

**ESEA FLEXIBILITY  
Michigan Amendment Submission**

Dear Assistant Secretary:

I am writing on behalf of the Michigan Department of Education to request approval to amend the State’s approved ESEA flexibility request. The relevant information, outlined in the *ESEA Flexibility Amendment Submission Process* document, is provided in the table below.

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by the Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
2.a.i (page 63)	Our original application states that if a school is named a Focus School, it is automatically “red” on the scorecard.	Change this so that Focus Schools are not automatically “red” and instead receive the appropriate color designation.	Working with our newly declared Focus Schools, we recognize the need for detailed data and tailored information; using a blanket “red” designation will lessen their ability to understand their overall performance. It also will dilute the meaning of the “red” designation, which will in turn limit our ability to help schools use that information for improvement.	<p>We sent an email to all LEAs and ISDs/ESAs and posted a public memo on our website inviting comment on the proposed amendments. We convened both the Title I Committee of Practitioners and the members of the Education Alliance (see page 25 of Michigan’s approved Flexibility Request for membership) for in-person meetings specifically to discuss and solicit feedback on the proposed amendments. Seventeen members of the Committee of Practitioners and 16 members of the Education Alliance attended the meetings. We received eleven responses to the solicitation for comments representing 90 LEAs, 3 ISDs/ESAs, 2 professional organizations, 2 education interest groups, and the public.</p> <p>Several comments were received in support of this proposed amendment. No suggested changes or opposition to this proposed amendment were made. Two comments were received urging the MDE to include detailed information in the scorecards to help explain the colored rankings to stakeholders. Several additional amendments were proposed. In response to those, MDE has either made minor adjustments to the approved ESEA Flexibility Request (see the redlined version attached) based on guidance received from USED or decided not to submit the additional proposed amendments at this time. All written comments received are attached.</p>

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0581.

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by the Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
<p><i>2B (page 111), footnote 7</i></p>	<p>We identify our current growth proficient metric, which specifies that a student can be considered proficient if they demonstrate growth at a rate that allows them to reach proficiency in three years.</p>	<p>We would like to change this to count a student as “growth proficient” if they show growth (i.e. show improvement or significant improvement), at a rate that allows them to reach proficiency in four years.</p>	<p>Due to our ambitious AMOs and rigorous new cut scores, we want to privilege growth in the system and reward schools and districts for the progress students make toward proficiency, recognizing that many students have a great deal of improvement to attain. Furthermore, the rigor of the cut scores is such that increasing the flexibility in growth rate will only have the effect of shifting the growth rate to a four-year trajectory.</p>	<p>We sent an email to all LEAs and ISDs/ESAs and posted a public memo on our website inviting comment on the proposed amendments. We convened both the Title I Committee of Practitioners and the members of the Education Alliance (see page 25 of Michigan’s approved Flexibility Request for membership) for in-person meetings specifically to discuss and solicit feedback on the proposed amendments. Seventeen members of the Committee of Practitioners and 16 members of the Education Alliance attended the meetings. We received eleven responses to the solicitation for comments representing 90 LEAs, 3 ISDs/ESAs, 2 professional organizations, 2 education interest groups, and the public.</p> <p>Several comments were received in support of this proposed amendment. One comment was received that suggested making explicit that the change in the “growth proficient” metric will be limited to a four-year trajectory to avoid potential misinterpretation that a slower trajectory could also be used. Several additional amendments were proposed. In response to those, MDE has either made minor adjustments to the approved ESEA Flexibility Request (see the redlined version attached) based on guidance received from USED or decided not to submit the additional proposed amendments at this time. All written comments received are attached.</p>

Attached to this letter is a redlined version of the pages from our approved ESEA flexibility request that would be impacted with strikeouts and additions to demonstrate how the request would change with approval of the proposed amendment[s]. Please contact Sally Vaughn at [vaughns1@michigan.gov](mailto:vaughns1@michigan.gov) with a copy to Abbie Groff at [groffa@michigan.gov](mailto:groffa@michigan.gov) or by phone at 517-335-0011 if you have any questions regarding these proposed amendment[s].

The Michigan Department of Education acknowledges that the U.S. Department of Education may request supplementary information to inform consideration of this request.

---

*Michael P. Flanagan*  
*Chief State School Officer*

---

*Date*