



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING

RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

December 2014

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Senate and House of Representative Education Committee Members

FROM: Natasha Baker, Director and School Reform Officer  
State School Reform-Redesign Office

SUBJECT: The 2013-2014 Legislative Report on Michigan's Priority Schools

The State School Reform-Redesign Office (SRO) has completed the annual report on Michigan's Priority Schools as required by Section 380.1280c of the Michigan Revised School Code Act 451 of 1976. This legislation includes the naming of the lowest achieving 5% of all public schools in this state, as defined for the purposes of the federal incentive grant program created under sections 14005 and 14006 of title XIV of the American recovery and reinvestment act of 2009, Public Law 111-5. Identified schools (without an Emergency Manager) are under the supervision of the reform/redesign officer and must submit and implement a redesign plan.

This report focuses on the technical assistance provided to Title I and non-Title I schools, as well as performance data for the 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 cohorts. Changes in proficiency are reported across all five content areas, with a focus on math and reading for cohorts 2010 and 2011 for whom the most data are available.

To complete this report, the State School Reform-Redesign Office collaborated with the Office of Evaluation, Strategic Research, and Accountability (OESRA) and the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII).

Attachment

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

JOHN C. AUSTIN – PRESIDENT • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH – VICE PRESIDENT  
DANIEL VARNER – SECRETARY • RICHARD ZEILE – TREASURER  
MICHELLE FECTEAU – NASBE DELEGATE • LUPE RAMOS-MONTIGNY  
KATHLEEN N. STRAUS • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
[www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde) • (517) 373-3324

2013-2014 Michigan Department of Education  
Report to the Legislature on Priority Schools  
State School Reform-Redesign Office



## **INTRODUCTION**

In 2010, the Michigan legislature passed a law (MCL 380.1280c) requiring the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to publish a list identifying the lowest achieving five percent of all public schools. Each school on the list must submit a redesign plan that addresses one of four federal intervention models identified by the U.S. Department of Education. The State School Reform-Redesign Office (SRO) approves, disapproves or requires changes to the redesign plans and provides technical assistance to schools. Schools remain under the authority of the SRO for a total of four years--one year of planning and three years of implementation. This report is provided as a requirement of law to provide an annual update on Priority schools.

## **INTERVENTION MODELS**

Each Priority school in Michigan is charged by the legislation of Sec 380.1280c with developing and implementing a redesign plan that is based on one of four intervention models: transformation, turnaround, restart and closure. These models were described firstly under the Race-to-the-Top competitive funding program and subsequently required under the School Improvement Grant program, both sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. Approximately 68% of Michigan's Priority schools have selected the transformation model, 16% have selected turnaround, 12% have selected school closure, and 2% have selected the restart model. The remaining 2% of Michigan's Priority schools initially planned and implemented the transformation model but converted to a different model during the three-year course of implementation. Priority schools in Michigan self-select the respective model to be implemented. The four intervention models are explained below.

**TRANSFORMATION MODELS** include (1) developing teacher and school leader effectiveness; (2) implementing comprehensive instructional reform strategies; (3) repurposing existing learning and teacher planning time and creating community-oriented schools; and (4) providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

**TURNAROUND MODELS** include replacing the principal and at least 50 percent of the school's staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing a new or revised instructional program as well as several features from the transformation model.

**RESTART MODELS** include closing and reopening schools under a charter or education management organization selected through a rigorous review process. In a restart model, schools are required to enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend.

**SCHOOL CLOSURES** involve districts closing the school and transitioning its students to other schools.

## **STATE SCHOOL REFORM-REDESIGN SUPPORTS FOR ALL PRIORITY SCHOOLS**

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and its partner organizations provide a range of technical assistance and other supports to Priority schools to address broad issues of improvement and student achievement. Below is a short list of supports.

### **Next Network**

Next Network is an extensive suite of online tools and resources designed to support efforts to change instruction. Next Network serves as a comprehensive, digital resource for educators focused on rigor, relevance, and relationships for all students. The State Reform Office purchased 140 licenses for Priority schools.

### **Teaching for Excellence**

Teaching for Excellence Summer Training was a five day intensive training for educators held during the summer of 2014. The SRO sponsored the registration of educators from Priority schools to learn about research and evidence-based principles, concepts, strategies, and techniques that significantly impact student learning.

### **Principals Academy**

The Academy was created by Priority school principals and members of the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII). During the 2013-2014 school year, principals from school districts across the state participated in the Principals Academy, which focused on topics related to turnaround competencies.

### **Closing the Achievement Gap**

Since 2012, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has worked diligently to identify internal policies, practices, structures, and systems perceived to contribute to the achievement gap. The effort began as the result of a 2012 State Board of Education priority to reduce the achievement gap in the state, with an emphasis on African American young men. Data show that this student group is Michigan's lowest performing. In partnership with American Institutes for Research (AIR), the Great Lakes Equity Center and the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center, the SRO worked collaboratively with other MDE offices to develop strategies to close achievement gaps.

### **National Board Certification**

The SRO sponsored Priority school teachers wishing to engage in high-level professional development under the National Board certification field of Early and Middle Childhood Literacy.

### **Webinars**

Webinars are used to provide a variety of technical assistance information and dissemination of policies and supports for Priority schools. Webinars are posted on the Michigan Department of Education website to enable full access to trainings and reform strategies.

### **Technical Assistance Workshops**

The SRO provides technical assistance workshops to all Priority schools undergoing reform efforts. Attendees include ISD personnel, Intervention Specialists, and School

Improvement Facilitators who support Priority schools. These workshops focus on tools and strategies, including development and implementation of redesign plans.

### **MI Excel Supports For Title I Priority Schools**

MI Excel is directly linked to the needs of Michigan's Title I Priority schools. Supports available through MI Excel are as follows:

- **The School Support Team**, consisting of the Intermediate School District/Education Services Agency (ISD/ESA) School Improvement Facilitator, the District Representative, and the Intervention Specialist schedules Quarterly Reporting Meetings with teacher teams to monitor the implementation of the Instructional Learning Cycle.
- **The School Improvement Facilitators** provided by the ISD/ESA as part of the School Support Team, meet with the Priority school principal and School Improvement Team to review the school's needs and select appropriate supports offered through the MI Excel system to address those needs.
- **Intervention Specialists**, trained and prepared to help districts identify opportunities for transformation and student growth, meet regularly with Priority schools.
- **Data Dialogues** are available to Priority Title I schools. Priority schools receive support that includes trained facilitators working with schools and districts to engage in a data-based dialogue to develop specific strategies for the reform-redesign plans.
- **Superintendent's Dropout Challenge** requires each district to identify 10-15 students in Priority elementary, middle, and high schools who have multiple dropout risk factors and provide research-based supports and interventions to their students.
- **Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)** is a set of data collection tools to help schools analyze the instructional content being delivered in the classroom. Using the SEC, schools can determine how well content standards are being taught and where changes are possible.
- **MI Toolkit** is an online tool that is updated monthly with information and resources to support Priority schools in improving student achievement.

## **COHORT IMPROVEMENT RATES**

The 2010 and 2011 cohorts have had multiple years of reform implementation (three years and two years, respectively) to generate significant improvement, whereas the 2012 and 2013 cohorts are in the beginning stages of implementation. Therefore, improvement rates below only include updates for the 2010 and 2011 cohorts.

### **2010 Cohort Improvement**

- 33 of 64 elementary and middle schools in the 2010 Priority Cohort showed an improvement level greater than the statewide average when averaged across all subjects.
- 23 of 64 elementary and middle schools in the 2010 Priority cohort showed improvement greater than the statewide average in all subjects.
- 18 of 64 elementary and middle schools in the 2010 Priority cohort showed improvement greater than the statewide average in no subjects.
- 15 of 39 high schools in the 2010 Priority cohort showed an improvement level greater than the statewide average when averaged across all subjects.
- 6 of 39 high schools in the 2010 Priority cohort showed an improvement level greater than the statewide average in all subjects.
- 9 of 39 high schools in the 2010 Priority cohort showed an improvement level greater than the statewide average in no subjects.

### **2011 Cohort Improvement**

- 41 of 74 elementary and middle schools in the 2011 Priority Cohort showed an improvement level greater than the statewide average when averaged across all subjects.
- 25 of 74 elementary and middle schools in the 2011 Priority Cohort showed improvement greater than the statewide average in all subjects.
- 19 of 74 elementary and middle schools in the 2011 Priority Cohort showed improvement greater than the statewide average in no subjects.
- 23 of 45 high schools in the 2011 Priority Cohort showed an improvement level greater than the statewide average when averaged across all subjects.
- 11 of 45 high schools in the 2011 Priority Cohort showed an improvement level greater than the statewide average in all subjects.
- 7 of 45 high schools in the 2011 Priority Cohort showed an improvement level greater than the statewide average in no subjects.

## **PRIORITY SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA**

Performance data for each cohort year are listed below.

### **2010 Cohort (92 schools)**

- 21 schools (22.8%) are still considered in the lowest 5% schools (labeled Priority Schools in 2013).
- 44 schools (47.8%) are no longer considered lowest 5% schools.
- 27 schools (29.3%) are closed.

For the 44 schools no longer on the Priority/PLA list (i.e. those schools still under SRO supervision, but out of the bottom 5% ranking):

- 42 schools qualified for Top-to-Bottom rankings in 2014; 2 did not.
- The average percentile ranking is 19<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The median percentile ranking is 14<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The highest percentile ranking is the 69<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The lowest percentile ranking is the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile.

### **2011 Cohort (98 schools)**

- 24 schools (24.4%) remain in the lowest 5% schools.
- 55 schools (56.1%) are no longer in the lowest 5% of schools.
- 19 schools (19.3%) are closed.

For the 55 schools no longer in the lowest 5% of schools:

- 50 qualified for Top to Bottom rankings in 2014; 5 did not.
- The average percentile ranking is 22<sup>nd</sup> percentile.
- The median percentile ranking is 15<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The highest percentile ranking is the 98<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The lowest percentile ranking is the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile.

### **2012 Cohort (138 schools)**

- 41 schools (29.7%) remain the lowest 5% schools.
- 59 schools (42.7%) are no longer in the lowest 5% of schools.
- 38 schools (27.5%) are closed.

For the 59 schools no longer in the lowest 5% of schools:

- 52 qualified for Top-to-Bottom rankings in 2014; 7 did not.
- The average percentile ranking is 15<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The median percentile ranking is 11<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The highest percentile ranking is the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The lowest percentile ranking is the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile.

### **2013 Cohort (137 schools)**

- 71 schools (51.8%) remain the lowest 5% schools.
- 49 schools (35.7%) are no longer in the lowest 5% of schools.
- 17 schools (12.4%) are closed.

For the 49 schools no longer in the lowest 5% of schools:

- 46 qualified for Top-to-Bottom rankings in 2014; 3 did not.
- The average percentile ranking is 13<sup>th</sup> percentile.

- The median percentile ranking is 10<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The highest percentile ranking is the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile.
- The lowest percentile ranking is the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile.

## **CHANGE IN PROFICIENCY**

### **MATH**

The average Elementary/Middle math z-score (weighted by the number of students at each school) fell by 0.0125 between 2009 and 2014. Of the 2010 Priority schools with z-scores in both years, 15 (53.6%) improved relative to this standard and 13 (46.4%) declined. Proficiency at 2010 Priority schools has increased by 3.46% relative to an overall rate of 2.05%. Proficiency increased by a maximum of 32.48% and fell by a maximum of 7.79% among 2010 Priority schools.

The average Elementary/Middle math z-score (weighted by the number of students at each school) fell by 0.0121 between 2010 and 2014. Of the 2011 Priority schools with z-scores in both years, 21 (56.8%) improved relative to this standard and 16 (43.2%) declined. Proficiency at 2011 Priority schools increased at a rate of 2.90% relative to an overall rate of 2.74%. Proficiency increased by a maximum of 16.71% and fell by a maximum of 19.77% among 2011 Priority schools. Statewide among non-Priority schools, proficiency changes ranged from a 100% increase to an 80% decrease.

The average High School math z-score (weighted by the number of students at each school) fell by 0.0041 between 2009 and 2014. Of the 2010 Priority schools with z-scores in both years, 12 (30.8%) improved relative to this standard and 27 (69.2%) declined. Proficiency at 2010 Priority schools has increased by 0.01% relative to an overall rate of 1.85%. Proficiency increased by a maximum of 15.75% and fell by a maximum of 9.01% among 2010 Priority schools. Statewide among non-Priority schools, proficiency changes ranged from a 100% increase to a 100% decrease.

The average High School math z-score (weighted by the number of students at each school) fell by 0.0066 between 2010 and 2014. Of the 2011 Priority schools with z-scores in both years, 20 (44.4%) improved relative to this standard and 25 (55.6%) declined. Proficiency at 2011 Priority schools increased at a rate of 1.08% relative to an overall rate of 2.45%. Proficiency increased by a maximum of 18.38% and fell by a maximum of 8.48% among 2011 Priority schools. Statewide among non-Priority schools, proficiency changes ranged from a 100% increase to a 100% decrease.

### **READING**

The average Elementary/Middle reading z-score (weighted by the number of students at each school) fell by 0.0102 between 2009 and 2014. Of the 2010 Priority schools with z-scores in both years, 12 (42.9%) improved relative to this standard and 16 (57.1%) declined. Proficiency at 2010 Priority schools has increased by 10.39% relative to an overall rate of 8.63%. Proficiency increased by a maximum of 42.77% and fell by a maximum of 7.38% among 2010 Priority schools. Statewide among non-Priority schools, proficiency changes ranged from a 100% increase to a 100% decrease.

The average Elementary/Middle reading z-score (weighted by the number of students at each school) fell by 0.0080 between 2010 and 2014. Of the 2011 Priority schools with z-scores in both years, 19 (51.4%) improved relative to this standard and 18 (48.6%) declined. Proficiency at 2011 Priority schools increased at a rate of 6.95% relative to an overall rate of 4.42%. Proficiency increased by a maximum of 42.86% and fell by a maximum of 11.05% among 2011 Priority schools. Statewide among non-Priority schools, proficiency changes ranged from a 100% increase to an 80% decrease.

The average High school reading z-score (weighted by the number of students at each school) fell by 0.0054 between 2009 and 2014. Of the 2010 Priority schools with z-scores in both years, 15 (38.5%) improved relative to this standard and 24 (61.5%) declined. Proficiency at 2010 Priority schools increased by 4.65% relative to an overall rate of 8.03%. Proficiency increased by a maximum of 35.97% and fell by a maximum of 7.41% among 2010 Priority schools. Statewide among non-Priority schools, proficiency changes ranged from a 100% increase to a 100% decrease.

The average High School reading z-score (weighted by the number of students at each school) fell by 0.0060 between 2010 and 2014. Of the 2011 Priority schools with z-scores in both years, 21 (46.7%) improved relative to this standard and 24 (53.3%) declined. Proficiency at 2011 Priority schools increased at a rate of 2.29% relative to an overall rate of 3.35%. Proficiency increased by a maximum of 18.59% and fell by a maximum of 14.06% among 2011 Priority schools. Statewide among non-Priority schools, proficiency changes ranged from a 100% increase to a 100% decrease.

## **SCIENCE**

Science is assessed in 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades on the MEAP assessment in October and at 11<sup>th</sup> grade on the MME assessment in March. These changes represent a change from one cohort of students to the next for each school; they do not represent the change of individual students. An analysis of science achievement data from 2010-2011 to 2013-2014 reveals the following information:

- 11 of 28 elementary or middle schools (39.3%) in the Priority 2010 cohort with valid scores in both 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 showed test score improvement greater than or equal to the average improvement among elementary and middle schools statewide.
- One of these schools (3.6%) showed test score improvement gains greater than one standard deviation above that statewide.
- 22 of 39 high schools (56.4%) in the Priority 2010 cohort showed test score improvement greater than or equal to that among high schools statewide.
- One of these schools (2.6%) showed test score improvement gains greater than one standard deviation above that statewide.
- 18 of 30 elementary or middle schools (60.0%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps smaller than the state average.
- 5 of 30 elementary or middle schools (16.7%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps over one standard deviation larger than the state average.

- 36 of 39 high schools (92.3%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps smaller than the state average.
- One high school (2.6%) in the 2010 Priority cohort has an achievement gap more than one standard deviation larger than the state average.
- Elementary and middle schools in the 2010 Priority cohort ranged from 0% to 20.0% proficient, with an average of 6.5% (compared to 17.8% statewide).
- High schools in the 2010 Priority cohort ranged from 0% to 30.0% proficient, with an average of 6.2% (compared to 23.7% statewide).

## **SOCIAL STUDIES**

Social Studies is assessed in 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grades on the MEAP assessment in October and at 11<sup>th</sup> grade on the MME assessment in March. These changes represent a change from one cohort of students to the next for each school; they do not represent the change of individual students. An analysis of science achievement data from 2010-2011 to 2013-2014 reveals the following information:

- 11 of 27 elementary or middle schools (40.7%) in the Priority 2010 cohort with valid scores in both 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 showed test score improvement greater than or equal to the average improvement among elementary and middle schools statewide.
- None of these schools showed test score improvement gains greater than one standard deviation above that statewide.
- 18 of 39 high schools (46.2%) in the Priority 2010 cohort showed test score improvement greater than or equal to that among high schools statewide.
- Two of these schools (5.1%) showed test score improvement gains greater than one standard deviation above that statewide.
- 22 of 34 elementary or middle schools (64.7%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps smaller than the state average.
- Two elementary or middle schools (5.9%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps more than one standard deviation larger than the state average.
- 34 of 39 high schools (87.2%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps smaller than the state average.
- No high schools in the 2010 Priority cohort have an achievement gap more than one standard deviation larger than the state average.
- Elementary and Middle schools in the 2010 Priority cohort ranged from 0% to 42.9% proficient, with an average of 8.8% (compared to 27.1% statewide).
- High schools in the 2010 Priority cohort ranged from 0% to 46.9% proficient, with an average of 11.6% (compared to 33.1% statewide).

## **WRITING**

Writing is assessed in 4<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grades on the MEAP assessment in October and at 11<sup>th</sup> grade on the MME assessment in March. These changes represent a change from one cohort of students to the next for each school; they do not represent the change of individual students. Since the writing assessment is relatively new, only two years of data are used to determine improvement trends. An analysis of writing achievement

data at the high school level from 2010-2011 to 2013-2014 and of present achievement data at all levels reveals the following information:

- 22 of 39 high schools (56.4%) in the Priority 2010 cohort showed test score improvement greater than or equal to that among high schools statewide.
- One of these schools (2.6%) showed test score improvement gains greater than one standard deviation above that statewide.
- 18 of 26 elementary or middle schools (69.2%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps smaller than the state average.
- Two elementary or middle schools (7.7%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps more than one standard deviation larger than the state average.
- 32 of 39 high schools (82.1%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps smaller than the state average.
- Two high schools (5.1%) in the 2010 Priority cohort have achievement gaps more than one standard deviation larger than the state average.
- Elementary and Middle schools in the 2010 Priority cohort ranged from 5.4% to 60.0% proficient, with an average of 21.2% (compared to 48.9% statewide).
- High schools in the 2010 Priority cohort ranged from 1.7% to 63.5% proficient, with an average of 19.7% (compared to 40.0% statewide).

Overall, the majority of Priority schools (elementary, middle, and high) have shown gains in proficiency in core subjects, especially in math and reading. With the support of the SRO and a host of other technical assistance programs, schools were able to see some improvement in student achievement.

### **CHANGE IN GRADUATION RATES**

Graduation rates are calculated by tracking the enrollment of students once enrolled in ninth grade. School districts report these data to the Center of Educational Performance and Information (CEPI). Gathering these data aids the State in measuring transfers and high school completion.

For the 2010 Priority Cohort:

- 17 of the 46 schools (37.0%) with graduation rate data in 2013-2014 have two-year average graduation rates above 80%.
- 28 of the 46 schools (69.9%) have improved their graduation rate since the 2010-2011 school year.
- The (unweighted) average graduation rate for the 2010 Priority cohort improved by 1.42%.
- The average graduation rate among 2010 Priority cohort schools that improved their graduation rate increased by 6.0%, with a maximum of 20.3%.
- The (unweighted) average statewide graduation rate for 2013-2014 was 80.5%; the average statewide graduation rate for 2010-2011 was 80.1%.

For the 2011 Priority Cohort:

- 16 of the 52 schools (30.8%) with graduation rate data in 2013-2014 have two-year average graduation rates above 80%.
- 27 of the 52 schools (51.9%) have improved their graduation rate since the 2010-2011 schools year.
- The (unweighted) average graduation rate for the 2011 Priority cohort improved by 0.14%.
- The average graduation rate among 2011 Priority cohort schools that improved their graduation rate increased by 6.3%, with a maximum of 20.3%.

### **ACHIEVEMENT GAPS**

One critical element of Michigan's accountability system for schools is the closing of the achievement gap between the lowest performing 30% of students and the highest performing 30% of students in each tested subject per grade level. Each school's achievement gaps are compared to the state average achievement gap to detect progress in closing those gaps.

An analysis of achievement gaps across subject areas for the 2010 Priority schools highlights the following:

- 34 elementary and middle schools had achievement gaps in at least one content area.
- 25 of those 34 had achievement gaps that did not exceed the state average achievement gap by more than one standard deviation.
- 39 high schools had achievement gaps in at least one content area.
- 36 of those 39 had achievement gaps that did not exceed the state average achievement gap by more than one standard deviation.

An analysis of achievement gaps across subject areas for 2011 Priority schools highlights the following:

- 41 elementary and middle schools had achievement gaps in at least one content area.
- 29 of those 41 had achievement gaps that did not exceed the state average achievement gap by more than one standard deviation.
- 45 high schools had achievement gaps in at least one content area.
- 43 of those 45 had achievement gaps that did not exceed the state average achievement gap by more than one standard deviation.

## **CONCLUSION**

The goal of the School State Reform-Redesign Office is to provide assistance to Priority schools to support rapid turnaround and to ensure all students graduate ready for careers, college, and community. Schools in the 2010 Cohort have the most data available and show growth in student achievement in all subject areas.

Student achievement, improvement in each of the assessed subject areas is considered as a factor in the overall performance and ranking of schools. Such metrics can help determine the change over time for a school to try to ensure that student achievement in any area is improving over time. For the Top to Bottom metric, this improvement is standardized so that schools can look at their own scores from year to year and compare this improvement to statewide averages for all schools in the state.

An analysis of growth and improvement for the 2010 Priority schools reveals the following information:

- 44 schools (47.8 percent) have increased their Top to Bottom ranking and are no longer considered in the lowest five percent.
- The average percentile ranking is 19, with the highest ranking of 69.
- Math proficiency of 2010 Priority schools has increased by 3.46 percent relative to an overall rate of 2.05 percent.
- Reading proficiency of 2010 Priority schools has increased by 10.39 percent relative to an overall rate of 8.63 percent.
- Science test scores showed improvement greater than or equal to the average improvement among elementary and middle schools statewide in 39.3 percent of 2010 Priority Schools.
- Social Studies test scores showed improvement greater than or equal to the average improvement among elementary and middle schools statewide in 40.7 percent of 2010 Priority schools.
- Writing test scores showed improvement greater than or equal to the average improvement among high schools statewide in 56.4 percent of 2010 Priority schools.
- Priority schools in all cohorts are showing improvement and an average of 46 percent of schools are no longer identified in the lowest achieving five percent.
- Of the schools no longer in the lowest achieving five percent, the highest percentile ranking is 98 and the lowest is 5.

Additional questions related to this report should be directed to Jill Baynes, Department Manager, in the State School Reform-Redesign Office at [Baynesj@michigan.gov](mailto:Baynesj@michigan.gov) or (517) 335-2741.