What is happening?

Accountability System and Identification of Schools in Need of Improvement
Identification of Schools

Aligned with Top 10 in 10 & Required by ESSA

Michigan’s Top 10 in 10 Plan

- Data and accountability will be used to help drive resources and focus improvement activities for students and educators.

- Reduce the impact of high-risk factors, including poverty, and provide equitable resources to meet the needs of all students to ensure that they have access to quality educational opportunities.
Identification of Schools

Aligned with Top 10 in 10 and Required by ESSA

Michigan ESSA Plan

– Designed to improve the way Michigan
  • supports students and schools,
  • trains and evaluates educators,
  • assesses student learning,
  • and holds schools accountable for results.
– Approved by USED in November of 2017
Accountability Timelines

- **2016-17** accountability (Winter/Early Spring 2018) will be run using the new system and will include required federal designations.
  - Secure preview for schools February 26 - March 26, 2018
  - Public release by March 30, 2018

- **2017-18** accountability (Fall 2018) will be run and be used to support Partnership District work.
Major Accountability Changes

- Unification of tasks previously accomplished by separate systems
  - Scorecard
  - Top-to-Bottom (TTB)
  - Gap Ranking
  - English Learner (EL) accountability (i.e., NCLB Title III AMAOs)
- Partial points based on the degree to which targets are met
- Common statewide targets
- Only building-level accountability

- Frequency of federal designations
- Addition of School Quality/Student Success component
- Greater flexibility in how states and district support designated schools
- Increases local control of, and local responsibility for, the improvement of designated schools
- 1% cap moves to participation
Index System: Index Values

- 0-100 index values generated for almost every public school
  - Subset of these schools eligible for identifications

- Index values are used to determine federally required identifications
  - Example: lowest 5% of overall index values = Comprehensive Support schools

- Index values also generated for each system component and any subgroup in the school meeting minimum n-size requirements

- All index values use a percent of target met concept
  - Example: proficiency target is 80%. School’s proficiency = 50%. Proficiency index = 50/80 or 62.5.
Long Term Goals and Targets

• Index values are tied to performance against long term goals
  – Percent of goal (target) met

• Long term goals are ambitious and aligned to Top 10 in 10

• Goals to increase performance such that the statewide average moves up to the value of the current 75th percentile by the end of 2024-25
  – Goals are “anchored” at these values through 2024-25

• Expectations are the same for all students

• Participation requirement (target) remains at 95%
Index System: Components

• ESSA requires the accountability system to have the following components:
  – Proficiency
  – Growth
  – Graduation Rate
  – English Learner (EL) Progress
  – School Quality/Student Success

• Michigan has chosen to have the following additional component:
  – Participation
    – 95% participation rate is still required under ESSA system but not required to be a component

• Subgroup disaggregation for all components except EL Progress

• Min. n-size 30 for all subgroups
Index System: Components

- Overall indices (0-100) are calculated by combining component indices using the following weights:
  - 29% Proficiency
  - 34% Growth
  - 10% Graduation Rate
  - 10% English Learner (EL) Progress
  - 14% School Quality/Student Success
  - 3% Participation

- Weights are redistributed proportionally if a school is missing a component

- Proficiency and Growth use Math and ELA only

- Each component also has a index value from 0-100
Using the Index for School Identification
To meet the minimum requirements of ESSA, the accountability system is required to identify:

- **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI)**
  - Lowest performing schools
  - Schools with graduation rates below 67%
  - Additional Targeted Support Schools not exiting that status in a state-determined timeframe

- **Targeted Support and Improvement Schools (TSI)**
  - Schools with 1-2 subgroups performing at the level of a CSI school

- **Additional Targeted Support Schools (ATS)**
  - Schools in which three or more subgroups are performing at the level of a CSI school
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>How often is the designation given?</th>
<th>Who determines supports?</th>
<th>Who determines exit criteria and timelines?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Every 3 Years</td>
<td>LEA; Approved by SEA</td>
<td>SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>School; Approved by LEA</td>
<td>LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add’l Targeted</td>
<td>Every 3 Years</td>
<td>School; Approved by LEA</td>
<td>SEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How was the Index Used

Business rules for identification of schools for improvement
- Approximately 3,400 schools received an Index value
- Of those schools approximately 2,800 met the following rules
  - Minimum n-size of 30
    - Mathematics, English Language Arts, and Graduation Rate
  - Special Education Centers were exempted
    - 100% of students in building have an IEP

Special Consideration for Alternative Education Entities
- At least 90% of students are flagged as ‘alternative education’ in MSDS
- Educational Setting in the EEM contains ‘Alt’
- School Emphasis in EEM is ‘Alternative Education’
Schools: Three methods for CSI identification
- Lowest performing schools - among lowest 5%
- Schools with graduation rates below 67%
- ATS Schools not exiting that status in a state-determined timeframe

Districts: Partnership District
- In most cases having a CSI school was a flag for designation
  - The CSI was identified as a low performing school
- Exception: CSI schools that are an Alternative Education Entity did not lead to a Partnership District designation
CSI Planning

Requirements
– Differentiated based upon district partnership status
– Incorporate existing planning systems to complete (SIP/DIP)
– Approved by the local district and the MDE

The CSI plan is required to:
– be informed by the indicators within the Index,
– include evidence-based interventions,
– be based on a school-level needs assessment, and
– identify resource inequities.
Targeted Support and Improvement Schools (TSI)
• Schools with 1-2 subgroups that are low performing

Additional Targeted Support Schools (ATS)
• Schools in which three or more subgroups are low performing

Both TSI and ATS Plans are developed and approved by local district
School Supports

ESSA Title I Supports
• Regional Assistance Grants (RAG)
• The intermediate school district (ISD) or educational service agency (ESA) receives funding to assist the district in the creation, implementation and monitoring of the CSI plan
• The ISD/ESA provides a CSI plan Implementation Facilitator at no cost
• The ISD/ESA provides supports at no cost
• All CSI schools may receive RAG supports regardless of Title I status
Regional Assistance Grants

• RAG supports **are**:
  – Aligned with the CSI plan
  – Based on the results of the needs assessment
  – Flexible and responsive
  – Mutually agreed upon by the district and ISD/ESA

• RAG supports **are not**:
  – Arbitrary and unconnected to the CSI plan
  – Prescriptive
  – Defined and dictated by the state
  – Defined and dictated by the ISD/ESA
If the “home” ISD/ESA does not have the capacity to provide certain supports or services, the district may secure those services from another ISD/ESA.
Statewide Technical Assistance Grant (TAG)

Training, technical assistance, and professional learning for all CSI and TSI schools and their districts in the following areas:

- The Blueprint for Systemic Reconfiguration
- Multi-Tiered Systems of Support
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment
TAG supports are:
• Optional
• Provided at no cost for CSI and TSI schools and their district staff regardless of Title I status
• Coordinated with the Regional Assistance Grant for CSI schools
• Provided statewide through face-to-face and virtual sessions
Next Steps, Timelines, Resources
Next Steps and Timelines

• Public release will occur the week of March 26, 2018
• Local districts will have 90 days to complete their Partnership Agreements (If applicable) [July 1, 2018]
• The timeline for CSI Planning Requirements will be determined soon.
• Continued coordination of supports
Next Steps Points of Contact

• Partnership Districts
  – Liaison

• Non-Partnership Districts with at least one CSI school
  – Dan LaDue ladued@Michigan.gov or
  – Jill Baynes baynesj@Michigan.gov

• Districts with only TSI schools
  – Bill Witt wittb1@Michigan.gov or
  – Connie McCall mccallc@Michigan.gov
Resources

Accountability System Resources: [www.michigan.gov/mde-accountability](http://www.michigan.gov/mde-accountability)

For questions about Michigan’s ESSA plan, please email us at: MDE-ESSA@michigan.gov

For questions about school accountability, please email us at: MDE-Accountability@michigan.gov

Follow MDE:

- **Facebook**: [@michdepted](http://facebook.com/michdepted)
- **Twitter**: [@mieducation](http://twitter.com/mieducation)
- **Online**: [www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde)