Michigan ESSA: Feedback Report Supports

Team Leads	**Karen Ruple** – MI Excel SSoS Manager, Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation ruplek@michigan.gov **Dr. Paula Daniels –** Regional Consultant Manager, Office of Field Services DanielsP1@michigan.gov
Information	Supports Action Team web page
Key Ideas (summary)	MDE **supports** to high performing, average performing and low performing districts and schools **need to be differentiated** to meet identified needs. **Opinions** about the potential state services/supports at the **district** level **ranged fairly evenly** among the options. **Opinions** about potential state services/supports at the **school** level **ranged fairly evenly** among the options.
Key Question 1 **Number of responses: 250**	**How important do you think it is for the MDE to provide supports for the following types of districts/schools?**
Key findings	• It is considered more important to provide supports to low-performing/low-growth districts/schools than to high-performing/high-growth districts/schools. • MDE should consider providing some type of support to all categories of districts/schools.
Next Steps	Share survey results with Supports mini-teams. Finalize draft of supports from each mini-team. Convene a single supports team to draft an MDE tiered system of support for districts/schools.
Key Question 2 **Number of responses: 252**	**What type of services/support should the MDE provide for high-performing/high-growth districts/schools?**
Key Findings	• High-performing/high-growth districts/schools should get state-provided appropriate resources that these districts/schools could choose to use (73%). • High-performing/high-growth district/schools should have moderate involvement by MDE (23%). • High-performing/high-growth districts/schools need to have the state highly involved in their improvement efforts (3.5%).

Next Steps	Share survey results with Supports mini-teams.
	Finalize draft of supports from each mini-team.
	Convene a single supports team to draft an MDE tiered system of support for districts/schools.
Key Question 3 **Number of responses: 252**	**What type of services/support should the MDE provide for average-performing/average-growth districts/schools?**
Key Findings	• Average-performing/average-growth districts/schools should get state-provided appropriate resources that these districts/schools could choose to use (27%). • Average-performing/average-growth district/schools need to have moderate involvement by MDE in their improvement efforts (60%). • Average-performing/average-growth districts/schools need to have the state highly involved in their improvement efforts (12%).
Next Steps	Share survey results with Supports mini-teams.
	Finalize draft of supports from each mini-team.
	Convene a single supports team to draft an MDE tiered system of support for districts/schools.
Key Question 4 **Number of responses: 253**	**What type of services/support should the MDE provide for low-performing/low-growth districts/schools?**
Key Findings	• Low-performing/low-growth districts/schools should get state-provided appropriate resources that these districts/schools could choose to use (62%). • Low-performing/low-growth district/schools need to have moderate involvement by MDE in their improvement efforts (22.5%). • Low-performing/low-growth districts/schools need to have the state highly involved in their improvement efforts (15%).
Next Steps	Share survey results with Supports mini-teams.
	Finalize draft of supports from each mini-team.
	Convene a single supports team to draft an MDE tiered system of support for districts/schools.

Key Question 5 **Number of responses: 254**	**Which of the potential services/support should the MDE provide at the *district* level?**
Where respondents agreed	• assistance on how to support effective teaching (57%) • experienced educators to provide coaching/mentoring to superintendents/district leaders (57%) • assistance in developing plans to improve students' academic performance (53%) • professional development/training on district systems (i.e. Blueprint for Turnaround (50%) • assistance and training on how to complete a district comprehensive needs assessment (48%)
Where respondents diverged	Ninety-six (96) respondents offered "other" comments advocating for: • library media center/media specialists (38%) • MDE review of district-level processes and recommendations for improvement (27%) • district choice rather than state mandates for supports (7%) • additional funding (8%)
Next Steps	Share survey results with Supports mini-teams Finalize draft of supports from each mini-team Convene a single supports team to draft an MDE tiered system of support for districts/schools
Key Question 6 **Number of responses: 246**	**Which of the potential services/support should the MDE provide at the *school* level?**
Where respondents agreed	• training and support in parent engagement practices (53%) • experienced educators coaching/mentoring principals/teacher leaders (53%) • multi-tiered system of support training (50%) • training and support in providing differentiated instruction (50%) • instructional coaches (49%) • assistance to Title I schools on programs for eligible students (43%)
Where respondents diverged	• professional development/training in school systems, i.e. Blueprint for Turnaround (37%) • data coaches to help educators understand data and use it to improve teaching and learning (37%) • assistance and training in school improvement planning (37%) • assistance and training on completing the comprehensive needs assessment (34%) • second language acquisition best practices (32%) • school culture and climate review by MDE and recommendations (32%)

Next Steps	Share survey results with Supports mini-teams.
	Finalize draft of supports from each mini-team.
	Convene a single supports team to draft an MDE tiered system of support for districts/schools.