

# PA 601: Finalizing the A-F System



# Where we have been

- PA 601 was passed in December 2018 during lame duck and was signed into law by then-Governor Snyder.
- MDE began months of discussions with the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) to understand to what extent PA 601 could meet the requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
- In May 2019, it was clear from USDOE that the state system could not meet the requirements of ESSA.
- The MDE escalated design efforts for the A-F system.
- The legislatively required peer review panel was nominated by Governor Whitmer.
- The MDE began discussing the A-F system, with a focus on the elements that allowed decision making discretion, with the State Board of Education.

## Where we are now

- The State Board of Education (SBE) has reviewed the initial A-F work and has provided decisions and feedback to the MDE.
- The MDE and the SBE have reviewed:
  - The recommended cut scores from the standard recommending committee
  - The report of the legislatively required peer review panel
- Using these inputs, the following slides represent:
  - SBE input
  - Proposed cut scores

# Determining the Grading Scale for Each Required Factor

- The law requires that schools be assigned grades and labels
- Determining the “cut scores” for those grades and labels is decision-making discretion
  - A “cut score” is the score that separates one grade from another
- How is a “cut score” determined?
  - Utilize a process to develop *recommended* cut scores
    - Independent facilitator
    - Educators develop recommended definitions, use data, and produce recommended cut scores/grading scales
  - Legally mandated peer review panel reviews these proposed standards and writes report
  - (Note: The law does not say “approve” but simply review.)
  - Approval of the cut scores (decision-making discretion)

# How Recommended Cut Scores are Developed

- MDE engaged an independent facilitator, the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA)
  - NCIEA has done accountability standard setting in five other states and provides a nationally recognized, independent voice of expertise
- MDE identified a committee of practitioners that included 11 individuals
- The committee met twice:
  - First to establish performance level descriptors
  - Then to look at possible impact data and establish cut scores

# On Track Attendance: Cut Scores

“On track attendance” means that a student misses fewer than 10% of the school days

	<b>Significantly Above Average</b>	<b>Above Average</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Below Average</b>	<b>Significantly Below Average</b>
On Track Attendance	94 - 100	88 – < 94	76.5 - < 88	55 - < 76.5	Below 55

# Assessment Participation: Cut Scores

	<b>Significantly Above Average</b>	<b>Above Average</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Below Average</b>	<b>Significantly Below Average</b>
Assessment Participation	96.5 - 100	94 - < 96.5	91.5 - < 94	86 - < 91.5	Below 86

# Subgroup Comparison: Cut Scores

- This metric compares subgroups in a school with the state average for those subgroups. The goal is to identify schools with subgroups performing below the state average.
- Average those comparisons and obtain a score.
- The scores are then divided into categories, where a low score means the school is close to the state average and a high score means they are well below the state average.

	Significantly Above Average	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Significantly Below Average
Subgroup Comparison	1.00	1.00 - < 1.25	1.25 - < 1.5	1.5 - < 1.9	Above 1.9



# English Learner Progress: Cut Scores

Numbers in the chart indicate the percent of English Learners who demonstrate proficiency or adequate growth on the English language learner assessment (WIDA-Access).

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
EL Progress	60 - 100	45- < 60	25- < 45	10- < 25	Below 10

# Graduation Rate: Cut Scores

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
Graduation Rate	93 – 100	85 - <93	75 - <85	67 - <75	Below 67

# Proficiency: Cut Scores

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
Proficiency	55-100	40 - <55	23 - <40	10 - <23	Below 10

# Modifying the Growth Metric

- There has been substantial interest and discussion regarding the best ways to measure and credit schools for the growth that students demonstrate on assessments.
- For the first year of A-F, we recommend that we use the current growth calculation.
- Concurrently, we will convene a stakeholder group to discuss the various options for modifying this metric in the future.



# Growth: Cut Scores

The numbers in the table are the percent of students in the school who demonstrated *adequate growth*.

	A	B	C	D	F
Growth	55-100	40 - <55	25 - <40	10 - <25	Below 10

# Comparison to Similar Schools

---

To be responsive to feedback, the MDE proposes changing the matching methodology to:

70% free lunch

20% student with disabilities

10% student FTE

# Comparison to Similar Schools

The number ranges in the table below are *z-score ranges*. Z-scores range from 3 (extremely above average) to -3 (extremely below average), although in practice, most z-scores range from 1 (above average) to -1 (below average). A z-score of zero tells you that you are no different than the average.

	A	B	C	D	F
Peer Comparison	Above or Equal to 0.89	0.48 - 0.89	-0.15 - 0.48	-0.84 - -0.15	Below -0.84

# Questions?

## **Venessa A. Keesler, Ph.D.**

Deputy Superintendent, Division of Educator,  
Student and School Supports

[keeslerv@Michigan.gov](mailto:keeslerv@Michigan.gov)

## **Chris Janzer**

Assistant Director for Accountability, Office of  
Educational Assessment and Accountability

[janzerc@michigan.gov](mailto:janzerc@michigan.gov)

For more information visit The MDE  
Accountability website: [www.Michigan.gov/mde-  
accountability](http://www.Michigan.gov/mde-accountability)