

2018-19
Michigan School Grades

School Administrator Guide



Table Of Contents

Introduction	3	Additional Notes on Michigan’s Growth Metrics.	10
Michigan’s Multiple School Accountability Systems – Why an Additional System?	3	Graduation	10
Peer Review Panel	4	English Learner Progress	11
Standards Setting	4	Performance Among Peers	11
System Summary	5	Additional Notes on Determining Peer Schools	12
Overview of School Letter Grades and Rankings.	5	On-Track Attendance	13
School Letter Grades	5	Assessment Participation	13
Summary Status Labels	6	Student Subgroup Performance	13
Accountability Concepts	6	Alternative Education Campus Details	14
Full Academic Year (FAY)		AEC Identification.	14
Student Status	6	AEC Data Collection	15
Student Residency Status	6	AEC Summary Status Reporting	15
Minimum Student Counts (N-Size)	7	State Designations	15
Student Subgroups.	7	State-CSI Schools	15
Grade Levels and Assessments Included	7	Reward Schools	15
Alternative Education Campuses	7	School Grades Report Preview Window	16
Sending Scores Back for Shared Educational Entities	8	School Grades Report Access	16
System Indicators	9	Additional Resources and Support	16
Proficiency	9	Appendix A, Data Sources	17
Growth	9	The table below shows by indicator	17

Introduction

This guide is meant to provide a detailed look at the Michigan School Grades System, which was developed to fulfill the new reporting requirements for school accountability set forth in Public Act 601 of 2018 (MCL 380.1280g).

On December 28, 2018, Public Act 601 of 2018 (P.A. 601) was signed into law, creating a statewide accountability system for Michigan public schools based on the methods and indicators included in the legislation. P.A. 601 also created a Peer Review Panel, with five appointed members charged with reviewing the Michigan Department of Education's (MDE) implementation of the letter grades and rankings accountability system described in the law.

Michigan's Multiple School Accountability Systems – Why an Additional System?

Michigan public schools are held accountable through multiple school transparency performance reports. While having several school accountability systems is less than ideal, each serves a specific audience or fulfills a specific state or federal law.

- The Michigan Parent Dashboard for School Transparency, available at www.MiSchoolData.org/ParentDashboard, reports a holistic, data-driven story of what is happening in Michigan's local schools for parents and other caregiver audiences. The Parent Dashboard allows users to choose, see, and understand the school performance factors most important to them, from a variety of factors. The Michigan Parent Dashboard for School Transparency was developed for parents, with help from parents, and includes many school factors above and beyond what is required under state and federal reporting laws. Where possible, it provides not only a chosen school's data but also the average of similar (peer) schools and the statewide average to help place school performance data in greater context for parents.

- The Michigan School Index System, available at www.MiSchoolData.org/SchoolIndex2/Location.aspx, serves to fulfill the federal requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) for a statewide system to identify schools in need of Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Additional Targeted Support (ATS). It is directed toward educators and stakeholders for the purposes of school improvement and program evaluation. MDE uses the results of the Michigan School Index System to determine the appropriate level of support given to districts and schools statewide.
- The Michigan School Grades System, available at www.MiSchoolData.org/SchoolGrades/SchoolGrades.aspx, reports on eight different indicators that were prescribed in the state law, Public Act 601 of 2018.

The Michigan School Grades System that is detailed in this guide comes from an initiative of the state legislature and a few key stakeholders. The believed intent of P.A. 601 was for letter grades and rankings for schools to replace or be integrated within the federal accountability system (Michigan School Index). However, after multiple interactions with the United States Department of Education and the Michigan Legislature, it was found that P.A. 601 was not compliant with the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). To remain compliant with ESSA and the new state school accountability law, MDE had to produce the Michigan School Grades as a separate, additional, school accountability report on MI School Data. MDE has implemented P.A. 601 with a system designed to align as closely as possible to existing priorities and to reuse current policies and practices for school and district familiarity.

Peer Review Panel

Pursuant to Public Act 601 of 2018, a five-member A-F Peer Review Panel was created, with members appointed by Governor Gretchen Whitmer, Michigan House Speaker Lee Chatfield, and Michigan Senate Majority Leader Mike Shirkey. Over three months, the A-F Peer Review Panel met to review and discuss the accountability system created by section 1280g of the Revised School Code and the implementation provided to the A-F Peer Review Panel by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE).

The A-F Peer Review Panel was charged with reviewing MDE's standards and procedures in formulating and implementing Public Act 601 of 2018 (Section 1280g of the Revised School Code). The panel was required to submit findings to MDE and to the standing committees of the Michigan House of Representatives and the Michigan Senate that have jurisdiction over education legislation. The A-F Peer Review Panel submitted its Executive Report on October 31, 2019; it can be read in its entirety at https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/A-F_Peer_Review_Panel_Report_675750_7.pdf.

Standards Setting

The foundation of an accountability system is the scale used to determine the thresholds, or “cut scores” for each category being graded or ranked. To support the independence of this important part of the system development, MDE impaneled a committee of 11 Michigan practitioners and engaged with the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA), or Center for Assessment, to facilitate the standard-setting process for the School Grades system. The NCIEA-facilitated committee met twice—once to establish performance level descriptors and a second time to look at possible impact data and to establish cut score recommendations that were presented to the State Board of Education (SBE). The final cuts for the system were set by SBE after discussion and modification of the cuts recommended by the committee.



System Summary

Overview of School Letter Grades and Rankings

The Michigan School Grades System is comprised of eight graded or ranked school performance indicators, as well as two status indicators that only apply to certain non-traditional school types. These indicators were specifically identified by state law in section 1280g of the Revised School Code. Below are the included indicators and the type of summary status each indicator will receive as an outcome.

Indicator Label Type	Indicator
Letter Grade	Student Proficiency
	Student Growth
	Graduation
	English Learner Progress
	Performance Among Peers
Ranking Label	Student Subgroup Performance
	On-Track Attendance
	Assessment Participation
Summary Status Label (Alternative Education Campus Schools only)	Legislative Compliance
	Progress Toward Goals



School Letter Grades

P.A. 601 requires MDE to assign letter grades (A, B, C, D, and F) for five of the eight system indicators. The table below shows the range of values used to assign letter grades within each of the indicators.

Letter Grades	Student Proficiency	Student Growth	Graduation	English Learner Progress	Performance Among Peers
A	55 or higher	55 or higher	90 or higher	60 or higher	0.89 or higher
B	40 to 54.99	40 to 54.99	80 to 89.99	45 to 59.99	0.48 to 0.88
C	23 to 39.99	25 to 39.99	70 to 79.99	25 to 44.99	-0.15 to 0.47
D	10 to 22.99	10 to 24.99	67 to 69.99	10 to 24.99	-0.84 to -0.14
F	Below 10	Below 10	Below 67	Below 10	Below -0.84

School Ranking Labels

P.A. 601 requires MDE to assign ranking labels for three of the eight system indicators. The table below shows the range of values used to assign ranking labels within each of the indicators.

Ranking Label	On-Track Attendance	Assessment Participation	Student Subgroup Performance
Significantly Above Average	94 or higher	90 or higher	1.00 or lower
Above Average	88 – 93.99	80 – 89.99	1.01 – 1.25
Average	76.5 – 87.99	70 – 79.99	1.26 – 1.50
Below Average	55 – 76.49	60 – 69.99	1.51 – 1.90
Significantly Below Average	Below 55	Below 60	1.91 or higher

Summary Status Labels

P.A. 601 requires MDE to exclude certain school types, called Alternative Education Campuses (AECs), from receiving letter grades and ranking labels. Instead, AECs are assigned a summary status of “Met” or “Not Met” based on whether the school is in compliance with applicable law. Alternative Education Campuses are described in greater detail later in this guide.



Accountability Concepts

The following concepts are integral to understanding the Michigan School Grades System and general school accountability results reporting practices. These are used throughout the system.

Full Academic Year (FAY) Student Status

To ensure the data represent the programmatic needs of students in the building, only students enrolled for a Full Academic Year (FAY) are included in the assessment indicators (Proficiency, Growth, and English Learner Progress). FAY is defined as students reported as enrolled in the school at the Fall General Collection, the Spring General Collection, and at the enrollment

snapshot for the given assessment. Students not present in all three snapshots are not FAY. All information for determining FAY will come from MSDS (Michigan Student Data System). For more information on FAY, refer to the Full Academic Year Business Rules at http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Full_Academic_Year_Business_Rules_516581_7.pdf.

Student Residency Status

Students reported in state systems as having a student residency setting of homeschooled or as private/nonpublic are excluded from the student-level data and system indicators used in the computation of school letter grades and rankings.

Minimum Student Counts (N-Size)

The following table gives the minimum n-size (number of student records) required by each indicator to provide a letter grade or ranking label. In cases where the minimum n-size is not met, no letter grade or ranking label will be given.

Indicator	N-Size
Proficiency	1
Growth	1
Graduation	10
English Learner Progress	30
Performance Among Peers	1
On-Track Attendance	10
Assessment Participation	30
Student Subgroup Performance	30

Grade Levels and Assessments Included

The School Grades System includes students enrolled within assessed grades for the assessment programs and content areas indicated in the table below.

Area Assessed	Grades Assessed	Assessment Program
English Language Arts	3-8, 11*	M-STEP, PSAT 8/9, SAT, MI-Access
Mathematics	3-8, 11*	M-STEP, PSAT 8/9, SAT, MI-Access
English Language Proficiency	K-12	WIDA ACCESS
* 12th grade students are counted in accountability calculations if they were not counted in grade 11.		

Alternative Education Campuses

P.A. 601 defines a class of schools called Alternative Education Campuses (AECs). MDE excludes AECs from receiving letter grades and ranking labels, and instead gives them a summary status based on whether they complied with applicable law. More information on AECs is provided in the section “Alternative Education Campuses Details.”

Student Subgroups

Unlike the Michigan School Index System, the School Grades System does not disaggregate by student subgroup. Instead, indicators use the “All Students” subgroup, which provides letter grades or ranking labels only for the school as a whole.

The Student Subgroup Comparison indicator combines applicable student subgroups from up to ten of the following includes ten student groups:

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic of Any Race
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Two or More Races
- White
- Economically Disadvantaged
- English Learners
- Students with Disabilities



Sending Scores Back for Shared Educational Entities

The 2018-19 Michigan School Grades System results incorporate the Sending Scores Back Program for Shared Educational Entities (SEEs) and Specialized Shared Educational Entities (S2E2s). As part of the Sending Scores Back Program, SEEs and S2E2s for accountability do not receive school letter grades and rankings. Instead, students who attend a SEE or S2E2 classroom program are “sent back” and included in the school grades and rankings calculations of their home/sending school. The home/sending school is known as the “Building Pupil Would Otherwise Attend” and is a new characteristic that was reported in the MSDS beginning in Spring 2019. Students who had this characteristic reported are included in the calculations for the building that was reported within that characteristic. The following indicators of the school grades system include students “sent back” for districts operating or participating in a SEE or S2E2:

- Growth
- Proficiency
- Performance Among Peers
- Student Subgroup Performance
- English Learner Progress
- Assessment Participation

Note: Some schools reported the “Building Pupil Would Otherwise Attend” to be the SEE school itself. When this occurs, the SEE school receives school grades and rankings with assessment-related indicators based only on the students whose “Building Pupil Would Otherwise Attend” characteristic was indicated to be the SEE school.



System Indicators

Proficiency

The Proficiency indicator aggregates Full Academic Year (FAY) student proficiency across the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Scores are included from M-STEP, SAT, PSAT 8/9 in grade 8, and MI-Access assessments. Grade 12 students are included if they were not previously included in grade 11 reporting. The data in this indicator is sourced from the 2018-19 school year.

The combined proficiency rate is calculated by first calculating the proficiency rate of each content area (number of FAY students proficient divided by the number of FAY students tested). Then, the two content area rates are combined, using a simple, unweighted, average (adding ELA rate plus mathematics rate, then dividing that sum by two).

The letter grade for this indicator is determined by comparing the combined proficiency to the letter grade scale for proficiency given in the School Letter Grades section of this guide.

Growth

The Growth indicator aggregates the percent of FAY students meeting adequate growth across the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Scores are included from M-STEP, SAT, PSAT 8/9 in grade 8, and MI-Access assessments. The data in this indicator is sourced from the 2018-19 school year.

The combined rate of students meeting adequate growth is calculated by first calculating the rate of students meeting adequate growth within each content area (number of FAY students meeting adequate growth divided by the number of students with growth scores). Then the two content area rates are combined using a simple, unweighted, average

(adding ELA rate plus mathematics rate, then dividing that sum by two).

The letter grade for this indicator is determined by comparing the combined rate of students meeting adequate growth to the letter grade scale for growth given in the School Letter Grades section of this guide.

Note: The following cases are excluded from the growth indicator:

- Grade 3 assessment results are not included as those students only have the current assessment score (no prior state assessment score); therefore, a growth score cannot be calculated for grade 3 students.
- The assessments of MI-Access Supported Independence (SI) and Participation (P) are not included, because growth scores cannot be calculated for these assessments due to the small number of students taking them.



Additional Notes on Michigan's Growth Metrics

The adequate growth metric describes the percentage of students on a path to becoming proficient or maintaining proficiency within three years. It is measured by the percentage of students who meet either of the following conditions:

- Having a growth score at or above their growth target
- Moving from being non-proficient to being proficient

Michigan's growth score measure is the Student Growth Percentile (SGP), which describes a student's learning over time compared to other students with similar prior achievement scores (scale scores). SGPs range from 1 to 99, and indicate what percentage of similar students had lower growth than that student. The average growth score (SGP), by definition, is 50.

Michigan's growth target measure is the Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP), which describes how much growth a student needs to consistently attain to be on a path to reach or maintain proficiency within three years. AGPs range from 1 to 99 and indicate what growth score (SGP) a student needs to reach to count as having "met adequate growth."

Graduation

The Graduation indicator uses the same adjusted cohort calculation used in the School Index accountability system, also reported by the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI). Four-, five-, and six-year rates are calculated, and the best rate is used in determining an overall graduation rate letter grade for the school. The data in this indicator is sourced from the 2017-18 school year.

- Four-year cohort graduation rates represent the percentage of students graduating on-track within four years of first entering high school.

- Five-year cohort graduation rates indicate the percentage of students graduating on-track or off-track within five years of first entering high school. Early/middle college students successfully graduating with high school diplomas and early college certificates of completion/associates degrees within five years are considered on-time graduates.
- Six-year cohort graduation rates indicate the percentage of students graduating on-track or off-track within six years of first entering high school.

The letter grade for this indicator is determined by comparing the highest, or "best of", the graduation rate among the four-, five-, and six-year cohort graduation rates to the letter grade scale for graduation rate given in the School Letter Grades section of this guide.



English Learner Progress

The English Learner (EL) Progress indicator grades the rate of a student's progress toward acquiring proficiency in English. The data in this indicator is sourced from the 2018-19 school year.

Students are counted as showing progress based on one of the following two pathways:

- Demonstrating adequate growth on WIDA ACCESS
- Demonstrating English proficiency on WIDA ACCESS (performance level of 4.5 or higher)

The letter grade for this indicator is determined by comparing the EL progress rate to the letter grade scale for EL Progress given in the School Letter Grades section of this guide.

Note: the following cases are excluded from the growth indicator:

- Grade K assessment results are not included, as those students only have the current assessment score (no prior state assessment score); therefore, a growth score cannot be calculated for grade K students.
- Scores from WIDA Alternate ACCESS are not included because growth scores cannot be calculated for this assessment, due to the small number of students taking them.

For a description of adequate growth, see the subsection "Additional Notes on Michigan's Growth Metrics" under the growth indicator. The same growth model is used for EL progress, with the exception that growth targets are based on students reaching English language proficiency within five years as compared to three years for content area growth. The five-year time frame for EL progress is based on research showing that EL students on average need between five to seven years to acquire English Language proficiency.



Performance Among Peers

This indicator compares a school's student proficiency to the average student proficiency from a group of 30 similar peer schools. The data in this indicator is sourced from the 2018-19 school year.

For the school, and each of its peer schools, a combined mathematics and ELA proficiency rate is calculated using the methods described in the Proficiency indicator. Then, a simple, unweighted, average of the peer school's combined proficiency is calculated to get a single peer average proficiency rate. The peer average proficiency rate is subtracted from the school's proficiency rate to get the difference in proficiency between the school and its peer group. Finally, a z-score of the difference is calculated and used to determine letter grades, with higher positive z-scores indicating schools performing above their peers and lower negative z-scores indicating schools performing below their peers.

The letter grade for this indicator is determined by comparing the z-score to the letter grade scale for performance among peers given in the School Letter Grades section of this guide.

Additional Notes on Determining Peer Schools

Peer schools are identified by finding the differences between schools on select characteristics. Schools with small differences in their characteristics are more likely to be each other's peers. The characteristics used to find similar schools for the School Grades system include:

- percentage of student full-time equivalency (FTE) receiving free lunch
- percentage of students with Disabilities FTE
- student headcount FTE

The values for each characteristic are standardized to produce a z-score. A z-score describes a value's relationship to the average of a group of values. A z-score of zero represents the distribution's average. For example, each school's full-time equivalency (FTE) value for students receiving a free lunch is plotted into a distribution consisting of all schools' free lunch FTE values. Schools with FTE values closest to the distribution's average will have a z-score close to zero.

The characteristic's values are standardized to z-scores to ensure that the difference in scale between characteristics does not have an undue effect on the combined closeness measure. For example, Student Headcount FTE will nearly always have a much higher value than Percent of Students with Disabilities FTE. If these are not standardized, when they are combined the result would mostly be a measure of Student Headcount FTE. By standardizing to z-scores, this issue is avoided.

The school's three standardized characteristics are compared to all other schools in the state by calculating a weighted Euclidean Distance (a combined "closeness" measure), using the weights below.

- 70% – percentage of student FTE receiving free lunch
- 20% – percentage of students with Disabilities FTE
- 10% – student headcount FTE

Schools with similar grade ranges (such as elementary with elementary) are grouped and then sorted, based on their closeness values. For each school, the 30 most similar schools (those most closely matching the characteristic profile of the school) are selected as the school's peer schools.

The concept of peer or similar schools is not new. It has been used by the Parent Dashboard for School Transparency since 2018, which provides data on peer school group averages for most of the included metrics, so that the selected school's performance data displayed on the dashboard is contextualized by the performance data of its most similar schools, statewide. On the Parent Dashboard, schools' peer group data are shown using the label "Similar Schools by Student Characteristics". It is important to note when comparing the similar schools methodology used on the Parent Dashboard to the Performance Among Peers indicator of the School Grades report, that the weighting formula is used to determine the groups of similar schools are different. The State Board of Education requested that the peer/similar school formula for the School Grades system use the aforementioned school characteristics and weights; the Parent Dashboard's formula uses 50 percent student headcount FTE, 20 percent of students eligible for free OR reduced lunch, 15 percent student-teacher ratio, and a 15 percent expenditure per student.



On-Track Attendance

The on-track attendance indicator ranks the percentage of students not chronically absent in a school. The data in this indicator is sourced from the 2018-19 school year. Students are defined as chronically absent if they have a cumulative enrollment of at least ten days and have missed more than 10 percent of their scheduled days. This definition is used to calculate the percentage of students NOT chronically absent.

The ranking label for this indicator is determined by comparing the on-track attendance rate (percent not chronically absent) to the ranking label scale for on-track attendance given in the section School Ranking Labels.

Assessment Participation

The participation indicator aggregates student participation in state assessments across the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Test events are included from M-STEP, SAT, PSAT 8/9 in grade 8, and MI-Access assessments. Grade 12 students are included if they were not previously included in grade 11 reporting. The data in this indicator is sourced from the 2018-19 school year.

The combined participation rate is calculated by first calculating the participation rate of each content area (the number of students tested divided by the number of students enrolled). Then the two content area rates are combined using a simple, unweighted, average (adding the ELA rate plus the mathematics rate, then dividing that sum by two).

The letter grade for this indicator is determined by comparing the combined proficiency to the letter grade scale for proficiency given in the section “School Ranking Labels” in this guide.

Student Subgroup Performance

Student subgroup performance is a measure based on a school’s subgroup proficiency rates on state assessments compared to the same subgroup’s performance statewide. That is, student subgroup performance indicator assigns a rating label based on a school’s subgroups’ performance relative to the corresponding subgroup at the state-level.

A subgroup is included when there are at least 30 FAY students with valid test scores in it. For each valid subgroup, the combined (ELA and mathematics) proficiency rate is compared with the corresponding subgroup at the state level. A z-score is used to describe the difference in proficiency between a school-level subgroup and the corresponding state-level subgroup.

School-level subgroup z-scores are then translated into a deviation rating using the following scale. The rating scale is applied to help differentiate school-level values when subgroup data are later combined:

- Low/no deviation = any z-score greater than or equal to -1; set deviation rating = 1
- Moderate deviation = any z-score between -1.01 and -1.99; set deviation rating = 2
- High deviation = any z-score less than or equal to -2; set deviation rating = 3

Finally, a single average subgroup comparison score is calculated for the school, by summing the deviation ratings for a school’s subgroups and dividing by the number of valid subgroups.

The letter grade for this indicator is determined by comparing the average deviation rating to the letter grade scale for Student Subgroup Performance given in the section “School Ranking Labels” in this guide.

Alternative Education Campus Details

P.A. 601 defines a class of schools called Alternative Education Campuses (AECs). MDE is required to exclude AECs from receiving letter grades and ranking labels, and instead gives them a summary status, based on whether they complied with applicable law.

AEC Identification

The table below lists the eight types of schools that are included as Alternative Education Campus (AEC) schools for the School Grades system, and provides the technical definition of each of the eight types.

School Type	Technical Definition
Alternative education centers	At least 90% of students reported with Alternative Education Code 9220 in MSDS, AND "Alternative Education" in School Emphasis in the EEM snapshot for the academic year, AND "Alternative Education" in Grade or setting in the EEM snapshot for the academic year
Delinquent institutions	"Delinquent Institution" (Deling) in Educational Settings Actual (Summary) Characteristic in the EEM snapshot for the academic year
Juvenile detention facilities	"Juvenile Detention Facility" (JuvDtn) in Educational Settings Actual (Summary) Characteristic in the EEM snapshot for the academic year
Locked-down schools	"Locked-Down School" (Locked) in Educational Settings Actual (Summary) Characteristic in the EEM snapshot for the academic year
Neglected institutions	"Neglected Institution" (Negl) in Educational Settings Actual (Summary) Characteristic in the EEM snapshot for the academic year
Residential childcare institutions or youth homes (RCCI)	"Residential Child Care Institution or Youth Home" (RCCI) in Educational Settings Actual (Summary) Characteristic in the EEM snapshot for the academic year
Special education centers	At least 90% of students reported as Students with Disabilities in MSDS, AND "Special Education Center Program" in Educational Settings Actual (Summary) Characteristic in the EEM snapshot for the academic year
Strict discipline academies	"Strict Discipline Academy" characteristic in the EEM snapshot for the academic year

EEM - Educational Entity Master

MSDS - Michigan Student Data System

AEC Data Collection

Once identified as an AEC, eligible schools are invited to use MDE's Grant Electronic Monitoring System (GEMS) web application to submit assurances and other required documentation. Through GEMS, the identified AEC schools are offered an assurance question to ascertain whether the school is following existing law. Instructions on how to complete this process are provided within GEMS. This assurance data will be collected on an annual basis for each subsequent release of the School Grades system report for P.A. 601. Future releases will also include other assurances and respective summary status outcomes.

AEC Summary Status Reporting

Based on the information submitted in GEMS, an AEC will receive a School Grades report on MI School Data containing only a self-reported compliance indicator. The compliance indicator will be reported in lieu of grades and/or rankings. Grades and rankings for other indicators on the School Grades report will be shown as not applicable for AECs. The compliance indicator for an AEC will display the school's compliance with law as they reported it in GEMS. Eligible AECs that do not complete the GEMS assurance will receive letter grades and rankings based on applicable data.

State Designations

P.A. 601 also requires MDE to designate low-performing schools for supports and high-performing schools for recognition. Low-performing schools are called State-CSI Schools and high-performing schools are called Reward Schools.

State-CSI Schools

State-CSI Schools are low-performing schools defined by the following criteria:

- High schools graduating less than 2/3 of students
- Any school receiving the lowest grade on **all** of the following:
 - ▶ student proficiency
 - ▶ student growth
 - ▶ similar school proficiency comparison

The total of State-CSI schools cannot exceed 5 percent of all public schools. State-CSI Schools are identified on the same schedule as federal CSI Schools and are identified every three years. The next identification will be Fall 2020, using 2019-20 data.

Reward Schools

Reward Schools are high-performing schools defined by the following criteria:

- High school with a graduation rate of at least 99 percentage
- Any school receiving the highest grade on **any** of the following:
 - ▶ student proficiency
 - ▶ student growth
 - ▶ similar school proficiency comparison

MDE will not identify any school as a Reward School that is already identified as a lowest-performing (CSI) school, or any other school identified with consistently underperforming subgroups. Reward Schools are identified annually.

School Grades Report Preview Window

School Grades Report Access

To access a school's preview data of the School Grades in MI School Data, users must have a secure MI School Data account with an approved "Accountability User" role.

For those having a secure MI School Data account with an approved "Accountability User" role:

- **Log into the site**
 - ▶ Go to the MI School Data (www.mischooldata.org)
 - ▶ Click on "Login" at the top right of the page
 - ▶ Enter your MI School Data username and password and click the login button
 - To reset your password for an existing MI School Data user account, use the "Forgot Password" link on the login page
- **Navigate to the School Grades Report**
 - ▶ Hover over "K-12 Grade" in the menu on the top of the page
 - ▶ Click on "School Grades"
- **Select your school**
 - ▶ Type the name of your school, district, city, or county in the search box
 - ▶ Click on your school from the list of schools generated below the search box

To request MI School Data accountability access for a school, contact your ISD Accountability administrator identified at: https://www.michigan.gov/documents/cepi/MISchoolData_ISDContacts_572230_7.pdf

Additional Resources and Support

This document and many other helpful resources are publicly available on the Michigan School Grades page (www.mi.gov/mde-schoolgrades).

The Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) is available to answer any additional questions or concerns you may have regarding the School Grades system, OEAA can be reached by email at mde-accountability@michigan.gov or phone at 877-560-8378, option 3.



Appendix A, Data Sources

The table below shows by indicator:

- The agency owner of the data
(who users can contact for questions)
- The system housing the data
(where the data are collected/stored)
- The data quality window for the data
(how users can review/correct the data)

Indicator	Agency Owner	System(s) Used	Data Quality Window
Assessment Demographic Data	MDE/OEAA	Secure Site	Verification of Enrollment & Demographic window after the assessment window
Growth Data	MDE/OEAA	Secure Site	Verification of Enrollment & Demographic Window
Proficiency Data	MDE/OEAA	Secure Site	
EL Progress Data	MDE/OEAA	Secure Site	
Participation Data	CEPI/MDE/OEAA	MSDS, Secure Site	Verification of Answer Documents Window
Performance Among Peers Data	CEPI/MDE/OEAA	MSDS, Secure Site	Verification of Students Not Tested Window (Verification occurs following assessment administration windows)
Subgroup Performance Data	MDE/OEAA	Secure Site	
Graduation Rate	CEPI	MSDS	Graduation rate data cleanup window (occurs summer through mid-September)
On-Track Attendance	CEPI	MSDS	End of Year (EOY) MSDS Collection window (late spring/early summer)
Legislative Compliance (AEC schools only)	MDE/OEAA	GEMS/MARS	AEC GEMS collection window (February)

MDI - Michigan Department of Education

OEAA - Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability

CEPI - Center for Educational Performance and Information

