



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING

RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

July 23, 2012

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Mike Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Presentation of 2011-2012 Accountability Results

On August 2, 2012, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) released the 2011-2012 Accountability Results. There were six different metrics released, including:

- Statewide Top to Bottom Ranking
  - Priority Schools
  - Focus Schools
  - Reward Schools
- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
- Education Yes! (Michigan's state accreditation system)

These metrics were required by either Michigan's approved request for ESEA Flexibility (i.e., Priority, Focus and Reward schools) or state law (Priority/Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools and Education Yes!). The purpose of this presentation is to provide an overview of the metrics and results.

*Statewide Top to Bottom Ranking*

The Statewide Top to Bottom Ranking is a ranking of all schools<sup>1</sup> in Michigan based on their achievement, improvement, and achievement gap in all five tested content areas.<sup>2</sup> MDE released this list originally in August of 2011 for informational purposes. The ranking methodology has undergone no major modifications, with the exception of being adjusted to reflect Michigan's new career-and-college-ready cut scores. This list provides a percentile rank, along with important diagnostic information on a school's achievement, improvement, and achievement gap for all

<sup>1</sup> Schools must have at least 30 full academic year students in both the current and previous years in at least two state-tested content areas in order to qualify for a ranking.

<sup>2</sup> Some schools will not have enough full academic year students in certain content areas to have those content areas considered in their ranking. In those situations, schools are ranked only on the content areas in which they have met the 30 full academic year student requirement listed in the previous footnote.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

JOHN C. AUSTIN – PRESIDENT • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH – VICE PRESIDENT  
NANCY DANHOF – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER  
RICHARD ZEILE – NASBE DELEGATE • KATHLEEN N. STRAUS  
DANIEL VARNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

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

schools in Michigan. It also forms the base list from which the Priority, Focus and Reward metrics are calculated. More information can be found at [www.mi.gov/ttb](http://www.mi.gov/ttb).

#### *Priority Schools (formerly Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools)*

Priority Schools are the bottom 5% of the Statewide Top to Bottom ranking. Since 2010, Michigan law has required the identification of Persistently Lowest Achieving schools; with the approval of Michigan's ESEA Flexibility request, federal accountability now also requires that these schools be identified. Michigan's approved request for ESEA Flexibility provides the opportunity to align federal and state accountability metrics and standardize the identification procedure of Priority (formerly PLA) schools.

In 2012, 146 schools were identified as Priority Schools.<sup>3</sup> Ninety-eight of these are new to the Priority/PLA list in 2012; 36 were on for their third consecutive year, and 12 were on in 2011 and are named again in 2012. Schools on the Priority list are placed under the supervision of the State Reform Officer and are required to design and implement plans to turn around their performance. More information can be found at [www.mi.gov/priorityschools](http://www.mi.gov/priorityschools).

#### *Focus Schools*

Focus Schools are defined as those schools with the largest within-school achievement gaps. Achievement gap is defined as the difference between the average standardized scale score for the top 30% of students in school and the bottom 30% of students in a school. MDE believes this methodology is an improvement over using a solely demographic-based gap methodology because it helps to target *achievement* gaps specifically. This metric was required by Michigan's approved ESEA Flexibility request and provides the opportunity to reaffirm and sharpen attention to the achievement gap in Michigan. In 2012, there are 358 Focus schools total, across 176 districts and 47 ISDs.

In the collaborative process of applying for ESEA Flexibility, MDE had the opportunity to hear concerns from stakeholders in identifying a metric that would put the focus truly on achievement gaps. These concerns were based on the idea that certain types of schools would more likely to be named Focus Schools solely based on their demographic composition. MDE has undertaken extensive analyses (which can be viewed at [www.mi.gov/focusschools](http://www.mi.gov/focusschools)) and has not found, at this time, that the metric is identifying any type of school on a criteria other than its achievement gap. MDE believes it is critically important that this metric be used as an opportunity to bring to light students whose achievement has lagged behind that of their peers, who may previously have been masked by the higher performance of other students.

Further information can be found at [www.mi.gov/focusschools](http://www.mi.gov/focusschools).

---

<sup>3</sup> USED requires that Michigan identify 5% of Title I schools as Priority Schools. Because state metrics and interventions are extended to all schools, any school in the bottom 5% of the Top-to-Bottom ranking is identified as a Priority School. If this number is not equal to 5% of State Title I schools, additional schools are identified. In 2012, two additional Title I schools were identified.

### *Reward Schools*

Reward Schools are a metric required by the approved request for ESEA Flexibility and offer Michigan an exciting opportunity to identify and name schools deserving of additional recognition. There are three ways that a school can be identified as a Reward School:

- High achievement (i.e. top 5% of the Statewide Top to Bottom Ranking)
- High progress (i.e. top 5% of the improvement component of the Statewide Top to Bottom Ranking)
- Beating the Odds school.

In April of 2011, the State Board of Education commissioned the first Beating the Odds analysis (based on the 2010 accountability results) and recognized those schools at the Board meeting. This recognition was repeated in October of 2011, with the 2011 accountability results. The addition of Reward schools to the federal accountability policy aligns with these ongoing efforts of the State Board of Education to recognize schools for achievement and improvement and allows Michigan to integrate state efforts with these federal requirements.

There are currently 286 Reward Schools in 179 districts; this number will increase when Beating the Odds Schools are added to the list in the fall of 2012, when all three types of Reward Schools will be more extensively recognized.

Further information can be found at [www.mi.gov/rewardschools](http://www.mi.gov/rewardschools).

### *Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)*

Michigan's request for ESEA Flexibility fundamentally changed the *consequences* for schools in the 2012-2013 school year, but it did not change the *calculations* for AYP in 2012. The calculation changes to AYP will be implemented in 2013, with the implementation of the Accountability Scorecard (which Michigan developed in the ESEA Flexibility Request process). In 2012, AYP looked very similar to previous years' AYP, with the exception of three changes:

- Adjusted targets for the percent of students required to be proficient (for the 2012 year only)
- District AYP calculations
- Graduation rate calculations

These changes to calculations were implemented NOT as a result of ESEA Flexibility, but instead as the result of negotiations between MDE and USED to provide for an interim year plan, as well as new USED requirements. The proficiency targets were adjusted for this interim year to reflect Michigan's new career and college ready cut scores. These targets will be replaced in 2013 by the new differentiated targets that were approved as part of our request for ESEA Flexibility.

The changes to district AYP were implemented to bring greater transparency to district-level accountability. In 2012, each district was treated as one unit, as opposed to separating it into three levels (elementary, middle and high school). In previous years, lower performance at the high school level in a district was often

masked by higher performance in elementary or middle school. Additionally, this change helps districts begin to transition to the Accountability Scorecard. At the same time, USED required that MDE hold districts and schools accountable not only on the graduation rate of all students, but also on the rate for their subgroups. These two changes, taken in tandem, increased the number of districts not making AYP, as low graduation rates (overall or in subgroups) were no longer masked for districts.

In 2012, there were 602 (18%) schools that failed AYP, and 2726 (82%) that passed AYP, which is more schools making AYP than 2011. For districts, 284 (52%) made AYP, while the remaining 259 (48%) failed to make AYP.

Further information can be found at [www.mi.gov/schoolreportcard](http://www.mi.gov/schoolreportcard)

### *Education Yes!*

Education Yes!, Michigan's accreditation system, is the original system that has been in place since 2002. In the summer of 2011, MDE submitted to the legislative subcommittees on education a revised school accreditation system, named Michigan School Accreditation. According to Michigan statute, accreditation can only be modified following a legislatively-mandated process. Until that process has been completed, MDE continues to use the existing Education Yes! system. This year, with state new career-and-college-ready cut scores, Education Yes! grades went down significantly. In 2012, the distribution of grades from Education Yes! is as follows:

- Grade A: 201 schools (*compared to 1765 in 2011*)
- Grade B: 710 schools (*compared to 888 in 2011*)
- Grade C: 1720 schools (*compared to 228 in 2011*)
- Grade D: 243 schools (*compared to 130 in 2011*)
- Unaccredited: 4 schools (*compared to zero in 2011*)

Further information can be found at [www.mi.gov/schoolreportcard](http://www.mi.gov/schoolreportcard)