of MEAP *using only FAY students*. The four comparisons include the percent of students proficient (proficient in 2008-11), the percent of students Improving or Significantly Improving, the percent of students Not Proficient but Improving, and the percent of students moving from Not or Partially Proficient to Proficient or Advanced (growth from 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11).

Table 3: Cumulative Growth in Math from 2009 - 2011 for students in grade 3-8

Math Cumulative Growth					
PSAname	N_math	Percent Proficient	Percent Improving	Not/Partially Proficient but Improving	Not/Partially Proficient -> Proficient/Advanced
State	1,579,995	37%	33%	25%	8%
All TPSs	1,481,841	38%	33%	25%	8%
The 11 Large Authorizers	98,138	27%	36%	30%	8%
CMU, GVSU, and LSSU	49,767	32%	36%	29%	9%
BMCC	17,903	25%	36%	31%	8%
CMU	26,046	29%	36%	29%	8%
DPS	1,487	21%	36%	33%	10%
EMU	3,438	22%	34%	30%	7%
FSU	6,887	16%	38%	35%	7%
GVSU	19,204	36%	36%	28%	9%
LSSU	4,517	35%	37%	29%	10%
NMU	2,524	24%	33%	29%	7%
OU	5,521	23%	34%	30%	8%
SVSU	9,697	20%	33%	29%	7%
WRESA	914	23%	40%	36%	10%

Approximately 37% of students statewide were proficient on the math tests, compared to 38% of students in TPS, 27% in schools of the large authorizers, and 32% of students in schools affiliated with the three major authorizers. The growth rate for each of the authorizers was equivalent or higher than the state average. It is reasonable to expect that students who are not proficient are more likely to improve than students who are already proficient. While students in DPS and WRESA authorized schools are less likely to be proficient in math than the state average, they have a higher percentage of students improving, including students moving from not proficient to proficient.

Table 4 shows the cumulative growth/progress of students in reading for the last three years of MEAP *using only FAY students*. The four comparisons include the percent of students proficient (proficient in 2008-11), the percent of students Improving or Significantly Improving, the percent of students Not Proficient but Improving, and the percent of students moving from Not or Partially Proficient to Proficient or Advanced (growth from 2008-9, 2009-10, and 2010-11).

***Table 4: Cumulative Growth in Reading from 2009 - 2011
for students in grade 3-8***

Reading Cumulative Growth					
PSAname	N_reading	Percent Proficient	Percent Improving	Not/Partially Proficient but Improving	Not/Partially Proficient -> Proficient/ Advanced
State	1,577,792	62%	37%	19%	10%
All TPSs	1,479,740	62%	37%	19%	10%
The 11 Large Authorizers	98,036	52%	40%	25%	12%
CMU, GVSU, and LSSU	49,714	58%	39%	22%	12%
BMCC	17,899	50%	41%	26%	12%
CMU	26,017	55%	40%	24%	11%
DPS	1,487	43%	39%	28%	15%
EMU	3,432	41%	39%	28%	12%
FSU	6,887	38%	42%	32%	13%
GVSU	19,191	62%	38%	21%	11%
LSSU	4,506	61%	40%	22%	13%
NMU	2,504	53%	37%	22%	11%
OU	5,535	47%	40%	28%	13%
SVSU	9,663	45%	40%	28%	13%
WRESA	915	66%	38%	18%	12%

Approximately 62% of students statewide were proficient on the MEAP reading 2011, compared to 62% of students in TPS, 52% in the schools of the large authorizers, and 58% of students in schools affiliated with the three largest authorizers. However, the totality of schools of the included authorizers had higher rates of growth than the TPS.

Part III: Authorizer Comparison by Subgroup

Part III of this study compares the authorizers using the Top to Bottom Business Rules on the MEAP by subgroup: 1) All students; 2) by race and ethnicity (Comparing Black, White and Hispanic students); 3) by Economically Disadvantaged (ED) and Not Economically Disadvantaged (not ED), 4) by Limited English Proficient (LEP) and not Limited English Proficient (not LEP), and 5) by Special Education (SE) and not Special Education (not SE). Within and between each subgroup, authorizers were compared by percent proficient in the MEAP tests in:

- Reading in Grades 3 to 8
- Mathematics in Grades 3 to 8
- Writing in Grades 4 and 7
- Science in Grades 5 and 8
- Social Studies in Grades 6 and 9

Results

Table 5 shows the number of students tested in MEAP tested grades and the distribution of students. This table can be used to compare the proportion of students in each subgroup by authorizer. In Michigan, race is correlated with economically disadvantaged (ED). Black and Hispanic students are more likely to receive free or reduced price lunch than White students. Students in charter schools are more likely to be Black and ED than the state population as a whole. A smaller percentage of Special Education students are in charter schools than the state population as a whole.

Table 5: Comparison of the number of students tested by subgroup and the distribution of students tested

Number of Students Tested										
Authorizer	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	NotED	LEP	Not LEP	SE	NotSE
State	1,570,028	1,111,664	276,261	93,615	742,697	827,331	59,785	1,510,243	175,360	1,394,668
All Authorizers	109,308	37,976	57,787	7,591	73,555	35,753	5,963	103,345	9,815	99,493
BMCC	19,823	6,224	10,942	1,303	13,604	6,219	1,099	18,724	1,770	18,053
CMU	28,915	11,674	14,414	1,373	18,494	10,421	1,183	27,732	2,630	26,285
DPS	1,602	2	1,592	6	1,195	407		1,602	112	1,490
EMU	3,549	510	2,751	165	2,815	734	98	3,451	392	3,157
FSU	7,842	1,750	4,954	780	6,403	1,439	735	7,107	736	7,106
GVSU	21,775	9,083	9,832	1,339	12,773	9,002	544	21,231	1,996	19,779
LSSU	5,242	2,046	2,796	217	3,145	2,097	171	5,071	469	4,773
NMU	2,731	952	755	401	1,974	757	155	2,576	310	2,421
OU	5,997	1,824	4,068	40	4,637	1,360	664	5,333	356	5,641
SVSU	10,688	3,473	5,131	1,880	7,970	2,718	1,306	9,382	966	9,722
WRESA	1,144	438	552	87	545	599	8	1,136	78	1,066

Distribution of Students Tested										
Authorizer	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	Not ED	LEP	Not LEP	SE	NotSE
State	100%	71%	18%	6%	47%	53%	4%	96%	11%	89%
All Authorizers	100%	35%	53%	7%	67%	33%	5%	95%	9%	91%
BMCC	100%	31%	55%	7%	69%	31%	6%	94%	9%	91%
CMU	100%	40%	50%	5%	64%	36%	4%	96%	9%	91%
DPS	100%	0%	99%	0%	75%	25%	0%	100%	7%	93%
EMU	100%	14%	78%	5%	79%	21%	3%	97%	11%	89%
FSU	100%	22%	63%	10%	82%	18%	9%	91%	9%	91%
GVSU	100%	42%	45%	6%	59%	41%	2%	98%	9%	91%
LSSU	100%	39%	53%	4%	60%	40%	3%	97%	9%	91%
NMU	100%	35%	28%	15%	72%	28%	6%	94%	11%	89%
OU	100%	30%	68%	1%	77%	23%	11%	89%	6%	94%
SVSU	100%	32%	48%	18%	75%	25%	12%	88%	9%	91%
WRESA	100%	38%	48%	8%	48%	52%	1%	99%	7%	93%

Statewide 18% of tested students are Black; among the authorizers, the highest percentage of Black students tested is in DPS authorized schools (99%), followed by EMU

(78%), and OU (68%). For the four largest authorizers, the percentage of students tested who are Black is BMCC: (55%), CMU: (50%), SVSU: (48%) and GVSU: (45%).

Table 6: Percentage of FAY students by subgroup proficient in Math and Reading in all tested grades

Math										
	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	NotED	LEP	NotLEP	SE	NotSE
State	37%	42%	15%	23%	22%	50%	18%	37%	13%	39%
BMCC	25%	38%	17%	23%	19%	39%	15%	26%	7%	27%
CMU	28%	42%	15%	26%	19%	46%	16%	29%	10%	30%
DPS	21%	N/A	21%	N/A	18%	29%	N/A	21%	16%	21%
EMU	21%	42%	16%	29%	18%	33%	43%	20%	15%	22%
FSU	16%	27%	10%	17%	14%	27%	10%	17%	5%	18%
GVSU	35%	46%	23%	29%	26%	48%	21%	35%	13%	37%
LSSU	32%	44%	22%	28%	24%	42%	18%	32%	16%	33%
NMU	23%	29%	13%	18%	18%	34%	4%	24%	8%	24%
OU	23%	33%	18%	10%	20%	30%	14%	24%	7%	24%
SVSU	20%	32%	12%	22%	16%	32%	19%	20%	8%	21%
WRESA	23%	32%	16%	25%	13%	33%	N/A	23%	13%	24%

Reading										
	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	NotED	LEP	NotLEP	SE	NotSE
State	63%	70%	40%	49%	49%	76%	30%	65%	26%	67%
BMCC	53%	65%	44%	52%	46%	68%	29%	54%	18%	56%
CMU	56%	69%	43%	53%	46%	74%	27%	57%	23%	59%
DPS	44%	N/A	44%	N/A	40%	56%	N/A	44%	36%	44%
EMU	42%	67%	37%	47%	37%	63%	47%	42%	20%	45%
FSU	40%	51%	35%	38%	36%	60%	19%	43%	17%	43%
GVSU	63%	75%	50%	60%	54%	76%	41%	64%	26%	67%
LSSU	61%	75%	52%	61%	54%	72%	44%	62%	28%	64%
NMU	54%	62%	40%	46%	49%	66%	17%	56%	23%	57%
OU	49%	52%	47%	32%	46%	59%	22%	52%	20%	50%
SVSU	46%	59%	40%	38%	41%	62%	29%	49%	19%	49%
WRESA	67%	79%	57%	71%	57%	76%	N/A	67%	33%	69%

Note: If the number of students is less than 10, the percent proficient was not calculated and is shown as N/A

In math, statewide, 37% of all students tested were proficient. The authorizers vary from a high of 35% proficient by GVSU to a low of 16% by FSU. Statewide, the percent of Black students proficient was 15%, compared to 23% of Black students at schools authorized by GVSU, 22% at schools authorized by LSSU, 21% at schools authorized by DPS. Only 10% of Black students were proficient in schools authorized by FSU and 12% in schools authorized by SVSU. Special Education students at schools authorized by DPS, EMU, and LSSU outperformed students statewide.

In reading, the proficiency rate of all students at schools authorized by Wayne RESA, GVSU and LSSU were close to the state average. The percentage of proficient Black students was higher than the state average for schools authorized by BMCC, CMU, DPS, GVSU, LSSU, OU and WRESA. Special education students at Wayne RESA, LSSU, and DPS authorized schools had a higher percentage of students that were proficient than the state.

Table 7 compares the MEAP proficiency rates for all students on reading and math in grades 5 and 8 grades - the transition years for many students. Writing, science and social studies are shown for the grades where students are tested. Each subject and grade is ranked from the lowest percent proficient to the highest.

Table 7: Proficiency Rates for All students by Test, Grade, and Authorizer

	DPS	FSU	NMU	SVSU	WRESA	OU	BMCC	EMU	CMU	GVSU	LSSU	State
Math_G5	11%	17%	21%	21%	23%	25%	27%	28%	29%	36%	38%	40%
	FSU	EMU	SVSU	NMU	OU	DPS	BMCC	CMU	WRESA	LSSU	GVSU	State
Math_G8	10%	10%	12%	14%	14%	15%	17%	21%	23%	26%	29%	30%
	DPS	FSU	EMU	SVSU	OU	BMCC	NMU	CMU	GVSU	State	LSSU	WRESA
Reading_G5	45%	45%	50%	52%	53%	56%	57%	60%	67%	67%	70%	75%
	FSU	EMU	DPS	SVSU	NMU	BMCC	OU	CMU	State	LSSU	WRESA	GVSU
Reading_G8	39%	40%	43%	44%	46%	49%	50%	54%	59%	59%	61%	61%
	EMU	FSU	NMU	SVSU	BMCC	OU	DPS	CMU	WRESA	LSSU	State	GVSU
Writing_G4	27%	30%	30%	33%	39%	39%	40%	41%	42%	42%	46%	48%
	DPS	EMU	FSU	NMU	SVSU	WRESA	BMCC	CMU	OU	LSSU	State	GVSU
Writing_G7	23%	28%	32%	35%	35%	37%	40%	46%	47%	48%	48%	50%
	FSU	OU	SVSU	EMU	NMU	BMCC	WRESA	CMU	GVSU	LSSU	DPS	State
Science_G5	4%	5%	6%	6%	6%	7%	10%	10%	13%	13%	16%	17%
	FSU	WRESA	NMU	SVSU	OU	EMU	BMCC	CMU	GVSU	LSSU	State	DPS
Science_G8	5%	5%	5%	6%	7%	7%	10%	10%	13%	14%	16%	21%
	FSU	DPS	OU	EMU	SVSU	BMCC	NMU	LSSU	WRESA	CMU	GVSU	State
Social Studies_G6	8%	11%	12%	12%	14%	15%	16%	20%	20%	20%	24%	28%
	DPS	NMU	FSU	EMU	SVSU	BMCC	OU	WRESA	CMU	LSSU	GVSU	State
Social Studies_G9	6%	10%	10%	12%	13%	17%	19%	20%	21%	24%	25%	31%

For most subjects and grades, the state proficiency rate is higher than any of the authorizers. Authorizers that have the highest proficiency rates for most subjects are GVSU and LSSU. Detroit is the highest ranked authorizer for Science in both 5th and 8th grade. LSSU and Wayne RESA outperform the state average in 5th grade reading and LSSU, WRESA, and FVSU outperform the state in 8th grade reading.

Attachment A

Table 8 compares the percentage of proficiency rates on MEAP by race and ethnicity in selected grades in all tested subjects. Proficiency is ranked based on the Black student proficiency rate.

Table 8: Comparison of MEAP Proficiency rates by Subject, Grade, Race and Ethnicity

		NMU	FSU	DPS	SVSU	CMU	BMCC	State	OU	EMU	WRESA	GVSU	LSSU
Math_G5	Black	10%	11%	11%	13%	16%	17%	18%	18%	24%	24%	26%	31%
Math_G5	Hispanic	12%	21%	N/A	22%	23%	27%	25%	N/A	37%	6%	28%	21%
Math_G5	White	32%	27%	N/A	33%	42%	41%	45%	42%	52%	24%	45%	50%
Math_G5	All	21%	17%	11%	21%	29%	27%	40%	25%	28%	23%	36%	38%
		FSU	EMU	NMU	CMU	WRESA	SVSU	State	OU	BMCC	DPS	GVSU	LSSU
Math_G8	Black	5%	5%	7%	8%	8%	9%	9%	10%	11%	15%	17%	17%
Math_G8	Hispanic	21%	7%	11%	19%	15%	6%	16%	N/A	14%	N/A	27%	21%
Math_G8	White	18%	34%	13%	35%	49%	23%	35%	20%	28%	N/A	45%	40%
Math_G8	All	10%	10%	14%	21%	23%	12%	30%	14%	17%	15%	29%	26%
		FSU	NMU	EMU	DPS	SVSU	State	CMU	BMCC	OU	GVSU	LSSU	WRESA
Reading_G5	Black	40%	43%	44%	45%	46%	47%	48%	48%	51%	56%	68%	68%
Reading_G5	Hispanic	47%	47%	60%	N/A	43%	55%	60%	56%	N/A	64%	46%	63%
Reading_G5	White	54%	66%	77%	N/A	63%	73%	73%	66%	58%	76%	76%	83%
Reading_G5	All	45%	57%	50%	45%	52%	67%	60%	56%	53%	67%	70%	75%
		FSU	EMU	NMU	State	SVSU	WRESA	DPS	CMU	BMCC	LSSU	OU	GVSU
Reading_G8	Black	33%	36%	37%	38%	38%	42%	43%	43%	45%	49%	49%	52%
Reading_G8	Hispanic	41%	27%	46%	45%	36%	69%	N/A	55%	51%	61%	N/A	56%
Reading_G8	White	55%	63%	49%	65%	57%	90%	N/A	67%	57%	76%	53%	73%
Reading_G8	All	39%	40%	46%	59%	44%	61%	43%	54%	49%	59%	50%	61%
		NMU	FSU	EMU	SVSU	State	CMU	BMCC	LSSU	WRESA	OU	DPS	GVSU
Writing_G4	Black	17%	25%	26%	26%	28%	29%	32%	35%	36%	39%	40%	40%
Writing_G4	Hispanic	27%	33%	39%	32%	35%	39%	35%	26%	33%	N/A	N/A	42%
Writing_G4	White	35%	36%	29%	43%	51%	51%	47%	51%	45%	40%	N/A	53%
Writing_G4	All	30%	30%	27%	33%	46%	41%	39%	42%	42%	39%	40%	48%
		DPS	EMU	FSU	NMU	State	WRESA	SVSU	BMCC	CMU	LSSU	GVSU	OU
Writing_G7	Black	23%	24%	25%	27%	27%	29%	32%	34%	35%	42%	43%	44%
Writing_G7	Hispanic	N/A	36%	30%	44%	37%	20%	33%	47%	39%	46%	47%	N/A
Writing_G7	White	N/A	49%	46%	44%	54%	52%	42%	47%	58%	58%	57%	53%
Writing_G7	All	23%	28%	32%	35%	48%	37%	35%	40%	46%	48%	50%	47%
		FSU	SVSU	NMU	EMU	BMCC	CMU	GVSU	State	OU	WRESA	LSSU	DPS
Science_G5	Black	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%	4%	13%	16%
Science_G5	Hispanic	3%	3%	N/A	3%	5%	6%	7%	7%	N/A	13%	3%	N/A
Science_G5	White	11%	13%	11%	29%	14%	19%	21%	20%	9%	14%	15%	N/A
Science_G5	All	4%	6%	6%	6%	7%	10%	13%	17%	5%	10%	13%	16%
		FSU	WRESA	EMU	SVSU	NMU	State	CMU	GVSU	OU	BMCC	LSSU	DPS
Science_G8	Black	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	5%	5%	7%	8%	21%
Science_G8	Hispanic	5%	N/A	7%	3%	2%	7%	9%	10%	N/A	7%	6%	N/A
Science_G8	White	13%	13%	32%	13%	7%	19%	17%	24%	10%	16%	23%	N/A
Science_G8	All	5%	5%	7%	6%	5%	16%	10%	13%	7%	10%	14%	21%
		NMU	FSU	EMU	SVSU	CMU	BMCC	State	GVSU	OU	DPS	LSSU	WRESA
Soc St_G6	Black	3%	5%	6%	8%	9%	9%	9%	10%	10%	11%	15%	18%
Soc St_G6	Hispanic	11%	5%	17%	13%	14%	7%	16%	19%	N/A	N/A	20%	10%
Soc St_G6	White	24%	16%	36%	23%	33%	26%	34%	36%	16%	N/A	28%	27%
Soc St_G6	All	16%	8%	12%	14%	20%	15%	28%	24%	12%	11%	20%	20%
		NMU	WRESA	FSU	DPS	CMU	EMU	State	SVSU	GVSU	BMCC	LSSU	OU
Soc St_G9	Black	3%	3%	5%	6%	7%	7%	8%	8%	10%	10%	13%	16%
Soc St_G9	Hispanic	12%	N/A	17%	N/A	25%	9%	19%	10%	22%	24%	16%	N/A
Soc St_G9	White	12%	49%	27%	N/A	36%	40%	37%	24%	45%	29%	42%	25%
Soc St_G9	All	10%	20%	10%	6%	21%	12%	31%	13%	25%	17%	24%	19%

Attachment A

In all subjects, there remain significant gaps between subgroups. Black students are the lowest performing subgroup in all subjects. LSSU, GVSU, and OU have a higher percentage of Black students proficient in almost all subjects than the state. In 8th grade reading, Black students outperform the state in schools of 9 of the authorizers; Hispanic students outperform the state in schools of 5 authorizers; White students outperform the state in schools of 4 authorizers. All students, including the subgroups, in schools authorized by NMU, FSU, EMU, and SVSU (except in 7th grade writing) are less likely to be proficient on these MEAP tests. Students in DPS authorized schools exceed all other authorizers in both 5th and 8th grade science.

Attachment A

Table 9 compares the proficiency rate on MEAP in selected grades in all tested subject by the percentage of students who are Economically Disadvantaged (ED). Student proficiency is ranked based on the proficiency rate of Economically Disadvantaged students.

Table 9: Comparison of MEAP Proficiency rates by Subject, Grade and Economically Disadvantaged

		DPS	FSU	SVSU	WRESA	NMU	CMU	BMCC	OU	State	EMU	GVSU	LSSU
Math_G5	ED	10%	16%	17%	17%	18%	20%	21%	22%	25%	26%	28%	31%
Math_G5	Not ED	12%	25%	33%	28%	28%	45%	40%	34%	53%	36%	48%	51%
Math_G5	All	11%	17%	21%	23%	21%	29%	27%	25%	40%	28%	36%	38%
		WRESA	EMU	SVSU	FSU	CMU	BMCC	NMU	DPS	OU	State	LSSU	GVSU
Math_G8	ED	5%	6%	8%	8%	11%	12%	12%	13%	13%	15%	17%	20%
Math_G8	Not ED	43%	25%	25%	16%	38%	31%	19%	23%	18%	41%	38%	43%
Math_G8	All	23%	10%	12%	10%	21%	17%	14%	15%	14%	30%	26%	29%
		DPS	FSU	EMU	SVSU	BMCC	OU	CMU	NMU	State	GVSU	LSSU	WRESA
Reading_G5	ED	40%	41%	44%	46%	49%	50%	51%	54%	54%	59%	66%	71%
Reading_G5	Not ED	57%	66%	75%	68%	71%	65%	76%	64%	80%	79%	76%	77%
Reading_G5	All	45%	45%	50%	52%	56%	53%	60%	57%	67%	67%	70%	75%
		EMU	FSU	DPS	SVSU	NMU	State	CMU	BMCC	WRESA	OU	LSSU	GVSU
Reading_G8	ED	36%	36%	38%	39%	43%	44%	45%	47%	47%	49%	50%	54%
Reading_G8	Not ED	55%	52%	63%	59%	56%	70%	71%	60%	75%	54%	72%	71%
Reading_G8	All	40%	39%	43%	44%	46%	59%	54%	49%	61%	50%	59%	61%
		NMU	EMU	FSU	SVSU	CMU	BMCC	State	LSSU	WRESA	DPS	OU	GVSU
Writing_G4	ED	25%	26%	28%	28%	31%	32%	33%	33%	36%	36%	36%	40%
Writing_G4	Not ED	46%	32%	39%	48%	59%	54%	60%	55%	46%	52%	50%	60%
Writing_G4	All	30%	27%	30%	33%	41%	39%	46%	42%	42%	40%	39%	48%
		DPS	EMU	WRESA	FSU	NMU	SVSU	State	BMCC	CMU	LSSU	GVSU	OU
Writing_G7	ED	22%	23%	25%	28%	29%	32%	34%	35%	36%	41%	43%	44%
Writing_G7	Not ED	25%	46%	44%	46%	50%	45%	61%	51%	63%	58%	60%	57%
Writing_G7	All	23%	28%	37%	32%	35%	35%	48%	40%	46%	48%	50%	47%
		FSU	EMU	SVSU	BMCC	CMU	OU	NMU	WRESA	GVSU	State	DPS	LSSU
Science_G5	ED	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	7%	8%	8%	11%
Science_G5	Not ED	12%	23%	15%	15%	21%	11%	12%	13%	21%	25%	37%	16%
Science_G5	All	4%	6%	6%	7%	10%	5%	6%	10%	13%	17%	16%	13%
		EMU	SVSU	FSU	CMU	NMU	OU	BMCC	GVSU	State	LSSU	DPS	WRESA
Science_G8	ED	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%	6%	7%	7%	9%	13%	N/A
Science_G8	Not ED	25%	15%	10%	19%	7%	13%	17%	21%	23%	19%	53%	11%
Science_G8	All	7%	6%	5%	10%	5%	7%	10%	13%	16%	14%	21%	5%
		FSU	EMU	DPS	SVSU	BMCC	OU	NMU	CMU	WRESA	GVSU	State	LSSU
Soc St_G6	ED	5%	7%	9%	10%	10%	10%	10%	11%	12%	14%	15%	16%
Soc St_G6	Not ED	26%	35%	16%	27%	26%	18%	31%	38%	28%	37%	40%	27%
Soc St_G6	All	8%	12%	11%	14%	15%	12%	16%	20%	20%	24%	28%	20%
		DPS	WRESA	FSU	EMU	NMU	SVSU	CMU	BMCC	LSSU	GVSU	OU	State
Soc St_G9	ED	5%	6%	8%	8%	8%	10%	12%	12%	13%	15%	15%	17%
Soc St_G9	Not ED	10%	38%	19%	21%	14%	25%	33%	26%	41%	38%	33%	43%
Soc St_G9	All	6%	20%	10%	12%	10%	13%	21%	17%	24%	25%	19%	31%

In schools authorized by GVSU and LSSU Economically Disadvantaged students perform as well or better than the state average on most MEAP tests.

Attachment A

Table 10 compares the proficiency on MEAP in selected grades in math by Limited English Proficiency. Student proficiency is ranked based on the Limited English Proficiency rate.

Table 10: Comparison of MEAP Proficiency rates by Subject, Grade and Limited English Proficiency

		NMU	FSU	LSSU	CMU	BMCC	GVSU	SVSU	State	OU	EMU	DPS	WRESA
Math_G5	LEP	7%	13%	13%	15%	16%	16%	18%	20%	20%	55%	N/A	N/A
Math_G5	Not LEP	22%	18%	39%	29%	28%	37%	22%	40%	25%	27%	11%	23%
Math_G5	All	21%	17%	38%	29%	27%	36%	21%	40%	25%	28%	11%	23%
		SVSU	BMCC	CMU	OU	LSSU	State	FSU	GVSU	DPS	EMU	NMU	WRESA
Math_G8	LEP	6%	7%	8%	8%	10%	10%	11%	14%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math_G8	Not LEP	13%	18%	22%	15%	27%	30%	10%	29%	15%	10%	14%	24%
Math_G8	All	12%	17%	21%	14%	26%	30%	10%	29%	15%	10%	14%	23%
		NMU	FSU	OU	CMU	SVSU	State	BMCC	LSSU	GVSU	EMU	DPS	WRESA
Reading_G5	LEP	17%	17%	21%	28%	33%	34%	40%	43%	45%	60%	N/A	N/A
Reading_G5	Not LEP	60%	48%	56%	61%	55%	69%	57%	71%	68%	50%	45%	75%
Reading_G5	All	57%	45%	53%	60%	52%	67%	56%	70%	67%	50%	45%	75%
		BMCC	OU	State	CMU	FSU	SVSU	LSSU	GVSU	DPS	EMU	NMU	WRESA
Reading_G8	LEP	19%	22%	22%	26%	27%	28%	30%	33%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Reading_G8	Not LEP	51%	55%	60%	55%	40%	45%	60%	61%	43%	40%	48%	61%
Reading_G8	All	49%	50%	59%	54%	39%	44%	59%	61%	43%	40%	46%	61%
		NMU	SVSU	CMU	FSU	BMCC	State	OU	GVSU	LSSU	EMU	DPS	WRESA
Writing_G4	LEP	15%	21%	22%	24%	25%	25%	28%	30%	31%	35%	N/A	N/A
Writing_G4	Not LEP	32%	35%	41%	31%	39%	47%	41%	48%	43%	27%	40%	41%
Writing_G4	All	30%	33%	41%	30%	39%	46%	39%	48%	42%	27%	40%	42%
		NMU	FSU	LSSU	State	BMCC	SVSU	CMU	GVSU	OU	DPS	EMU	WRESA
Writing_G7	LEP	7%	10%	18%	18%	19%	23%	25%	26%	27%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing_G7	Not LEP	36%	34%	49%	49%	41%	37%	47%	51%	50%	23%	28%	37%
Writing_G7	All	35%	32%	48%	48%	40%	35%	46%	50%	47%	23%	28%	37%
		SVSU	OU	CMU	State	GVSU	BMCC	NMU	EMU	DPS	FSU	LSSU	WRESA
Science_G5	LEP	0%	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	5%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science_G5	Not LEP	7%	6%	10%	17%	13%	7%	7%	6%	16%	4%	14%	10%
Science_G5	All	6%	5%	10%	17%	13%	7%	6%	6%	16%	4%	13%	10%
		CMU	OU	BMCC	State	GVSU	LSSU	DPS	EMU	FSU	NMU	SVSU	WRESA
Science_G8	LEP	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	5%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science_G8	Not LEP	10%	8%	10%	16%	13%	14%	21%	7%	5%	6%	7%	5%
Science_G8	All	10%	7%	10%	16%	13%	14%	21%	7%	5%	5%	6%	5%
		BMCC	FSU	CMU	SVSU	State	LSSU	GVSU	EMU	DPS	NMU	OU	WRESA
Soc St_G6	LEP	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	9%	10%	18%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Soc St_G6	Not LEP	15%	9%	21%	16%	29%	21%	24%	12%	11%	17%	13%	20%
Soc St_G6	All	15%	8%	20%	14%	28%	20%	24%	12%	11%	16%	12%	20%
		SVSU	State	NMU	BMCC	CMU	OU	FSU	GVSU	LSSU	DPS	EMU	WRESA
Soc St_G9	LEP	4%	6%	6%	7%	8%	9%	10%	13%	15%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Soc St_G9	Not LEP	14%	32%	10%	18%	21%	21%	10%	25%	24%	6%	11%	20%
Soc St_G9	All	13%	31%	10%	17%	21%	19%	10%	25%	24%	6%	12%	20%

BMCC, CMU and SVSU authorized school have the highest number of LEP students. LEP students in these schools generally do not exceed the state average on performance for any of the MEAP tests.

Attachment A

Table 11 compares the proficiency rate on MEAP in selected grades in all tested subjects by Special Education status. Student proficiency is ranked based on the proficiency rate of Special Education students.

Table 11: Comparison of MEAP Proficiency rates by Subject, Grade for Special Education students

		NMU	OU	BMCC	SVSU	FSU	CMU	GVSU	State	LSSU	EMU	DPS	WRESA
Math_G5	SE	7%	7%	7%	8%	12%	13%	14%	15%	19%	21%	N/A	N/A
Math_G5	Not SE	22%	26%	29%	22%	18%	30%	38%	43%	40%	29%	11%	25%
Math_G5	All	21%	25%	27%	21%	17%	29%	36%	40%	38%	28%	11%	23%
		FSU	NMU	OU	BMCC	SVSU	CMU	LSSU	EMU	State	DPS	GVSU	WRESA
Math_G8	SE	1%	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	8%	10%	N/A
Math_G8	Not SE	11%	15%	15%	19%	13%	23%	28%	11%	32%	15%	31%	24%
Math_G8	All	10%	14%	14%	17%	12%	21%	26%	10%	30%	15%	29%	23%
		NMU	OU	SVSU	BMCC	EMU	FSU	CMU	GVSU	State	DPS	LSSU	WRESA
Reading_G5	SE	18%	18%	21%	23%	24%	25%	30%	30%	31%	31%	42%	50%
Reading_G5	Not SE	61%	55%	54%	59%	53%	47%	63%	71%	72%	46%	72%	76%
Reading_G5	All	57%	53%	52%	56%	50%	45%	60%	67%	67%	45%	70%	75%
		BMCC	FSU	CMU	DPS	SVSU	OU	LSSU	State	GVSU	EMU	NMU	WRESA
Reading_G8	SE	10%	11%	14%	15%	16%	17%	18%	18%	20%	22%	28%	N/A
Reading_G8	Not SE	53%	42%	58%	45%	46%	52%	63%	63%	64%	42%	48%	64%
Reading_G8	All	49%	39%	54%	43%	44%	50%	59%	59%	61%	40%	46%	61%
		SVSU	NMU	LSSU	OU	BMCC	FSU	CMU	EMU	State	WRESA	GVSU	DPS
Writing_G4	SE	6%	8%	9%	9%	10%	10%	15%	16%	17%	19%	20%	44%
Writing_G4	Not SE	36%	33%	45%	41%	41%	32%	43%	28%	50%	43%	50%	40%
Writing_G4	All	33%	30%	42%	39%	39%	30%	41%	27%	46%	42%	48%	40%
		FSU	EMU	BMCC	NMU	SVSU	LSSU	CMU	State	DPS	OU	GVSU	WRESA
Writing_G7	SE	1%	4%	6%	7%	9%	9%	10%	10%	12%	12%	15%	15%
Writing_G7	Not SE	35%	31%	43%	39%	38%	52%	50%	52%	24%	50%	54%	39%
Writing_G7	All	32%	28%	40%	35%	35%	48%	46%	48%	23%	47%	50%	37%
		LSSU	FSU	NMU	SVSU	BMCC	OU	EMU	CMU	State	GVSU	DPS	WRESA
Science_G5	SE	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	6%	7%	12%	N/A
Science_G5	Not SE	14%	4%	7%	6%	8%	6%	7%	11%	18%	14%	16%	10%
Science_G5	All	13%	4%	6%	6%	7%	5%	6%	10%	17%	13%	16%	10%
		OU	BMCC	LSSU	CMU	SVSU	State	NMU	GVSU	DPS	EMU	FSU	WRESA
Science_G8	SE	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	8%	10%	N/A	N/A
Science_G8	Not SE	8%	10%	15%	11%	6%	18%	6%	13%	22%	7%	5%	6%
Science_G8	All	7%	10%	14%	10%	6%	16%	5%	13%	21%	7%	5%	5%
		OU	NMU	BMCC	SVSU	DPS	CMU	LSSU	FSU	EMU	GVSU	State	WRESA
Soc St_G6	SE	2%	2%	4%	5%	6%	6%	6%	7%	7%	8%	9%	N/A
Soc St_G6	Not SE	12%	17%	16%	15%	11%	22%	22%	8%	13%	26%	31%	21%
Soc St_G6	All	12%	16%	15%	14%	11%	20%	20%	8%	12%	24%	28%	20%
		FSU	OU	BMCC	NMU	LSSU	SVSU	GVSU	WRESA	State	CMU	EMU	DPS
Soc St_G9	SE	3%	3%	4%	5%	6%	6%	6%	8%	8%	9%	11%	13%
Soc St_G9	Not SE	11%	20%	18%	11%	26%	14%	26%	21%	34%	22%	12%	5%
Soc St_G9	All	10%	19%	17%	10%	24%	13%	25%	20%	31%	21%	12%	6%

The percentage of proficient Special Education students is consistently equal or better in schools authorized by DPS, WRESA, and GVSU.

Authorizer Priority/Focus/Reward School Summary

Public School Academy Unit
Office of Education Improvement and Innovation

Prepared by staff to illustrate the number of
priority, focus, and reward schools
attributable to each authorizer

Authorizer Priority/Focus/Reward School Summary

Authorizers	Quartile Ranking	Priority		Focus		Reward		No Designation		Total Count	Total Percent
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
Bay Mills Community College	0-25	2	4.55%	1	2.27%			16	36.36%	19	43.18%
	26-50			4	9.09%	2	4.55%	8	18.18%	14	31.82%
	51-75			1	2.27%		0.00%	1	2.27%	2	4.55%
	76-100					1	2.27%	1	2.27%	2	4.55%
	No Ranking*							7	15.91%	7	15.91%
Bay Mills Community College Total		2	4.55%	6	13.64%	3	6.82%	33	75.00%	44	100.00%
Bay-Arenac ISD	No Ranking							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Bay-Arenac ISD Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Central Michigan University	0-25	1	1.56%					15	23.44%	16	25.00%
	26-50					2	3.13%	21	32.81%	23	35.94%
	51-75					5	7.81%	4	6.25%	9	14.06%
	76-100			1	1.56%	3	4.69%	4	6.25%	8	12.50%
	No Ranking*							8	12.50%	8	12.50%
Central Michigan University Total		1	1.56%	1	1.56%	10	15.63%	52	81.25%	64	100.00%
Cheb-Otsego-Presque Isle ESD	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Cheb-Otsego-Presque Isle ESD Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
DeTour Area Schools	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
DeTour Area Schools Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Detroit City School District	0-25	4	26.67%							4	26.67%
	51-75					1	6.67%			1	6.67%
	76-100			1	6.67%					1	6.67%
	No Ranking*							9	60.00%	9	60.00%
Detroit City School District Total		4	26.67%	1	6.67%	1	6.67%	9	60.00%	15	100.00%

Authorizer Priority/Focus/Reward School Summary

Authorizers	Quartile Ranking	Priority		Focus		Reward		No Designation		Total Count	Total Percent
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
Eastern Michigan University	0-25	1	11.11%					6	66.67%	7	77.78%
	26-50			1	11.11%			1	11.11%	2	22.22%
Eastern Michigan University Total		1	11.11%	1	11.11%		0.00%	7	77.78%	9	100.00%
Eaton ISD	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Eaton ISD Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.43%	1	100.00%
Ferris State University	0-25			1	4.00%			11	44.00%	12	48.00%
	26-50			1	4.00%	1	4.00%	4	16.00%	6	24.00%
	51-75							1	4.00%	1	4.00%
	No Ranking*							6	24.00%	6	24.00%
Ferris State University Total			0.00%	2	8.00%	1	4.00%	22	188.43%	25	300.00%
Grand Rapids Public Schools	0-25			1	100.00%					1	100.00%
Grand Rapids Public Schools Total			0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%
Grand Valley State University	0-25			1	2.33%			9	20.93%	10	23.26%
	26-50							9	20.93%	9	20.93%
	51-75			1	2.33%	3	6.98%	7	16.28%	11	25.58%
	76-100			3	6.98%			3	6.98%	6	13.95%
	No Ranking*							7	16.28%	7	16.28%
Grand Valley State University Total			0.00%	5	11.63%	3	6.98%	35	81.40%	43	100.00%
Highland Park City Schools	0-25					1	50.00%	1	50.00%	2	100.00%
Highland Park City Schools Total			0.00%		0.00%	1	50.00%	1	50.00%	2	100.00%
Hillsdale ISD	51-75							1	50.00%	1	50.00%
	76-100							1	50.00%	1	50.00%
Hillsdale ISD Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	2	100.00%	2	100.00%

Authorizer Priority/Focus/Reward School Summary

Authorizers	Quartile Ranking	Priority		Focus		Reward		No Designation		Total Count	Total Percent
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
Kalamazoo RESA	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Kalamazoo RESA Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Kellogg Community College	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Kellogg Community College Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Lake Superior State University	26-50			1	100.00%			2	22.22%	3	33.33%
	51-75							1	11.11%	1	11.11%
	76-100					1	11.11%	1	11.11%	2	22.22%
	No Ranking*							3	33.33%	3	33.33%
Lake Superior State University Total			0.00%	1	100.00%	1	11.11%	7	77.78%	9	100.00%
Macomb ISD	26-50							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Macomb ISD Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Manistee ISD	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Manistee ISD Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Northern Michigan University	0-25	1	20.00%					2	40.00%	3	60.00%
	26-50							1	20.00%	1	20.00%
	51-75			1	20.00%					1	20.00%
Northern Michigan University Total		1	100.00%	1	20.00%		0.00%	3	60.00%	5	100.00%
Oakland University	0-25							6	66.67%	6	66.67%
	51-75							2	22.22%	2	22.22%
	76-100					1	11.11%			1	11.11%
Oakland University Total			0.00%		0.00%	1	11.11%	8	88.89%	9	100.00%
Ottawa Area ISD	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Ottawa Area ISD Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%

Authorizer Priority/Focus/Reward School Summary

Authorizers	Quartile Ranking	Priority		Focus		Reward		No Designation		Total Count	Total Percent
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
Saginaw ISD	No Ranking*							2	100.00%	2	100.00%
Saginaw ISD Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	2	100.00%	2	100.00%
Saginaw Valley State University	0-25			1	3.23%			13	41.94%	14	45.16%
	26-50			1	3.23%			5	16.13%	6	19.35%
	51-75			1	3.23%	1	3.23%	2	6.45%	4	12.90%
	No Ranking*							7	22.58%	7	22.58%
Saginaw Valley State University Total			0.00%	3	9.68%	1	3.23%	27	87.10%	31	100.00%
St. Clair County RESA	No Ranking*							4	100.00%	4	100.00%
St. Clair County RESA Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	4	100.00%	4	100.00%
Suttons Bay Public Schools	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Suttons Bay Public Schools Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Traverse City Area Public Schools	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Traverse City Area Public Schools Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Washtenaw Community College	76-100							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Washtenaw Community College Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Washtenaw ISD	76-100			1	100.00%					1	100.00%
Washtenaw ISD Total			0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%

Authorizer Priority/Focus/Reward School Summary

Authorizers	Quartile Ranking	Priority		Focus		Reward		No Designation		Total Count	Total Percent
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
Wayne RESA	0-25							2	28.57%	2	28.57%
	26-50							1	28.57%	1	14.29%
	51-75							1	28.57%	1	14.29%
	No Ranking*							3	28.57%	3	42.86%
Wayne RESA Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	7	114.29%	7	100.00%
Midland County ESA	No Ranking*							2	100.00%	2	100.00%
Midland County ESA Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	2	100.00%	2	100.00%
Allegan Area ESA	No Ranking*							1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Allegan Area ESA Total			0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Grand Total		9	100.00%	23	100.00%	22	100.00%	234	100.00%	288	100.00%

* "No Ranking" status indicates a school has less than 30 FAY students in at least two test subjects; or a school is too new and does not have a minimum of two years of test data.