



# RACE TO THE TOP II

## ACCELERATE MICHIGAN

Section E

Michigan's  
Students

Michigan's  
Future

608 W. Allegan Street  
Lansing, MI 48933  
[www.mi.gov/mde](http://www.mi.gov/mde)

## **(E) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

### **State Reform Conditions Criteria**

#### **(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and Local Education Agencies**

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 local education agencies that are in improvement or corrective action status. The State's statute on school accreditation (MCL 380.1280) gives the state superintendent the authority to provide technical assistance to any school that is unaccredited. For a school that is unaccredited for three consecutive years, the state superintendent has authority to replace the school administrator, to give parents school choice, to require the school to use a research-based school improvement model, or to close the school. In Michigan, standards for school accreditation are based primarily, but not solely, on student achievement. Standards for the Michigan School Accountability and Accreditation System adopted by the State Board of Education in June 2009, can be found in Appendix E.1.

Michigan recently passed legislation that added a new statute, MCL 380.1280c, which authorizes the state superintendent to place the persistently lowest achieving schools (as defined by Race to the Top and School Improvement Grant guidelines) under the supervision of the State Reform Officer. The Reform 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. Charter schools that are persistently lowest achieving are also subject to intervention or closure. If a school district has a financial emergency as defined by state statute (MCL 141.1238), 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. The state recently used this authority in Detroit Public Schools to appoint an emergency financial manager with authority over all financial matters.

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 (MCL 380.502). The State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents are as follows: MCL 380.1280 Accreditation (Appendix E.2), MCL 380.1280c Reform/Redesign Officer (Appendix E.3), MCL 141.1238 Emergency Financial Manager (Appendix E.4), MCL 380.502

Public School Academy Organization and Administration (Appendix E.5), and Michigan School Accountability and Accreditation System Standards(Appendix E.1).

**(E)(1) Intervention in lowest-achieving schools and Local Education Agencies**

Michigan has chosen to concentrate efforts on those schools that are truly the lowest performing in the state. Michigan has developed rigorous business rules (Appendix E.6) for identifying the persistently lowest achieving schools that emphasize student achievement by weighting achievement and progress with a 2 to 1 ratio. Michigan’s work for the 2010–11 school year will focus on the Detroit Public Schools and 35 other Local Education Agencies. The State has far-reaching authority to intervene in the lowest-achieving Title I schools that are in improvement or corrective action status and in the lowest-achieving secondary schools that are eligible for Title I funds. While some authority has been in place for 19 years, new legislation provides strong authority for the superintendent of public instruction over the lowest performing public schools as defined by Race to the Top and the School Improvement Grant guidance.

The current system of supports provided to schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring comprises four elements: 1) a school-building audit to identify and address needs; 2) a process mentor team to provide monitoring and support for implementing the improvement plan; 3) leadership support in the form of a Principal’s Fellowship and Leadership Coach; and 4) instructional coaches to assist with the implementation of evidenced based practices in the use of data and the delivery of content. *Process Mentors* provide technical assistance and support in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. They advise school teams on process and procedure to help accomplish both short and long term instructional goals. *Data and Content Support* is funded through a Title I Accountability grant. Targeted at sub-group populations, supports are provided for a data driven needs assessment, evidence based interventions and coaching to ensure implementation fidelity.

Through the Race to the Top and Federal School Improvement Grant funding, Michigan will be able to implement a much more intensive support model for struggling schools. Although many Local Education Agencies have used external coaches, not many have used external providers to facilitate the turnaround process.

One exception is the Detroit Public School District, where the emergency financial manager has closed 29 of the district’s 194 schools and hired outside firms to restructure 17

others. He also has redirected the placement of dozens of principals, often from relatively high-performing schools to lower-performing ones, and is working to broker agreements that would allow identified schools to extend the school day. Most other Local Education Agencies have turned to their Intermediate School District or Regional Educational Service Agency for assistance and support for school improvement. The Michigan Department of Education has engaged the Intermediate School District organizations to expand the state's capacity to intervene in low-performing schools.

To assist schools in the selection of turnaround partners, Michigan will issue a Request for Proposals to invite potential external providers including Intermediate School Districts to describe their demonstrated success turning around low-performing schools. All external providers including Intermediate School Districts will be required to participate in a State-run training program that specifies performance expectations and familiarizes external providers with state legislation and regulation. External providers will be evaluated regularly, and those that are not getting results will be removed from the authorized list.

One of the major concerns with the four options for school turnaround is that all but closure require the replacement of the school principal. Therefore, it is critical for Michigan to develop a pipeline of qualified principals and support new principals in turnaround efforts. In addition, new state legislation requires the appointment of a State School Reform/Redesign Officer who will have supervisory authority over the lowest performing schools. Statewide, over the past four years, 282 schools have come off the list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. This demonstrates that a number of school districts in Michigan have engaged in reform with varying degrees of success, and two districts have undergone dramatic changes in response to low student achievement, loss of students, and loss of funding. The School District of the City of Pontiac has closed eight schools in an effort to concentrate staff and resources to provide a focused effort to increase student achievement and to re-size the district to match the current student population. Detroit Public Schools has closed 27 schools and has engaged reform partners for 17 of their high schools. Detroit Public Schools is now working to engage reform partners for 13 of the elementary schools.

**(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools**

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

- (i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and
- (ii) Support its Local Education Agencies in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an Local Education Agencies with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or Appendices shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State’s success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and Appendices may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For Appendices included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the Appendices can be found.

Evidence for (E)(2) (please fill in table below):

The State’s historic performance on school turnaround, as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) that States or Local Education Agencies attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and lessons learned to date.

## **(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools**

### **(E)(2)(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools**

Michigan has chosen to concentrate efforts on those schools that are truly the lowest performing in the state. The business rules were created to allow a ranking of all schools in the state. State statute (MCL 380.1280c) provides for the identification of persistently lowest achieving schools using the same business rules as those defined in guidance for the Race to the Top, State Fiscal Stabilization and School Improvement Grant applications. The definition includes both student achievement and improvement for every school. Achievement is weighted twice as heavily as progress. 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 improvement and/or increase their improvement to a degree that will reasonably quickly lead to adequate achievement levels. The ranking process identifies which schools receive Title I funds and are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, or are secondary schools eligible for but not receiving Title I funds. Secondary schools are defined as those containing any of grades 7-12. The business rules for ranking schools are included in Appendix E.6 (Business Rules for School Ranking). Within two weeks of United States Department of Education approval of the business rules, the state agency will publish the list of schools identified as persistently lowest achieving. High schools were also included if they have a four-year graduation rate below 60% for the last three consecutive years. Michigan will utilize the \$115 million School Improvement Grant to focus turnaround efforts for the 2010–11 school year on the Detroit Public Schools and 35 other Local Education Agencies with schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving. At this time 22 schools (.5% of schools) are not eligible for Title I funds. Michigan is confident that the current business rules are identifying the lowest achieving schools. The state agency plans to rank order all schools in the state to ensure that the lowest achieving schools have access to funding needed to implement one of the four turnaround models. Each year, as the calculations for proficiency and student progress are completed, any new schools that are identified will be invited to apply for a School Improvement Grant. As a result of recently passed legislation, Public Act 204 of 2009, all schools identified in the lowest 5 percent of performance will be subject to intervention for turnaround or closure.

### **(E)(2)(ii) Support for Local Education Agencies**

The current system of supports provided to schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring comprises four elements: (1) a school building audit to identify and address needs, (2) a process mentor team to provide monitoring and support for implementing the improvement plan, (3) leadership support in the form of a Principal's Fellowship and Leadership Coach, and (4) instructional coaches to assist with the implementation of evidenced-based practices. The leadership support element has evolved over several years and has been fully operational for the last three years.

The Michigan Principal's Fellowship is designed to foster systematic school improvement by teaching principals (and their staffs) to focus on the "instructional core" – the interactions between teachers and students in the presence of content. Systematically improving the quality of each of these elements is the only way to increase student learning over time (Elmore 2008). To do that, leaders must learn how to establish coherent strategies across all classrooms and grade levels, and to empower teachers to improve their practices through professional learning communities that help them develop a shared understanding of what effective practice looks like.

All Title I schools in Michigan that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress for four consecutive years are required to complete the ongoing, interactive training sessions led by the staff and faculty from the Michigan State University College of Education. More than 800 educators from nearly 150 schools have participated in this initiative. Forty percent (16 out of 39 schools) of the schools participating in the second year of the fellowship made Adequate Yearly Progress for two consecutive years and will no longer be required to attend the program.

Plan: Through the Race to the Top and Federal School Improvement Grant funding, Michigan will be able to implement a much more intensive support model for struggling schools. Turning around struggling schools must become a routine process for Michigan Department of Education, in partnership with Intermediate School Districts and other external providers. The Michigan Department of Education Office of Education Improvement and Innovation will be accountable for managing and monitoring the School Improvement Grant process that will fund the turnaround efforts. Local Education Agencies will apply for up to \$2,000,000 per schools to support the turnaround. Schools identified as persistently lowest achieving must use one of the reform models (transformation, turnaround, or restart) to improve student achievement or must

close. The Office of Education Improvement and Innovation is collaborating with the state's education data collection agency, the Center for Education Performance and Information, to enhance data collection on the school turnaround efforts, to institute a state research collaborative, and to make regional data warehouses available to all schools to increase the use of student data and instructional improvement systems (see Section (C)(3))

Michigan 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. The opportunity to provide focused support to secondary schools is a welcome investment for the improvement of college and career readiness among those students whose educational needs have not been met. In addition, Race to the Top funds will support some of the infrastructure development described below. Michigan will continue to ensure coordination of funding streams, such as Title I and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, with School Improvement Grant funding to ensure a coherent reform process in Local Education Agencies.

#### *Model Overview*

- All identified schools in the persistently lowest achieving (bottom 5 percent) will be required to implement one of the four turnaround models (transformation, turnaround, restart, or closure).
- Michigan Department of Education will issue a Request For Proposal and generate a list of approved external providers (including Intermediate School Districts) to work with schools implementing all models other than closure. These providers will be available to work with all persistently lowest achieving schools.
- Districts with eligible schools will submit a turnaround grant application (using federal School Improvement Grant monies). The application will specify the model, external provider, and plan.
- Districts with identified schools that decline to submit an application may be subject to State takeover and selection of the intervention. Recently passed state legislation places identified schools under the management of a state school reform/redesign officer. The legislation gives districts with persistently lowest achieving schools 90 days to submit a plan to the state school reform/redesign officer, who then approves, disapproves, or

changes the plan. Refusal to submit a plan will be considered as a disapproved plan, and the school may be placed in the State Reform District under direct state control.

- 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 school leaders learn to manage the turnaround process.

### *Needs Assessment*

All schools receiving School Improvement Grant funds or identified as persistently lowest achieving will be required to complete a comprehensive needs assessment and planning process at the start of the intervention. Currently, all schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are required to do a comprehensive needs assessment using the School Improvement Framework portal (<http://www.advanc-ed.org/mde/>). These schools have been offered training on how to use student data more effectively to target improvement efforts. Training on the use of student data will be mandatory for identified lowest performing schools to help build a culture of data driven decision making. As the elements of the longitudinal student data system, the Regional Data Initiatives, and model formative assessments are developed, the State will develop and deploy assessment literacy training and mandate it for struggling schools. For the lowest-achieving schools, a facilitated improvement planning process will be used with an external facilitator to help the district and the school(s) examine the needs assessment, examine student data, and develop a three-year plan with measurable improvement goals. The external facilitator will hold the school accountable for meeting the goals on a weekly, quarterly, and annual basis. External facilitators will be drawn from the State's cadre of school improvement facilitators and leadership coaches or provided by the turnaround partners selected by the Local Education Agency. Given the urgency of turning around these schools, we anticipate conducting initial needs assessments in the late summer of 2010—as soon as School Improvement Grant and Race to the Top funds are available—so that critical turnaround activities can commence in the fall of 2010.

### *Michigan Department of Education External Provider Selection Process and Training*

Although many Local Education Agencies have used external coaches, not many have used external providers to facilitate the turnaround process. One exception is the Detroit Public School District. Under the direction of Emergency Financial Manager Robert Bobb, Detroit Public Schools has engaged the services of five external providers to support school redesign in 17 high schools. The providers engaged in this effort are New York-based Edison Learning; Cincinnati-based EdWorks; New York-based Institute for Student Achievement; Bellevue, Washington-based Model Secondary Schools Project; and the International Center for Leadership in Education. Detroit Public Schools has used a rigorous selection process that will provide a model for other Local Education Agencies in the state.

Many Local Education Agencies have turned to their Intermediate School District or Regional Educational Service Agency for assistance and support for school improvement. The Michigan Department of Education has engaged the Intermediate School District or Regional Educational Service Agency organizations to expand the State's capacity to intervene in low-performing schools. Intermediate School Districts have engaged with Local Education Agencies as part of the process mentor teams and with direct provision of professional development and coaching to support schools in making needed improvements. Michigan Department of Education engaged in a research project in 2008–09 that noted, "Title I high-priority schools were more than twice as likely to make Adequate Yearly Progress last year (2007–08) compared to non-Title I high-priority schools, also had much larger concentrations of poverty and minority students than did their non-Title I counterparts. Even though increased student diversity and poverty can increase the number of Adequate Yearly Progress targets and increase the number of factors hampering adequate yearly progress for particular subgroups, Title I schools still made Adequate Yearly Progress at a higher rate. In short, those schools that demographically fit the stereotypical vision of a 'failing school'—large numbers of students living in poverty and large numbers of minority students—are actually much more likely to make Adequate Yearly Progress than those who do not fit those demographics. While providing counterevidence to these notions, this also shows the impact of the Statewide System of Support on Title I schools. While a more detailed analysis is needed to definitively show the Statewide System of Support is the only reason for the success of Title I schools, it is a major contributing factor." A more detailed research study is going on

now to gather evidence of effectiveness of the current system and the partnership with Intermediate School Districts.

To assist schools in the selection of turnaround external providers, Michigan will issue a Request for Proposal in the late spring 2010 to invite potential external providers including Intermediate School Districts to describe their demonstrated success turning around low-performing schools. Providers will demonstrate their ability to work with Local Education Agencies, schools, and the state education agency. Experience managing both academic and financial turnaround will be required for providers who will become lead partners in the turnaround process. The designation of a lead role includes direct responsibility for the turnaround process for one or more schools in a Local Education Agency. A supporting partner for the turnaround school indicates that the provider may be responsible for coaching, professional development, mentoring, or other instructional supports in the low-performing school as specified in the school improvement plan. Michigan Department of Education will make lists of external providers available to Local Education Agencies on the website.

All external providers, including Intermediate School Districts, will be required to participate in a state-run training program that specifies performance expectations and familiarizes providers with state legislation and regulation. External providers will be evaluated regularly, and those that are not getting results will be removed from the authorized list.

#### *District Request for Proposal Process*

Michigan Department of Education will issue a Request for Proposal/grant application for local districts as soon as the federal School Improvement Grant application is approved.

Districts will be required to:

- Identify the school (s) for which they are applying.
- Identify and defend the model they are selecting.
- Indicate which approved external provider or Intermediate School District they will work with to complete the turnaround.
- Submit an implementation plan.
- Submit a budget that is adequate for the chosen turnaround model.
- Establish benchmarks and success measures in collaboration with Michigan Department of Education.

- Agree to participate in State turnaround training and network.

In addition depending on the model chosen, School Improvement Grants will include:

- Incentives to retain effective and highly effective teachers and principals in schools, such as teacher leader opportunities, or turnaround teacher training (MCL 380.1280c(2))
- Provide an addendum to a collective bargaining agreement for any of the following that are necessary to implement the selected intervention model: contractual or other seniority system, contractual or other work rules. Unilateral changes in pay scales or benefits are not allowed. (MCL 380.1280c(2))
- Building-level decision-making authority for expenditures and professional development (MCL 380.1280c(2))
- Annual performance evaluation of staff and principal that includes student academic-growth measures as one significant factor (MCL 380.1249)
- For secondary schools, the use of Explore, Plan, and ACT assessments to provide a measure for growth until the statewide assessment system is developed for robust academic-growth measures
- Increased learning time for students, such as summer learning camp, afterschool college prep, year-round school, and flexible scheduling
- Job-embedded professional development for teachers and principals, such as instructional coaching in the classroom
- Stipulation that schools be encouraged to personalize student learning and to interject the “relationship” and “relevance” R’s into their schools through methods such as individualized education plans for all students; project-based or research-based learning, service learning, or proficiency-based achievement; and intensive career preparation.

#### *Turnaround Training for Districts*

One of the major concerns with the four options for school turnaround is that all but closure require the replacement of the school principal. Michigan is committed to developing a pipeline of qualified principals and supporting new principals in turnaround efforts. As such, in addition to the Principals Fellowship, Michigan will issue a Request for Proposal for the development of a Turnaround Academy to provide focused training for managing the turnaround

process. A formal professional learning network will be developed for the schools utilizing each of the turnaround options to help school leaders share promising practices, and to provide feedback to the Michigan Department of Education about the turnaround process. Michigan Department of Education will work with education partners to ensure that training is also available to school superintendents and school boards (see Section D(5), for more details on professional development).

#### *Other Infrastructure Requirements*

New state legislation will require the appointment of a State School Reform/Redesign Officer who will have supervisory authority over the lowest performing schools. The State School Reform/Redesign Officer reports directly to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and will coordinate with offices within Michigan Department of Education to ensure smooth implementation and complete monitoring and reporting on turnaround schools. New responsibilities for Michigan Department of Education include:

- Monitoring external provider selection and performance
- More closely monitoring turnaround school efforts
- Working collaboratively with districts, schools, and providers to ensure schools are on sustainable paths for improvement

In addition, in order to prepare for this program, action planning for the Michigan Department of Education prior to issuing or awarding School Improvement Grants must include the development of leading indicators of school performance, expectations for annual goals for turnaround schools, publication of methodology for identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools and the list of schools, consequences for not meeting performance goals, consequences for schools that fail to improve, and recognition for schools that achieve turnaround. The additional work and coordination with other offices within Michigan Department of Education will require six additional staff members. Two of those staff members will be funded through Race to the Top funds, and the remaining four will be funded with Title I School Improvement. Michigan plans to partner with Intermediate School Districts to increase and focus the work of a cadre of school improvement facilitators/monitors who will assist Michigan Department of

Education with oversight of the turnaround grant recipients (both School Improvement and Race to the Top).

Detroit Public Schools, the recipient of the largest School Improvement Grant, has already begun a partnership with Wayne County Regional Education Services Agency for professional development, coaching, mentoring, and data collection. Detroit Public Schools are receiving support from process mentors and data coaches to form more coherent approaches to instructional improvement based on student-level data. Wayne County Regional Education Services Agency is working to ensure that the reforms being put in place will be sustainable after the emergency financial manager completes his work. Detroit Public Schools has undergone frequent turnover in the superintendency and was placed into high risk-status by the State because of numerous problems with federal formula fund programs. Michigan Department of Education is working closely with the district, the Regional Education Services Agency, and the U.S. Department of Education to provide a coordinated effort at school and district turnaround.

For Tier 3 schools, those not in the lowest 5 percent, the existing statewide system of support will continue to serve the academic improvement needs of the schools and will determine those needs using a more diagnostic comprehensive needs-assessment process. The statewide system of support is under revision now to identify the modifications needed to make the system more diagnostic, responsive, and transparent.

### **Evidence for (E)(2)**

This section presents a brief history (2005–2008) of support to schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. In Michigan, these were called high-priority schools if they had been identified because of lack of academic progress.

In school year 2005–06, identified schools used federal Title I section 1003 funds to obtain services and supports to respond in various ways, as follows:

- Leadership coaches—Through the establishment of the Michigan Coaches Institute 60 leadership coaches were trained to support high priority schools and supported with state-level Title II, Part A funds.
- A regional support system—Regional assistance grants were awarded to Intermediate School Districts and Local Education Agencies with a portion of Michigan’s School Improvement funds. This support system provided direct technical assistance from school

improvement specialists who were responsible for ensuring that all schools received appropriate, coordinated assistance from the various providers available to the schools.

- A diagnostic on-site review process with selected schools identified for corrective action—This process was designed to help district and school staff do an in-depth analysis of current programs and practices in a school, and to target appropriate areas for corrective action.
- A Critical Schools Audit—This focused on educational and organizational practices that were based on the research areas included in the Michigan School Improvement Framework. The audit process allowed the Michigan Department of Education to deliver interventions based on the unique needs of each school. Further, identified schools were required to implement one of the recommended actions from the Critical Schools Audit when applying for the building-level school improvement funding.

A significant portion of the Title I set-aside funds was used to provide technical and regional assistance grants to support the highest needs schools in determining the reason for these schools' persistent lack of Adequate Yearly Progress and in addressing them. In 2006–07, support efforts were redefined to include a four-strand approach to assisting schools in each level of identification, as follows:

- The first strand identified was the strategic planning initiative. Michigan Department of Education worked with Intermediate School Districts to define components of a comprehensive needs assessment generated from basic elements of school-level data. The Comprehensive Needs Assessment data in turn became the baseline for improvement planning.
- The second strand identified was based on the Michigan School Improvement Framework. The system allows for a school improvement team to conduct a self-assessment and analyze the comprehensive needs assessment data to drive school improvement plan development and revision.
- The third strand focused on the dissemination of 1000 MI-Map Toolkit for School Reform. This effort included technical support for implementing the tools.
- The fourth strand revolved around regional assistance developed in partnership with the Intermediate School Districts. Schools received instructional coaches and participated in

various aspects of the school audit process. Michigan State University took the lead in developing and implementing the Michigan Principals Fellowship.

In 2007–08, Michigan Department of Education launched a broad initiative focused on Title I high-priority schools, that is, schools identified for reasons of proficiency. The system as a whole is described as the Statewide System of Support for Title I schools and contains the following components:

- The process begins with personalized visits by a Process Mentor Team that helps the staff review its school improvement plan, set short-term instructional goals, and help keep the spotlight on student achievement. If a school continues to progress through the stages of identification, the focus intensifies. Program auditors visit the school, reviewing the progress of the school in relation to the School Improvement Framework benchmarks.
- Intermediate School Districts with high priority Title I schools within their service areas were awarded funds to provide direct services to Local Education Agencies. Support to locals is based on need, including attention to the content areas, data, and working with special populations.
- All high-priority schools were assigned a mentor team to assist with implementing the school improvement plan. Mentors assisted a school in choosing and implementing best practices to address the reasons for identification.
- High-priority schools identified for corrective action or restructuring received a leadership coach to assist the building leadership team in identifying areas of incoherence that impede the implementation of the school improvement plan. These schools also were required to have the principal, leadership coach, and other school leadership attend the Michigan Principals Fellowship that includes a residential institute followed by weekend sessions throughout the school year. School teams analyzed their own data and using structured protocols, raised questions about instructional quality, coherence of instructional programs and the school's use of resources. Through the team's development of professional community, the principal and teachers are able to create systematic instructional improvement.

- In recognition of the need to use data, the Statewide System of Support expanded the use of Data for Student Success, an initiative aimed at giving schools a common tool for using and analyzing data.

Michigan has not used the four turnaround models defined in the Race to the Top application, but a state statute has allowed for closure and reform for many years. Newly passed legislation puts the four reform models in place for the 2010–11 school year, and the School Improvement Grant funds will support implementation.

In Michigan two districts have undergone dramatic changes in response to low student achievement, loss of students, and loss of funding. The School District of the City of Pontiac has closed eight schools in an effort to concentrate staff and resources to provide a focused effort to increase student achievement and to resize the district to match the current student population. Pontiac has lost many jobs during the economic recession. Detroit Public Schools has closed 27 schools and has engaged reform partners for 17 of its high schools. Detroit Public Schools is now working to engage reform partners for 13 of the elementary schools. Michigan Department of Education will work with Detroit Public Schools to support its reform efforts and align the district with the school turnaround process in the School Improvement and Race to the Top grant applications.

**Evidence**

Approach Used	No. of Schools Since SY2004–05	Results and Lessons Learned
Replacing staff or principal	73	See note below.
Other major restructuring or governance	112	See note below.

Outside expert	82	See note below.
----------------	----	-----------------

*Note:* Over the past four years, 282 out of 596 schools have come off the list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Data collection has not been strong enough to show a direct correlation between methods of improvement and a school’s ability to make adequate yearly progress or dramatic improvements in student achievement. Results do indicate that schools receiving extra support and assistance seem to improve. One lesson learned is that Michigan’s children are not improving fast enough to ensure that all students are college and career ready upon graduation. Michigan’s statewide system of support is undergoing a rigorous evaluation to determine which support elements produce the greatest improvements in student achievement. Improved data systems also will help in this effort.

<b>Performance Measures</b>	Baseline Data:	Actual Data:	End of SY 2010-	End of SY 2011-	End of SY 2012-	End of SY 2013-
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (described in Appendix C) will be initiated each year.	30	70	70	30	30	
As the cohort of lowest 5 percent moves through the turnaround process, the original schools will still be working through their reforms and may remain on the 5 percent list, so fewer schools will initiate in the later years.						