

---

# MICHIGAN'S CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZER REPORT

---

November 2014

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

*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*

## Michigan's Charter School Authorizers, 2014

By Liyang Mao and Bettie Landauer-Menchik, Education Policy Center, Michigan State University, August 2014

### **Purpose and Differences between 2011-12 Study and Current study**

The Top-to-Bottom (TtB) list is a key part of Michigan's school accountability system. The TtB list ranks schools on their student performance in mathematics, reading, writing, science and social studies and graduation rate data (for high schools). The TtB ranking system allows the state to compare all schools on the same scale regardless of size. 2,757 schools were included in the rankings for 2013-14.

This study updates the original study of the performance of Michigan's charter school authorizers written in 2011-12. Both studies use the state's Top to Bottom Ranking system, a complex formula that standardizes achievement, improvement and the achievement gap based on the *state's* mean score and standard deviation.

However, there are differences between the two studies. The original study included eleven authorizers with three or more schools and compared those authorizers with one another. The authorizers were ranked based on a mean and standard deviation created *only for authorizers. There were no comparisons to the state, only to other authorizers.*

Part I of this study utilizes a methodology developed by Michigan's Department of Education, Bureau of Assessment and Accountability specifically to compare authorizers. The BAA Authorizer Top to Bottom ranking compares authorizers, large and small, with *all traditional public schools*. The mean and standard deviation in the BAA methodology are based on *all schools*. The BAA Authorizer TtB ranking is also based on data for ten or more tested students, not thirty students as traditionally has been used.

Part II of this study uses the standard 30 tested students and compares the authorizers only to the state and one another, not to traditional public schools. Part II compares authorizers and the state by the rates of proficiency, growth, and the achievement gap.

The difference in the methodologies results in differences between the rankings in the 2012 report and this 2014 report.

### **Methodology**

This study uses Michigan's 2013-14 School Ranking Business Rules, i.e. the rules used for the state's school Top to Bottom ranking. The initial report included eleven authorizers who authorized three or more charter schools. Currently there are 35 charter school authorizers in the state; this report includes the 24 authorizers whose schools are included in the TtB rankings. They are:

- Bay Mills Community College
- Bay-Arenac ISD
- Central Michigan University
- Detroit City School District
- Eastern Michigan University
- Education Achievement Authority of Michigan
- Ferris State University
- Grand Rapids Public Schools
- Grand Valley State University
- Highland Park City Schools
- Hillsdale ISD
- Kellogg Community College
- Lake Superior State University
- Macomb ISD
- Midland County ESA
- Muskegon Heights School District
- Northern Michigan University
- Oakland University
- Saginaw Valley State University
- Suttons Bay Public Schools
- Traverse City Area Public Schools
- Washtenaw Community College
- Washtenaw ISD
- Wayne RESA

The university authorizers oversee the majority of students in charter schools in 2013-14. Since the initial report, a number of local school districts, intermediate school districts, and a community college have chartered schools for the first time. The newly added authorizers with two years of data include Education Achievement Authority (EAA), Grand Rapids Public Schools, Highland Park City Schools, Kellogg Community College, Macomb ISD, Muskegon Heights School District, Suttons Bay Public Schools and Traverse City Area Public Schools. New authorizers who are not included in this report are Baldwin Community Schools, Center Line Public Schools, Eaton Rapids Public Schools, Crawford-Oscoda-Ogemaw-Roscommon ISD, Jackson Community College, Port Huron Public Schools, and Manistee Area Public Schools.

Part I ranks authorizers by the rules developed by the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability specifically for charter school authorizers. Part II compares the proficiency and growth rates and the achievement gap of authorizers using current Top to Bottom rules. Part III of this study compares subgroup performance by authorizer using the Top to Bottom ranking rules.

### ***Part I: Authorizer Top to Bottom Rankings***

Part I of this study shows a top to bottom ranking for the twenty four authorizers utilizing a methodology developed by Michigan Department of Education's Bureau of Assessment and Accountability specifically to look at charter school authorizers. The Authorizer TTB list rolls up all FAY students in an authorizer's portfolio. The authorizer portfolio is then ranked as a single entity. The portfolio may include some charter school students whose schools did not get a Top to Bottom ranking. The revised methodology, while based on the MDE's 2013-14 School Ranking Business Rules, also includes small authorizers who would not otherwise be included. In order to compare smaller authorizers, schools with ten or more tested students were included, instead of the usual 30 students. Ranking calculations for the "all students group" are based on MEAP or MME tests and do not include students who took MEAP-Access or MI-Access.

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

Authorizers were rank ordered using an achievement index (weighted average of two years of achievement data), an improvement 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. For a more detailed methodology of the Business Rules from the state's website, visit [http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-22709\\_56562---,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-22709_56562---,00.html).

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 2013 and MME 2014**

	Number of FAY tested in MEAP 2013						Number of FAY tested in MME 2014				
	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies		Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies
	60,921	60,828	20,638	20,083	19,036		3,877	3,902	3,925	3,900	3,906
CMU	14,332	14,313	4,936	4,691	4,337	CMU	899	904	909	901	902
GVSU	13,163	13,146	4,379	4,462	4,043	GVSU	651	657	658	656	659
BMCC	9,211	9,182	3,075	3,045	2,923	SVSU	609	614	622	616	614
SVSU	5,326	5,308	1,759	1,798	1,776	BMCC	479	478	478	479	480
FSU	4,064	4,061	1,435	1,325	1,330	FSU	322	326	330	326	324
LSSU	3,457	3,451	1,190	1,151	1,136	OU	224	224	223	224	224
OU	3,142	3,146	1,076	989	953	LSSU	184	186	188	186	189
EMU	1,954	1,955	670	655	610	Washtenaw CC	141	141	141	141	141
Detroit SD	1,911	1,914	669	593	507	Wayne RESA	121	121	121	121	122
NMU	1,818	1,803	597	558	542	EMU	47	48	48	47	47
Highland Park S	634	635	210	206	259	Highland Park S	44	44	44	44	46
EAA	581	582	205	177	198	Muskegon Heights SD	40	41	41	40	40
Muskegon Heights SD	419	423	141	148	148	Macomb ISD	38	39	43	41	39
Wayne RESA	349	350	120	119	114	Kellogg CC	21	21	21	21	21
Hillsdale ISD	232	232	71	66	68	NMU	20	21	21	20	20
Washtenaw ISD	158	157	57	47	48	Midland ESA	14	14	14	14	15
Grand Rapids PS	101	101	25	25	15	Hillsdale ISD	12	12	12	12	12
Suttons Bay PS	35	35	13	4	3	Bay-Arenac ISD	11	11	11	11	11
Traverse City Area PS	34	34	10	24	20	Detroit SD	-	-	-	-	-
Bay-Arenac ISD	-	-	-	-	-	EAA	-	-	-	-	-
Kellogg CC	-	-	-	-	-	Grand Rapids PS	-	-	-	-	-
Macomb ISD	-	-	-	-	1	Suttons Bay PS	-	-	-	-	-
Midland ESA	-	-	-	-	5	Traverse City Area PS	-	-	-	-	-
Washtenaw CC	-	-	-	-	-	Washtenaw ISD	-	-	-	-	-

Three authorizers account for 60% of full academic year (FAY) charter school students taking MEAP: Central Michigan (CMU), Grand Valley (GVSU), and Bay Mills (BMCC). CMU, GVSU, BMCC, and Saginaw Valley (SVSU) account for 67% of high school students taking MME.

Table 2 shows the authorizer ranking using the methodology developed by the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability. The ranking is based on *achievement, improvement, and achievement gaps* across all five tested subjects (mathematics, reading, science, social studies, and writing), as well as graduation rate for authorizers with graduating students. *For schools/authorizers that include grades K-12, all subjects on MEAP and MME and graduation rates are weighted equally.*

**Table 2: Authorizer Top to Bottom Ranking using BAA methodology including schools with 10 or more FAY students tested**

Authorizer Name	z-score for MEAP					z-score for MME					Graduation Rate Index	Overall Performance Index	Rank
	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies			
Washtenaw CC						3.09	2.76	2.96	3.22	2.58	-0.26	2.60	99
Traverse City Area PS	0.49	3.08	-0.82	2.83								1.40	94
Washtenaw ISD	0.56	0.91	0.66	1.36	1.05							0.91	85
Grand Rapids PS	-0.15	-0.21	0.62	1.56	-0.88							0.19	59
Bay-Arenac ISD						0.91	2.16	0.51	-0.59	0.37	-4.95	0.11	55
Hillsdale ISD	-0.21	-0.41	-0.41	-0.35	-0.54	0.87	-0.20	0.07	1.54	0.50		0.09	53
Wayne RESA	0.25	0.42	0.62	0.45	-0.39	0.20	0.14	0.00	-0.81	-0.42	0.07	0.05	52
Midland County ESA						-0.82	1.64	0.27	-0.45	0.96	-4.99	-0.21	39
Oakland U	-0.99	-0.95	-0.89	-1.02	-0.74	0.47	0.47	0.60	0.32	0.03	-0.84	-0.33	34
Bay MillsCC	-0.79	-0.91	-0.61	-0.90	-0.77	0.31	0.35	0.22	0.22	0.12	-1.84	-0.43	30
Central MI U	-0.87	-0.86	-0.66	-0.88	-0.72	-0.98	-0.47	-0.41	-0.65	-0.69	-0.23	-0.67	21
Suttons Bay PS	-0.81	-0.56										-0.69	21
Saginaw Valley SU	-1.29	-1.30	-1.10	-1.14	-0.97	-0.75	-0.49	-0.66	-0.58	-0.76	-0.46	-0.86	15
Macomb ISD						-1.17	-0.52	0.06	-1.81	-1.96	-1.24	-1.10	10
Ferris SU	-1.04	-1.16	-0.77	-1.06	-0.97	-1.83	-1.13	-1.34	-1.45	-1.17	-0.70	-1.14	8
Grand Valley SU	-0.52	-0.64	-0.63	-0.98	-0.66	-1.61	-1.11	-0.92	-1.28	-1.34	-2.75	-1.15	8
Highland Park CS	-1.35	-1.52	-1.18	-0.74	-0.78	-0.32	-0.77	-1.16	-1.43	-0.68	-2.85	-1.18	8
Eastern MI U	-1.33	-1.39	-1.04	-1.35	-1.31	-1.72	-1.19	-1.22	-1.44	-1.06	-0.32	-1.21	7
Lake Superior SU	-1.07	-1.17	-1.51	-1.17	-1.07	-1.20	-1.12	-1.48	-1.00	-1.12	-1.78	-1.25	7
Northern MI U	-0.60	-0.95	-0.81	-0.96	-0.63	-1.29	-2.18	-2.42	-2.20	-1.57		-1.36	5
Detroit City SD	-1.59	-1.75	-1.43	-1.85	-1.24							-1.57	3
Education Achievement Auth.	-1.47	-1.93	-1.65	-2.22	-1.41							-1.74	1
Kellogg CC						-1.32	-1.96	-2.83	-0.74	-0.97	-3.45	-1.75	1
Muskegon Heights SD	-1.38	-1.65	-1.25	-1.01	-1.02	-1.89	-2.91	-3.11	-2.58	-2.64	-0.80	-1.83	1

The MEAP and MME subject areas show the z-scores for each content area and the graduation rate. The second to last column is the Authorizer Performance Index. The Authorizer Performance Index shows the rank order using an achievement index (weighted average of two years of achievement data), an improvement 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 state average for all schools. Washtenaw Community College (Washtenaw CC) ranks highest among the listed authorizers followed by Traverse City Area Public Schools and Washtenaw ISD. Scores that are negative show authorizers below the state average. Muskegon Heights School District, Kellogg Community College (Kellogg CC), Education

Achievement Authority (EAA), and Detroit City School District rank lowest. The last column is a ranking of the authorizers as they would be ranked on the state's Top to Bottom ranking, i.e. comparing authorizers to all schools in the state.

**Part II: A Comparison with CREDO, Authorizer Proficiency, Growth, and the Achievement Gap using 30 or more tested FAY students**

Note: from this point forward, tables will only show data for authorizers with 30 or more tested students.

Table 3 shows the proficiency rates of FAY students taking Fall 2013 MEAP and Table 4 shows the proficiency rates of FAY students taking MME in 2014. Data is shown only for authorizers with thirty or more students tested.

**Table 3: Percentage of Students Proficient on MEAP in 2013**

	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies
<b>State</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>Authorizer Total</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>BMCC</b>	33%	59%	47%	11%	14%
<b>CMU</b>	33%	60%	48%	13%	20%
<b>Detroit SD</b>	14%	37%	31%	9%	6%
<b>EAA</b>	9%	24%	12%	1%	1%
<b>EMU</b>	18%	45%	31%	4%	9%
<b>FSU</b>	22%	48%	36%	6%	10%
<b>Grand Rapids PS</b>	50%	72%	52%	40%	33%
<b>GVSU</b>	40%	65%	53%	14%	22%
<b>Highland Park CS</b>	11%	36%	25%	1%	2%
<b>Hillsdale ISD</b>	35%	65%	42%	14%	19%
<b>LSSU</b>	28%	56%	37%	10%	13%
<b>Muskegon Heights</b>	7%	26%	18%	0%	3%
<b>NMU</b>	33%	58%	42%	13%	14%
<b>Oakland U</b>	25%	51%	49%	7%	13%
<b>SVSU</b>	22%	49%	35%	7%	14%
<b>Suttons Bay</b>	20%	63%	54%	<10	<10
<b>Traverse City PS</b>	29%	91%	40%	42%	80%
<b>Washtenaw ISD</b>	54%	85%	68%	38%	52%
<b>Wayne RESA</b>	35%	72%	50%	14%	16%

On the math test in MEAP 2013, Washtenaw ISD and Grand Rapids Public Schools are the only authorizers that outperform the state. In reading, Traverse City, Washtenaw ISD, Grand Rapids PS, and Wayne RESA have proficiency rates at or above the state rate. In writing, Washtenaw ISD, GVSU, and Suttons Bay PS have proficiency rates at or above the state rate. In science, Traverse City PS, Grand Rapids PS, and Washtenaw ISD have proficiency rates at or above the state rate. In social studies, Traverse City Area PS, Washtenaw ISD, and Grand Rapids PS have proficiency rates at or above the state rate.

**Table 4: Percentage of Students Proficient on MME 2014**

Authorizer Name	Percent Proficient in MME 2014				
	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies
<b>State</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>Authorizers</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>BMCC</b>	22%	47%	41%	19%	35%
<b>CMU</b>	13%	46%	37%	13%	27%
<b>EMU</b>	4%	17%	6%	4%	11%
<b>FSU</b>	8%	36%	25%	9%	16%
<b>GVSU</b>	22%	54%	49%	22%	36%
<b>Highland Park CS</b>	0%	14%	5%	0%	0%
<b>LSSU</b>	16%	42%	35%	16%	33%
<b>Macomb ISD</b>	11%	67%	51%	15%	28%
<b>Muskegon Heights SD</b>	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Oakland U</b>	13%	42%	41%	8%	23%
<b>SVSU</b>	6%	30%	23%	7%	20%
<b>Washtenaw CC</b>	57%	89%	87%	60%	74%
<b>Wayne RESA</b>	15%	42%	35%	11%	21%

On all subjects, students in Washtenaw CC and Hillsdale ISD authorized schools outperform the state proficiency rate on the MME. Students in Macomb ISD authorized schools outperform the state in reading.

Table 5 looks at cumulative growth for All Students and for Students Previously Not Proficient or Partially Proficient. Table 5 shows the cumulative growth/progress of students in math and reading for the last three years of MEAP *using only FAY students*. The four comparisons include the percent of students proficient (proficient in 2011-13), the percent of students Improving or Significantly Improving, the percent of students Not Proficient or Partially Proficient but Improving (growth from 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13). Students are sorted by the growth in math first for All Students.

Table 5 shows a reasonable comparison with the CREDO results. The CREDO study had used a different methodology than Michigan uses to evaluate growth. Michigan uses FAY students in its growth measure. CREDO does not use FAY data in their 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 5: Cumulative Growth in Math and Reading from 2011– 2013 for students in grade 3-8**

Authorizer Name	All Students improving		Students Previously Not Proficient or Partially Proficient Improving	
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading
<b>State</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>57%</b>
<b>Traverse City Area Public Schools</b>	53%	37%	52%	100%
<b>Washtenaw ISD</b>	45%	45%	58%	79%
<b>Grand Rapids Public Schools</b>	42%	56%	50%	75%
<b>Education Achievement Authority</b>	37%	43%	38%	47%
<b>Northern Michigan University</b>	37%	41%	40%	55%
<b>Grand Valley State University</b>	36%	42%	40%	56%
<b>Hillsdale ISD</b>	35%	44%	38%	50%
<b>Detroit City School District</b>	35%	42%	38%	49%
<b>Bay Mills Community College</b>	34%	43%	37%	56%
<b>Central Michigan University</b>	34%	42%	38%	55%
<b>Wayne RESA</b>	32%	34%	37%	66%
<b>Saginaw Valley State University</b>	32%	43%	34%	53%
<b>Oakland University</b>	31%	43%	36%	53%
<b>Muskegon Heights School District</b>	31%	43%	32%	52%
<b>Highland Park City Schools</b>	30%	41%	32%	49%
<b>Lake Superior State University</b>	29%	40%	32%	53%
<b>Ferris State University</b>	28%	43%	30%	54%
<b>Eastern Michigan University</b>	26%	42%	30%	53%
<b>Suttons Bay Public Schools</b>	18%	41%	7%	33%

The cumulative Statewide Growth Rate for math was 32% and for reading was 40%. For the lowest performing students – those who were Not Proficient or Partially Proficient, the cumulative growth rate was 39% in math and 57% in reading. Twelve of 19 authorizers had a growth rate in math for All Students comparable or better than the state average. The seven authorizers whose growth rates were less than the state average included Oakland U, Muskegon Heights SD, Highland Park, LSSU, FSU, and EMU, and Suttons Bay PS. Seventeen authorizers had growth rates in reading for All Students comparable or better than the state average. Only Traverse City Area PS and Wayne RESA had growth rates in reading for All Students lower 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. One important criteria for growth is to look at the lowest performing students, those students who are Not Proficient or Partially Proficient, and evaluate their improvement. Only six of 19 authorizers met or exceeded the state rate of improvement for math for Not Proficient or Partially Proficient Students: Washtenaw ISD, Traverse City PS, Grand Rapids PS, EAA, NMU, and GVSU. In reading, four authorizers met or exceeded the state average for improvement: Traverse City PS, Washtenaw ISD, Grand Rapids PS, and Wayne RESA.

One quarter of the state’s TtB ranking is based on the achievement gap, i.e. the within-school gap in achievement between the top-scoring 30% and bottom-scoring 30% of students. Table 6 shows a ranking of the authorizers, with the widest gap between the highest and lowest performing students.

**Table 6: Achievement Gap Ranking of Authorizers**

Authorizer Name	Elementary/Middle					High School					Overall Gap
	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies	Math	Reading	Writing	Science	Social Studies	
Muskegon Heights SD	1.67	1.84	1.24	2.22	1.72	3.31	2.81	3.50	3.32	3.67	2.53
Highland Park CS	0.89	0.79	0.57	1.88	1.73	3.99	2.12	2.23	3.23	3.41	2.08
EAA	1.22	1.54	2.03	2.01	2.14						1.79
Traverse City PS	1.04	2.95	-0.74	3.83							1.77
EMU	-0.28	-0.46	-0.05	0.00	0.27	1.12	2.82	2.55	2.20	1.68	0.99
Macomb ISD						0.31	1.07	0.93	1.53	0.46	0.86
Washtenaw CC						1.20	0.72	0.92	0.58	0.56	0.80
Hillsdale ISD	0.00	-0.41	-0.16	0.58	-0.17	0.24	0.86	0.84	2.61	2.67	0.71
Wayne RESA	0.87	0.77	1.07	0.51	-0.37	-0.31	0.62	0.13	0.10	0.31	0.37
SVSU	-0.48	-0.46	-0.39	-0.07	-0.33	0.29	1.55	1.16	1.18	0.61	0.31
Oakland University	-0.66	-0.40	-1.57	-0.05	-0.04	0.28	0.84	-0.02	1.12	0.69	0.02
Suttons Bay PS	0.87	-0.88									0.00
FSU	-0.23	-0.17	-0.20	-0.40	-0.06	0.13	0.06	-0.13	0.24	0.15	-0.06
NMU	-0.86	-0.71	-1.13	-1.12	-0.10	0.80	0.98	-0.11	-1.41	-0.07	-0.37
Detroit City SD	-0.36	-0.14	-0.77	-2.17	1.05						-0.48
CMU	-1.49	-1.31	-1.22	-1.12	-1.07	-0.30	0.16	-0.10	0.40	-0.01	-0.61
LSSU	-1.17	-1.13	-0.74	-0.70	-0.25	-0.49	-0.56	-0.85	-0.18	-0.32	-0.64
Washtenaw ISD	-0.93	-0.59	-0.49	-0.14	-1.07						-0.64
BMCC	-1.25	-1.04	-1.04	-0.57	-0.21	-1.65	-1.79	-1.66	-1.39	-1.93	-1.25
GVSU	-1.71	-1.40	-1.52	-1.32	-1.12	-1.41	-1.01	-1.07	-1.10	-1.57	-1.32
Grand Rapids PS	-1.07	-3.52	-1.23	-1.13	-2.17						-1.82

Authorizers with a positive achievement gap have a smaller gap than the state average. In other words, students in the bottom 30% are performing at a level not significantly lower than students in the top 30%. Authorizers with a negative achievement gap have a higher gap than the state average. In other words, students in the bottom 30% within the authorizer’s schools are performing at a level significantly below the top 30% within their schools. Schools where proficiency levels are either very high or very low are less likely to have achievement gaps. Most of the authorizers identified with the smallest achievement gaps, i.e. Muskegon Heights SD, Highland Park SD, EAA, Traverse City PS, Macomb ISD, Washtenaw CC, and Hillsdale ISD are more likely to have a homogenous population (with either a concentration of low or high proficiency rates) than authorizers with large achievement gaps.

**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 and MME tests in the grades where they are administered.

Table 7 shows the number and proportion of students tested in MEAP and MME tested grades. Table 8 compares the proportion of students in each subgroup by authorizer. Authorizers with less than thirty FAY students in subgroups tested are not included.

In Michigan, race is correlated with economically disadvantaged. 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 Economically Disadvantaged than the state population as a whole. A smaller percentage of Special Education students are in charter schools and a larger percentage of Limited English Proficient students than the state population as a whole.

**Table 7: Number of students by subgroup for authorizers with 30 or more tested students**

Authorizer Name	Number of FAY tested in MEAP 13 and MME 14									
	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	Not ED	LEP	Not LEP	SE	Not SE
State	831,264	586,184	138,033	53,144	384,691	446,573	36,735	794,529	82,716	748,548
All Authorizers	75,022	23,946	40,464	5,595	52,415	22,576	5,138	69,869	7,019	67,963
CMU	17,485	6,807	8,725	937	11,412	6,073	932	16,553	1,631	15,854
GVSU	15,940	5,786	7,702	945	9,743	6,197	564	15,376	1,527	14,413
BMCC	11,342	3,621	5,838	877	7,883	3,459	783	10,559	1,066	10,276
SVSU	6,906	1,828	3,551	1,385	5,380	1,526	1,014	5,892	559	6,347
FSU	5,186	1,244	3,045	633	4,254	932	617	4,569	527	4,659
LSSU	4,246	1,516	2,288	291	2,880	1,366	216	4,030	461	3,785
OU	3,815	1,324	2,285	33	3,230	585	707	3,108	215	3,600
EMU	2,352	228	1,954	97	1,926	426	77	2,275	265	2,087
Detroit CS	2,170	47	2,030	<10	1,919	251	69	2,101	203	1,967
NMU	2,074	590	765	303	1,497	577	159	1,915	213	1,861
Highland Park CS	835	<10	827	<10	712	123	-	835	84	751
EAA	695	<10	683	<10	590	105	<10	688	83	612
Muskegon Heights SD	558	15	523	13	508	50	-	558	85	473
Wayne RESA	545	224	223	59	284	261	<10	542	58	487
Hillsdale ISD	263	253	<10	<10	70	193	-	263	11	252
Washtenaw ISD	180	129	<10	<10	17	163	-	180	31	149
Washtenaw CC	141	119	13	-	17	124	-	141	<10	134
Grand Rapids PS	101	58	<10	22	44	57	<10	97	<10	97
Traverse City Area PS	54	53	-	-	<10	46	-	54	<10	49
Macomb ISD	45	31	12	<10	12	33	-	45	<10	39
Suttons Bay PS	36	27	-	<10	<10	29	-	36	<10	28

**Table 8: Comparison of the number of students tested by subgroup and the distribution of students tested**

Authorizer Name	Percent of FAY students tested in MEAP 2013 and MME 2014									
	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	Not ED	LEP	Not LEP	SE	Not SE
State	100%	71%	17%	6%	46%	54%	4%	96%	10%	90%
All Authorizers		32%	54%	7%	70%	30%	7%	93%	9%	91%
BMCC	100%	32%	51%	8%	70%	30%	7%	93%	9%	91%
CMU	100%	39%	50%	5%	65%	35%	5%	95%	9%	91%
Detroit CS	100%	2%	94%	<10	88%	12%	3%	97%	9%	91%
EMU	100%	10%	83%	4%	82%	18%	3%	97%	11%	89%
EAA	100%	<10	98%	<10	85%	15%	<10	99%	12%	88%
FSU	100%	24%	59%	12%	82%	18%	12%	88%	10%	90%
Grand Rapids PS	100%	57%	<10	22%	44%	56%	<10	96%	<10	96%
GVSU	100%	36%	48%	6%	61%	39%	4%	96%	10%	90%
Highland Park CS	100%	<10	99%	<10	85%	15%	0%	100%	10%	90%
Hillsdale ISD	100%	96%	<10	<10	27%	73%	0%	100%	4%	96%
LSSU	100%	36%	54%	7%	68%	32%	5%	95%	11%	89%
Macomb ISD	100%	69%	27%	<10	27%	73%	0%	100%	<10	87%
Muskegon Heights SD	100%	3%	94%	2%	91%	9%	0%	100%	15%	85%
NMU	100%	28%	37%	15%	72%	28%	8%	92%	10%	90%
OU	100%	35%	60%	1%	85%	15%	19%	81%	6%	94%
SVSU	100%	26%	51%	20%	78%	22%	15%	85%	8%	92%
Suttons Bay PS	100%	75%	0%	<10	<10	81%	0%	100%	<10	78%
Traverse City Area PS	100%	98%	0%	0%	<10	85%	0%	100%	<10	91%
Washtenaw CC	100%	84%	9%	0%	12%	88%	0%	100%	<10	95%
Washtenaw ISD	100%	72%	<10	<10	9%	91%	0%	100%	17%	83%
Wayne RESA	100%	41%	41%	11%	52%	48%	<10	99%	11%	89%

Statewide 17% of tested students are Black; among charter school authorizers, the percentage is 54%. The percentage of economically disadvantaged (ED) tested students statewide is 46%, compared to 70% of tested students in schools by the included authorizers.

Tables 9-12 show the percentage of FAY students proficient in Math and Reading on MEAP /MME by subgroups. Six authorizers with less than thirty FAY students in subgroups tested are not included (Suttons Bay, Traverse City Area PS, Grand Rapids PS, Midland ESA, Kellogg CC, and Bay-Arenac).

**Table 9: Percentage of FAY students by subgroup proficient in Math in all tested grades including 11th grade**

Authorizer Name	Percent proficient in Math of FAY students taking MEAP 2013 and MME 20 14									
	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	Not ED	LEP	Not LEP	SE	Not SE
<b>State</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>43%</b>
Washtenaw CC	57%	61%	23%		<10	60%		57%	<10	58%
Washtenaw ISD	54%	57%	<10	<10	27%	57%		54%	27%	60%
Grand Rapids PS	50%	59%	<10	27%	39%	58%	<10	52%	<10	51%
GVSU	39%	54%	25%	34%	29%	55%	29%	40%	15%	41%
Hillsdale ISD	36%	36%		<10	21%	41%		36%	0%	37%
Bay Mills CC	33%	47%	20%	27%	25%	51%	16%	34%	11%	35%
NMU	33%	41%	19%	26%	26%	51%	15%	34%	11%	35%
CMU	32%	48%	17%	34%	21%	53%	19%	33%	14%	34%
Wayne RESA	30%	41%	16%	25%	21%	38%	<10	30%	8%	32%
Traverse City Area PS	29%	27%			67%	26%		29%	<10	29%
LSSU	27%	43%	16%	22%	19%	44%	19%	28%	13%	29%
Oakland U	25%	29%	22%	21%	22%	37%	14%	27%	9%	25%
Ferris SU	21%	36%	13%	16%	17%	38%	14%	21%	6%	22%
Suttons Bay PS	20%	27%		<10	<10	25%		20%	<10	18%
SVSU	20%	39%	10%	19%	16%	35%	10%	22%	6%	21%
EMU	17%	41%	14%	26%	16%	27%	30%	17%	12%	18%
Detroit City SD	14%	12%	14%	<10	13%	18%	9%	14%	9%	14%
Highland Park CS	11%		11%	<10	10%	13%		11%	5%	11%
Macomb ISD	11%	15%	0%	0%	0%	15%		11%	<10	9%
EAA	9%	<10	8%	<10	8%	11%	<10	9%	4%	9%
Muskegon Heights SD	7%	8%	7%		7%	2%		7%		7%

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

In math statewide, 41% of all students, 46% of White students, 16% of Black students, and 27% of Hispanic students were proficient. Black students exceeded the state proficiency rate at schools authorized by Washtenaw CC, GVSU, BMCC, NMU, and Oakland U. Hispanic students at schools authorized by GVSU and CMU exceeded the state rate. Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students at schools authorized by Washtenaw ISD, Grand Rapids PS, GVSU, NMU, and Traverse City PS outperformed the state average of 25% proficiency. Limited English Proficient (LEP) students at schools authorized by GVSU and EMU outperformed the state proficiency average of 19%. Only Special Education students at schools authorized by Washtenaw ISD, outperformed the 15% state average.

**Table 10: Percentage of FAY students by subgroup proficient in Reading in all tested grades including 11th grade**

Authorizer Name	Percent proficient in Reading of FAY students taking MEAP 2013 and MME 20 14									
	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	Not ED	LEP	Not LEP	SE	Not SE
<b>State</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>71%</b>
Traverse City Area PS	91%	91%			<10	90%		91%	<10	97%
Washtenaw CC	89%	90%	77%		71%	91%		89%	<10	89%
Washtenaw ISD	85%	88%	<10		67%	87%		85%	65%	89%
Grand Rapids PS	72%	79%	<10	59%	57%	84%	<10	74%	<10	73%
Macomb ISD	67%	74%	40%	<10	73%	64%		67%	<10	69%
Hillsdale ISD	65%	66%	<10	<10	54%	69%		65%	18%	67%
GVSU	65%	79%	51%	64%	55%	80%	47%	65%	31%	67%
Wayne RESA	64%	79%	47%	59%	53%	74%	<10	64%	31%	67%
Suttons Bay PS	63%	69%		<10	<10	68%		63%	<10	61%
CMU	59%	74%	45%	62%	50%	78%	41%	60%	30%	62%
Bay Mills CC	58%	71%	48%	55%	51%	75%	32%	60%	24%	61%
NMU	58%	70%	47%	48%	51%	79%	28%	61%	30%	61%
LSSU	55%	71%	45%	45%	47%	71%	40%	56%	27%	58%
Oakland U	51%	52%	50%	36%	48%	69%	25%	57%	24%	52%
SVSU	47%	67%	38%	43%	42%	64%	27%	50%	18%	49%
Ferris SU	47%	60%	41%	44%	43%	65%	29%	49%	17%	50%
EMU	45%	74%	41%	55%	42%	60%	57%	44%	25%	47%
Detroit City SD	37%	37%	37%	<10	37%	40%	20%	38%	17%	39%
Highland Park CS	34%		34%	<10	33%	40%		34%	17%	36%
Muskegon Heights SD	24%	31%	24%	17%	24%	24%		24%	4%	27%
EAA	24%	<10	24%	<10	24%	23%	<10	24%	12%	25%

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

The percentage of proficient Black students was higher than the state average for schools authorized by Washtenaw CC, GVSU, Wayne RESA, CMU, Bay Mills, NMU, LSSU, and Oakland U. The percentage of proficient Hispanic students was higher than the state average for schools authorized by Grand Rapids PS, GVSU, Wayne RESA, CMU, and EMU. Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students at schools authorized by Washtenaw CC and Washtenaw ISD, Grand Rapids PS, and GVSU, outperformed the state average of 55% proficiency. Limited English Proficient students at school authorized by GVSU, CMU, LSSU and EMU outperformed the state proficiency average of 35% proficiency. Only Special Education students at schools authorized by Washtenaw ISD, outperformed the 34% state proficiency average.

**Table 11: Percentage of FAY students by subgroup proficient in Writing in all tested grades including 11<sup>th</sup> grade**

Authorizer Name	Percent proficient in Writing of FAY students taking MEAP 2013 and MME 20 14									
	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	Not ED	LEP	Not LEP	SE	Not SE
<b>State</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>57%</b>
Washtenaw CC	87%	88%	77%		71%	90%		87%	<10	87%
Washtenaw ISD	68%	65%	<10	<10	<10	73%		68%	<10	78%
Suttons Bay PS	54%	<10		<10	<10	60%		54%	<10	64%
GVSU	52%	63%	42%	47%	42%	68%	36%	53%	17%	55%
Grand Rapids PS	52%	58%	<10	<10	<10	63%	<10	54%	<10	54%
Macomb ISD	51%	52%	50%	<10	55%	50%		51%	<10	55%
Oakland U	48%	49%	47%	50%	45%	62%	32%	52%	15%	49%
Hillsdale ISD	47%	47%	<10	<10	25%	58%		47%	<10	48%
CMU	46%	57%	35%	49%	38%	61%	28%	47%	15%	49%
Bay Mills CC	46%	53%	38%	45%	39%	62%	27%	47%	11%	49%
Wayne RESA	42%	54%	32%	44%	33%	55%		42%	14%	46%
NMU	41%	49%	31%	34%	35%	60%	17%	43%	6%	45%
Traverse City Are	40%	40%			<10	<10		40%	<10	<10
LSSU	37%	50%	29%	23%	30%	53%	16%	38%	6%	40%
Ferris SU	34%	45%	28%	33%	31%	48%	28%	35%	7%	37%
SVSU	32%	48%	23%	32%	28%	45%	19%	34%	8%	34%
Detroit City SD	31%	31%	29%	<10	29%	42%	32%	31%	11%	33%
EMU	30%	42%	28%	44%	29%	34%	54%	29%	14%	31%
Highland Park CS	21%		21%		23%	13%		21%	0%	23%
Muskegon Heigh	14%	<10	13%	<10	14%	14%		14%	0%	16%
EAA	12%		12%	<10	12%	12%	<10	12%	0%	13%

Only two of the authorizers had proficiency rates above the state average of 53%: Washtenaw CC and Washtenaw ISD. Black students in schools authorized by Washtenaw ISD, GVSU, Macomb ISD, Oakland U, BMCC, CMU, Wayne RESA and NMU exceeded the statewide average of 31% proficiency. Economically disadvantaged students in schools authorized by Washtenaw CC, GVSU, Macomb ISD, Oakland U, CMU, and BMCC met or exceeded the statewide proficiency average of 38%. Only Special Education students in schools authorized by GVSU met or exceeded the statewide average of 16%.

**Table 12: Percentage of FAY students by subgroup proficient in Science in all tested grades including 11<sup>th</sup> grade**

Authorizer Name	Percent proficient in Science of FAY students taking MEAP 2013 and MME 20 14									
	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	Not ED	LEP	Not LEP	SE	Not SE
<b>State</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>25%</b>
Washtenaw CC	60%	65%	31%		59%	60%		60%	<10	60%
Washtenaw ISD	38%	43%		<10	<10	39%		38%	<10	44%
Hillsdale ISD	19%	20%	<10		7%	22%		19%	<10	20%
GVSU	15%	28%	4%	15%	9%	25%	4%	15%	4%	16%
Macomb ISD	15%	21%	0%	<10	9%	17%		15%	<10	14%
CMU	13%	24%	3%	9%	5%	27%	3%	13%	6%	14%
NMU	13%	21%	7%	4%	8%	27%	0%	14%	6%	14%
Wayne RESA	13%	23%	7%	10%	8%	18%	<10	13%	7%	13%
Bay Mills CC	12%	23%	5%	7%	7%	23%	1%	13%	3%	13%
LSSU	11%	21%	4%	9%	6%	20%	10%	11%	3%	12%
Detroit City SD	9%	0%	10%	<10	9%	8%	0%	10%	8%	9%
Oakland U	7%	8%	6%	0%	6%	14%	6%	8%	1%	8%
SVSU	7%	17%	2%	5%	5%	14%	1%	8%	2%	7%
Ferris SU	6%	19%	1%	5%	3%	22%	1%	7%	1%	7%
EMU	4%	21%	1%	9%	2%	14%	10%	4%	1%	5%
Highland Park CS	1%		1%	<10	1%	2%		1%	0%	1%
EAA	1%	<10	1%		0%	4%	<10	1%	0%	1%
Muskegon Heights SD	0%	<10	0%	<10	0%	0%		0%	0%	0%

Science has the lowest proficiency rate of any of the state tests with less than one quarter of the state's students demonstrating proficiency. Only Washtenaw CC and Washtenaw ISD had proficiency rates above the statewide average. Only in the Washtenaw CC authorized school did black students demonstrate proficiency near the state average. Economically disadvantaged students in schools authorized by Washtenaw CC, GVSU, Macomb ISD, Oakland U, CMU, and BMCC met or exceeded the statewide proficiency average of 38%. Only Special Education students in schools authorized by GVSU met or exceeded the statewide average of 16%.

**Table 13: Percentage of FAY students by subgroup proficient in Social Studies in all tested grades including 11<sup>th</sup> grade**

Authorizer Name	Percent proficient in Social Studies of FAY students taking MEAP 2013 and MME 20 14									
	All Students	White	Black	Hispanic	ED	Not ED	LEP	Not LEP	SE	Not SE
<b>State</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>35%</b>
Washtenaw CC	74%	75%	77%		71%	75%		74%	<10	76%
Washtenaw ISD	52%	58%	<10	<10	40%	55%		52%	<10	59%
Macomb ISD	28%	32%	10%	<10	42%	21%		28%	<10	26%
GVSU	24%	40%	10%	25%	14%	39%	9%	25%	7%	26%
Hillsdale ISD	24%	25%	<10	<10	11%	27%		24%		24%
CMU	21%	34%	8%	19%	12%	37%	7%	22%	8%	22%
Wayne RESA	19%	36%	10%	24%	11%	31%	<10	19%	8%	21%
Bay Mills CC	17%	30%	8%	16%	11%	30%	9%	18%	4%	19%
LSSU	16%	31%	7%	10%	9%	31%	8%	17%	3%	18%
SVSU	15%	36%	7%	14%	12%	25%	5%	17%	7%	16%
Oakland U	15%	18%	13%	8%	13%	24%	13%	16%	2%	16%
NMU	14%	27%	3%	3%	8%	28%	0%	15%	8%	15%
Ferris SU	11%	28%	5%	7%	7%	29%	1%	12%	3%	12%
EMU	9%	42%	5%	13%	6%	20%	10%	9%	13%	8%
Detroit City SD	6%	8%	6%	<10	6%	3%	8%	6%	6%	6%
Muskegon Heights SD	2%	<10	2%	<10	2%	5%		2%	0%	3%
Highland Park CS	1%	<10	1%	<10	2%	0%		1%	3%	1%
EAA	1%	<10	1%		1%	0%	<10	1%	0%	1%

One in three students in the state is proficient in social studies. For students in all subgroups, but White, the percentage of proficient students is much lower. Subgroups at Washtenaw CC outperform subgroups in all other authorizers' schools.

### Summary of Findings /Conclusions

- Since the first authorizer report, an additional 76 charter schools have opened and 30 have closed. The number of charter schools with high school grades has increased, including cyber schools.
- Authorizer demographics vary widely. Two authorizers, CMU and GVSU, tested more than 13,000 students on MEAP reading and math, compared to two authorizers, Traverse City Area PS, and Suttons Bay PS, who tested 34 and 35 students. The number of high school students tested varies from 904 by CMU, 657 by GVSU, and 614 by SVSU to 21 or less at schools authorized by Kellogg CC, NMU, Midland County ESA, Hillsdale ISD, and Bay-Arenac ISD. The White student population varies from greater than 90% in Traverse City Area PS, Hillsdale ISD and Bay-Arenac, to less than 10% in the EAA, Highland Park, Muskegon Heights SD, Detroit City, and EMU authorized schools. The Black population varied from greater than 90% in Highland Park, EAA, Muskegon Heights, and Detroit to 9 authorizers with less than 10% Black students. Limited English Proficient students are concentrated in schools authorized by Oakland U (17%), SVSU (15%), and FSU (12%). Only two authorizers had a greater percentage of proficient Special

Education students than the state average – Washtenaw ISD (17%) and Muskegon Heights SD (15%).

- The authorizers with higher than state proficiency average in reading are Traverse City, Washtenaw ISD Grand Rapids PS, and Wayne RESA. In math, only Washtenaw ISD and Grand Rapids PS outperform the state. Only two Authorizers outperform the state average on MME subjects – Washtenaw CC and Hillsdale ISD.
- Students in schools of 12 authorizers had a cumulative growth rate in math for all students that was greater than the state growth rate. Seventeen authorizers outperformed the state in their cumulative growth in reading. However for the lowest performing students – those who are not proficient/partially proficient, only six of the authorizers met or exceed the state rate of improvement for math – Washtenaw ISD, Traverse City PS, Grand Rapids PS, EAA, NMU, and GVSU. In reading, the four authorizers who met or exceed the state average for improvement of the lowest performing students were Traverse City PS, Washtenaw ISD, Grand Rapids PS, and Wayne RESA.
- As has been correlated in other studies, the single factor that determines student proficiency on the statewide tests (and thus a higher ranking on TtB) is poverty and the percentage of Black students. Of the 6 authorizers who ranked above 50, only Wayne RESA has more than 10% Black students. Of the 10 authorizers who ranked below 10, Kellogg CC has less than 10 Black students, NMU had 37%, GVSU had 48% and the remaining 7 were greater than 54%. In the schools of authorizers ranked above 50, only Grand Rapids PS had a significant percentage of economically disadvantaged (44%); among the lowest ranked authorizers, the percentage of ED varied from 61% to 91% with most authorizers having more than 80% of the tested students receiving free/reduced price lunch
- Using the Top-to-Bottom ranking, when compared to all schools, the smaller authorizers – those with one or two schools, rank higher than authorizers with a large number of schools. Newer authorizers with schools open for only two years of data are likely to be ranked higher than authorizers where schools have been open longer periods of time. The authorizers who are ranked above the state average on the TtB include Washtenaw CC, Traverse City Area PS, Washtenaw ISD, Grand Rapids PS, Bay-Arenac ISD, Hillsdale ISD and Wayne RESA. All but Hillsdale and Wayne RESA have either only elementary/middle or high school grades.
- The larger, primarily university authorizers, are more likely to include K-12 schools. Z-scores on MME subjects tend to be lower than z-scores on MEAP subjects. Because the state calculates a simple average across all z-scores in the authorizer's portfolio, those authorizers with high school grades are more likely to have lower TtB rankings.
- The achievement gap is smaller for the smaller more homogenous authorizers. For authorizers with both elementary/middle and high schools, the achievement gap in high schools is smaller than the achievement gap in elementary/middle school.

Authorizers with the larger achievement gaps include most of the university authorizers who serve diverse communities.