

APPENDIX SUMMARY

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
A.1	Project Re-imagine Proposals	Project Re-imagine is driving grass-roots education reform in Michigan. These districts have proposed ideas that have been developed at the local level and reflect a cross-section of school districts and student populations – urban, rural, and suburban. Each of these 14 Project Re-imagine demonstration districts is transforming the way in which education is delivered, both in terms of teaching and learning and how schools are managed. They have proposed innovative strategies that go beyond the traditional, static ways public education has operated over the past 60 years.	
A.2	Sample Local Education Agency Memorandum of Understanding	A sample Memorandum of Understanding.	
A.3	Michigan Department of Education and Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators Partnership Agreement	The Michigan Department of Education has a long history of working collaboratively with the Intermediate School District community in a wide variety of both instructional and administrative areas. In 2006, a joint decision was made to formalize some aspects of the work between and among the intermediate districts and the department in order to maximize collective capacity. These formal partnership agreements are reviewed, updated and signed annually by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Michigan Association of School Administrators Executive Director. (Note: The Executive Director’s signature represents formal buy-in from both this association’s board and general membership of 57 intermediate school districts). The agreement sets forth the action plan to implement a system of regular and comprehensive planning and governance for joint partnership activities. Work is evaluated and revised annually and is directed by the Governance Committee on Joint Initiatives.	

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
A.4	Organizational Chart for Accelerate Michigan	The Accelerate Michigan Office will include project management staff, data analysts, consultants, and specialists to work in collaboration with the offices within the agency that are leading each of the four reform areas: standards and assessment, great teachers and leaders, comprehensive data systems, and struggling schools. In addition to internal collaboration efforts, staff in the Accelerate Michigan Office will ensure that collaborative efforts with external education partners are continuous and contribute to the coherent accountability and communication measures.	
A.5	Letters of Support	34 Letters of Support (in order) from Michigan Association of School Boards, Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, Michigan Association of Community and Adult Education, Bay Mills Community College, Saginaw Valley State University, Ford, Michigan Association of School Administrators, Michigan Council of Charter School Authorizers, Lake Superior State University, Central Michigan University, Eastern Michigan University, Michigan Association of Public School Academies, Oakland University, United Way for Southeastern Michigan, Michigan Staff Development Council, Michigan Mathematics and Science Centers Network, Michigan Association of School Psychologists, Network of Michigan Educators, University of Michigan, Ferris State University, Middle Cities Education Association, Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association, Detroit Regional Chamber, Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers, Midland County ESA, Michigan House of Representatives, AFT Michigan, Michigan Senate, Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan, Grand Valley State University, Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators, Michigan School Business Officials, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Highscope, and others as received.	

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
A.6	Stakeholder meetings – Letters from subject matter experts	Letters from organizations that represent Michigan’s leading institutes of higher education, associations for school leaders, business communities, urban education centers, and champions of a cross section of various education issues.	
A.7	Statewide Demographic Achievement Reports	Statewide reports on achievement in Michigan Education Assessment Program, Michigan Merit Exam, MI-Access, Michigan English Language Proficiency Assessment and National Assessment of Educational Progress.	
A.8	Superintendent’s Dropout Challenge Overview	The flyer Superintendent Flanagan sent to districts regarding the “Superintendent’s Dropout Challenge”.	
B.1	Achieve’s American Diploma Project Initiative and Plan	Michigan is working with the National Governors Association and the American Diploma Project to strengthen and improve America’s high schools so students are better equipped and prepared to handle the challenges to be college and career ready.	
B.2	State Superintendent’s Common Core State Standards Initiative Memorandum of Understanding	<p>Indicates State Superintendent’s commitment to the voluntary, state-led process to develop and adopt evidence-based, internationally benchmarked common core standards in English language arts and mathematics for K-12 as well as common assessments aligned to the core standards; defines the appropriate role of the federal government as providing key financial support (e.g., tiered incentives, long-term financial support for development/improvement); and revision and alignment of existing federal education laws. The responsibilities of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and National Governors Association (NGA) Center in the common core process are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate Common Core State-Based Leadership • Create a National Validation Committee • Develop End-of-High-School Expectations with Achieve, ACT, and College Board • Develop K-12 standards in English language arts and mathematics with aforementioned groups 	

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure adoption within three years • Convene a National Policy Forum 	
B.3	Governor’s Common Core State Standards Initiative Memorandum of Understanding	Indicates Governor’s commitment to Common Core Standards, as described in Appendix B-2	
B.4	International Benchmarking to Common Core	Common Core State Standards Initiative benchmarked to other countries	
B.5	States in Consortium	September 1, 2009: News release from NGA that confirms Michigan as one of the 48 states to join the Common Core State Standards Initiative	
B.6	Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researches (SMARTER) Balanced Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)	Michigan joined the Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER) balanced consortium by signing this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on January 6, 2010. The MOU designates Michigan as one of 13 “governing states” in the consortium to help write the proposal for a high-quality summative assessment system aligned to the Common Core State Standards for the Multi-State Consortium Common Assessment Race to the Top grant with common administrative guidelines, procurement practices, security protocols, and a common reporting format.	
B.7	Completion Posting Chart	Shows chart of the schedule for Michigan Merit Curriculum content expectations and guideline completion (last updated October 2007) for students graduating before 2011 and required for high school graduating class of 2011 (students entering 8 th grade in 2006) to prepare the state for the adoption of a common set of K-12 standards of State Board of Education by June 2010	
B.8	New Michigan Merit Curriculum Requirements	Includes narrative explaining the chart from Appendix B.7, released by the Michigan Department of Education and State Board of Education to prepare the state for the adoption of a common set of K-12 standards of State Board of Education by June 2010	
B.9	Common Core State	Actual K-12 Common Core State Standards for	

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
	Standards Initiative (CCSSI) English Language Arts (ELA) Alignment and Standards	<p>English Language Arts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment charts comparing CCSSI with Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE)/High School Content Expectations (HSCE) in five grade levels • K-2 Literacy Common Core Standards (CCS) – ELA GLCE Alignment • 3-5 Literacy CCS – ELA GLCE Alignment • 6-8 ELA CCS – ELA GLCE Alignment • 9-CCR ELA CCS – ELA HSCE • 6-12 Literacy in History/Social Studies (SS) and Science (SC) – CCS – ELA, SC, SS GLCE/HSCE 	
B.10	CCSSI Math Alignment and Standards	<p>Actual K-12 Common Core State Standards for Mathematics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment charts comparing CCSSI with Michigan GLCE/HSCE • K-8 CCS – Mathematics GLCE Alignment • HS CCS – Mathematics HSCE Topic and Course Alignment 	
B.11	State Board of Education (SBE) Agendas/ Discussions of CCSSI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 13, 2009: Agenda from Michigan SBE documenting presentation of Common Core State Standards by MaryAlice Galloway during Committee of the Whole Meeting • February 9, 2010: Agenda from Michigan SBE documenting presentation of an alignment of Michigan Standards and Content Expectations with the Draft K-12 Common Core State Standards by MaryAlice Galloway during Committee of the Whole Meeting 	
B.12	Adoption Timeline	<p>Outlines timeline for Common Core State Standards adoption; anticipates SBE approval (June 15, 2010); submit amendment to Race to the Top Phase 2 application to USED (June 2010); and final documents disseminated by four regional and web-based electronic presentations (August 31, 2010 – October 2010)</p>	
B.13	Curriculum Adoption Protocol Flowchart	<p>Visual presentation (without specified dates) of timeline in Appendix B.13</p>	
B.14	The Revised School	<p>Application states that Michigan Department of</p>	

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
	Code	Education will promote Common Core Reading Standards (CCRS) and Common Core K-12 standards adoption as extension of current college and career readiness work. Highlights in 380.1278 that state board will develop and update recommended “model academic core curriculum standards” as recommended “knowledge and skill content standards” for adoption in local curriculum and distributed to each school district; also that school board must approve the subject area content expectations and guidelines before they take effect.	
B.15	Standards and Assessment Implementation Timeline	Timeline indicates 1) rollout of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and supporting components by September 2010; 2) alignment of CCSS with postsecondary transition by September 2010; 3) development of curriculum framework by May 2013; 4) development of comprehensive system of high-quality professional development by December 2013; and 5) development and dissemination of instructional materials and assessments by spring of 2014	
B.16	Teaching for Learning Framework (TLF) Information	Michigan Department of Education developed Teaching for Learning Framework (TLF) “to assist educators in understanding rigorous standards and the ability to teach those standards so that all students learn and demonstrate proficiency.” Framework describes breakdown and overlap of the Core Elements Foundations, Strategies for Instruction and Using Data, explaining the fundamental processes and essential skills on which they are based	
B.17	Bring Formative Assessment Statewide in Michigan	A description of Michigan’s efforts to develop and implement a formative assessment process	
B.18	Balanced Assessment Figure	Presents a schematic of the different components of a balanced assessment and accountability system and their interconnections. Nine central points of schematic are: 1. Overarching professional development	

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Coherent process and content standards 3. Classroom formative assessment underlying other assessments 4. Accountability to provide incentives and minimize unintended consequences 5. Two entry points: limited number of high school exit goals and assessment literacy standards for educator certification 6. Three ultimate outcomes – all measures of students achievement 7. Two other critical goals: formative assessment and ongoing support for school teams and coaches 8. Capacity to include all students 9. Large-scale technical infrastructure 	
C.1	Michigan Consortium for Educational Research (MCER)	<p>Researchers at the University of Michigan and Michigan State University are collaborating with the Michigan Department of Education and Center for Educational Performance and Information to leverage state data to evaluate the impact of two major statewide reforms—the Michigan Merit Curriculum and the Michigan Promise Scholarship. This project supports two important goals in Michigan education: 1) using high-quality longitudinal data and rigorous quasi-experimental methods to evaluate policy and practice, and 2) creating collaborative working relationships between higher education institutions and the Department of Education in order to improve student performance and achievement, and to inform policy. The MCER also serves as an important first step in the move to true research collaboration in Michigan.</p>	
C.2	Description of Regional Data Initiatives Collaboration	<p>In August 2009, Michigan Department of Education released an \$11.6 million Title II, Part D, competitive grant funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, titled “Improving Instruction through Regional Data Initiatives.” In response to the ARRA grant opportunity, all 57 of Michigan’s Intermediate School Districts (ISDs) self-organized into eight consortia for rolling out professional development programs on five</p>	

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
		already installed and operational data analysis and reporting platforms. 97.5 percent of public school districts and 45 percent of public school academies signed up. (A second round will be funded through Race to the Top to allow the remaining public school academies to sign up under their authorizer). This is a summary of the request for proposal that explains the structure and function of grant program.	
C.3	Research Question Crosswalk	Alignment of P-20 Council priorities and the regional action research questions, which is part of the Regional Data Initiatives current scope of work that ties into the work of the broader Statewide Education Research Collaborative.	
C.4	P-20 Advisory Council	P-20 governance puts the P-20 Advisory Council (representatives from pre-school, K-12 postsecondary and other adult learner education and workforce communities) over PK-12 Data (educational program and data managers) and Adult Learner Data (postsecondary and workforce program and data managers) Work Groups which feed into the Research Collaborative (institutional researchers) and back to the Advisory Council. The P-20 Advisory Council draws to make policy recommendations to Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) and Michigan Department of Education for full implementation of P-20 system, develop a state research agenda with the Research Collaborative and resolve implementation issues raised by either of the Work Groups.	
D.1	2006 Teacher Equity Plan	Michigan’s 2006 No Child Left Behind Teacher Equity Plan	
D.2	2007 Highly Qualified and Experienced Teachers	2007 Summary Table for Highly Qualified and Experienced Teachers in Michigan Schools	
D.3	A Framework for Michigan Educator Evaluations	The Michigan association- and union-led Framework for annual educator evaluations	
D.4	Michigan Growth Model	A full, detailed, description of the Michigan growth model as submitted to and approved by the United States Department of Education.	
D.5	Central Michigan	The Central Michigan University (charter	

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
	University (CMU) Charter Schools College-Readiness Benchmarks	authorizer) plan for measuring student growth in the charter schools they authorize. Provided as an example of a thoughtful approach to satisfying legal requirements for schools to provide measures of student growth to educators	
D.6	Michigan School Improvement Framework	The Michigan School Improvement Framework - a high-quality tool for creating a school improvement plan and a comprehensive needs assessment	
D.7	Annotated Bibliography on Student Growth and Value-added Models	A brief annotated bibliography on issues in measuring student growth, and in measuring effects of educators on student growth	
E.1	Michigan School Accountability and Accreditation System (MI-SAAS) Standards	<p>Michigan School Accountability and Accreditation System (MI-SAAS) is a redesign of Education YES!; it has four elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student achievement – proficiency standards; performance level change (PLC); proficient/provisionally proficient on MME; year-to-year improvement in subject 2. Compliance with Michigan statute – 100% certified; annual school improvement plan; required curricula; fully compliant Annual Report published; Performance Indicators or equivalent submitted; literacy and math tested annually grades 1-5; designated schools participated in NAEP; high school six-year graduation rate 80% or above 3. Annual state accreditation status – cannot be fully accredited if does not make AYP 4. Additional school, district, community and state information – displays “points of pride” 	
E.2	MCL 380.1280 Accreditation	Gives superintendent of public instruction (SPI) authority to provide technical assistance to any unaccredited school; any school unaccredited for 3 consecutive years has authority to 1) replace school administrator, 2) to give parents	

Appendix Number	Appendix Title	Description	Page
		school choice, 3) to require use of research-based school improvement model or 4) to close the school.	
E.3	MCL 380.1280c Reform/Redesign Officer	Authorizes SPI to place low-performing schools under supervision of School Reform Officer; School Reform Officer can either approve district's redesign using one of the four intervention models (in E1.2) or impose one. PSAs in bottom 5% of all schools also subject to closure.	
E.4	MCL 141.1238 Emergency Financial Manager	For school districts in financial emergency as defined by statute, SPI has authority to nominate potential appointees for emergency financial manager to Governor for appointment up to a year, renewable annually.	
E.5	MCL 380.502 Public School Academy Organization and Administration	If authorizer for PSA does not engage in appropriate continuing oversight, SPI may revoke authorizing privileges	
E.6	Business Rules for School Ranking	The State Fiscal Stabilization Fund grant, Race to the Top grant and School Improvement grant provided guidance to states to identify the persistently lowest achieving schools. States must use a combination of student achievement and improvement and must also identify high schools that have a graduation rate below 60% for a number of years. The business rules provide both a short narrative and a detailed description of the process and the data used to rank schools to identify the lowest 5%.	
F.1	Charter School Laws	List of citations pertaining to charter school law in Michigan	