The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act

CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN

State of Michigan

For submission to the
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202

Initial Plan Submitted 11/15/2017
Initial Plan Approved 11/28/2017
Amendment Submitted 12/7/2017
Amendment Approved 12/15/2017
Amendment Submitted 2/3/2020
Amendment Approved 9/20/2022
Amendment Submission 8/11/2023

Contents

Introduction

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA),[1] requires the Secretary to establish procedures and criteria under which, after consultation with the Governor, a State educational agency (SEA) may submit a consolidated State plan designed to simplify the application requirements and reduce burden for SEAs. ESEA section 8302 also requires the Secretary to establish the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated State plan. Even though an SEA submits only the required information in its consolidated State plan, an SEA must still meet all ESEA requirements for each included program. In its consolidated State plan, each SEA may, but is not required to, include supplemental information such as its overall vision for improving outcomes for all students and its efforts to consult with and engage stakeholders when developing its consolidated State plan.

Completing and Submitting a Consolidated State Plan

Each SEA must address all of the requirements identified below for the programs that it chooses to include in its consolidated State plan. An SEA must use this template or a format that includes the required elements and that the State has developed working with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

Each SEA must submit to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) its consolidated State plan by one of the following two deadlines of the SEA's choice:

> April 3, 2017; or
> September 18, 2017.

Any plan that is received after April 3, but on or before September 18, 2017, will be considered to be submitted on September 18, 2017. In order to ensure transparency consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(5), the Department intends to post each State plan on the Department's website.

Alternative Template (*not applicable to Michigan's Plan*)

If an SEA does not use this template, it must:

1) Include the information on the Cover Sheet;
2) Include a table of contents or guide that clearly indicates where the SEA has addressed each requirement in its consolidated State plan;
3) Indicate that the SEA worked through CCSSO in developing its own template; and
4) Include the required information regarding equitable access to, and participation in, the programs included in its consolidated State plan as required by section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act. See Appendix B.

Individual Program State Plan (*not applicable to Michigan's Plan*)

An SEA may submit an individual program State plan that meets all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements for any program that it chooses not to include in a consolidated State plan. If an SEA

---

1 Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

intends to submit an individual program plan for any program, the SEA must submit the individual program plan by one of the dates above, in concert with its consolidated State plan, if applicable.

Consultation

Under ESEA section 8540, each SEA must consult in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor, or appropriate officials from the Governor's office, including during the development and prior to submission of its consolidated State plan to the Department. A Governor shall have 30 days prior to the SEA submitting the consolidated State plan to the Secretary to sign the consolidated State plan. If the Governor has not signed the plan within 30 days of delivery by the SEA, the SEA shall submit the plan to the Department without such signature.

Assurances

In order to receive fiscal year (FY) 2017 ESEA funds on July 1, 2017, for the programs that may be included in a consolidated State plan, and consistent with ESEA section 8302, each SEA must also submit a comprehensive set of assurances to the Department at a date and time established by the Secretary. In the near future, the Department will publish an information collection request that details these assurances.

For Further Information: If you have any questions, please contact your Program Officer at OSS. [State]@ed.gov (e.g., OSS.Alabama@ed.gov).

Cover Page

Contact Information	Email/Phone
SEA Contact (Name and Position): Sue C. Carnell, Ph.D., Chief Deputy Superintendent	Telephone:
Mailing Address: Michigan Department of Education Superintendent's Office PO Box 30008 Lansing, MI 48909	Email Address: MDE-ESSA@michigan.gov

By signing this document, I assure that:

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct.

The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304.

Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.

Name and Signatures	Date and Contact
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Brian J. Whiston State Superintendent	Telephone: 517-241-0494
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative *Brian J. Whiston*	Date: 4/3/17
Governor (Printed Name) Richard D. Snyder Governor	Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: 3/29/17
Signature of Governor *Rick Snyder*	Date: 4/17/17

Current Michigan leadership as of August 2023 submission:
Governor: Gretchen Whitmer
State Superintendent of Public Instruction: Michael F. Rice, Ph.D.

Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

Instructions: Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan but is eligible and wishes to receive funds under the program(s), it must submit individual program plans for those programs that meet all statutory and regulatory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission.

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included <u>all</u> of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.

or

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below that the SEA includes in its consolidated State plan:

☐ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

☐ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

☐ Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

☐ Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

☐ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

☐ Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

☐ Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)

Instructions

Each SEA must provide descriptions and other information that address each requirement listed below for the programs included in its consolidated State plan. Consistent with ESEA section 8302, the Secretary has determined that the following requirements are absolutely necessary for consideration of a consolidated State plan. An SEA may add descriptions or other information but may not omit any of the required descriptions or information for each included program.

Note Regarding Revisions to the Originally Submitted Plan

After the original submission of Michigan's ESSA Plan on April 17, 2017, several revisions were made to its contents, with updated versions of the plan provided to USED on May 3, 2017, August 11, 2017, August 17, 2017, September 6, 2017, and November 1, 2017.

This final version, with all additions/deletions incorporated was submitted November 15, 2017.

- **May 3, 2017, Revision** –

  Changes in this revision included:
  - Additional information requested by USED as a result of its initial check for plan completeness.
  - A section of response text for Section A.5 (Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators) that was inadvertently omitted from the original plan submission.

- **August 11, 2017, Revision** –

  Changes in this revision included:
  - Response to preliminary feedback from USED on all plan sections, except those related to Title I, Part A.

- **August 17, 2017, Revision** –

  Changes in this revision included:
  - Response to preliminary feedback from USED and peer review comments related to Title I, Part A of the plan.

- **September 06, 2017, Revision** –

  Changes in this revision included:
  - Response to additional requests for information and clarity from USED on the plan draft submitted on 8/17/17 on sections dealing with long-term goals and measures of interim progress, English Learner Progress, the School Quality and Student Success Indicator, and additional details related to the index system, and other updates for clarity, as noted within the plan.

- **November 1, 2017, Revision** –

  Changes in this revision included:
  - Response to interim feedback letter from USED dated 10/24/17 related to Title I, Part A of the plan.

- **November 15, 2017, Revision** –

  Changes in this revision included:
  - Response to interim feedback letter from USED dated 10/24/17 related to Title I, Part A of the plan – specifically, clarity around targets for the components of the School Quality/Student Success indicator.

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

1. <u>Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments</u> **(ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and**
   i. **and 34 CFR §§ 200.1–200.8.)[2]**

2. <u>Eighth Grade Math Exception</u> *(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4)):*

   i. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?
      □ Yes

      ■ No

   ii. If a State responds "yes" to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:

      ■ The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;

      ■ The student's performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;

      ■ In high school:

        1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;

        2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and

---

2 The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time.

3. The student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.
   □ Yes
   □ No

   iii. If a State responds "yes" to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.

Response

NA

3. **Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)) and (f)(4):**

   i. Provide its definition for "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population," and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

Response

Michigan's definition for "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population" states that any language other than English that accounts for 10% or more of the English Learner student population is considered significant. The most populous language in Michigan is Spanish, accounting for ~~43%~~ 42% of the English learner population in the tested grades of 3-8 and 11. The second most populous language is Arabic, and accounts for ~~27%~~ 28% of the English learner population in the tested grades of 3-8 and 11. Together, these two languages account for 70% of Michigan's English learner population in the tested grades of 3-8 and 11. This information was obtained by examining the languages of all English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans. In addition, the data query examined the languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in the LEAs, as well as languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels. Michigan will ~~annually~~ use this data annually to review the use of languages other than Spanish or Arabic by English learners to monitor the possible need of supports in new languages to be included in Michigan's assessment system. If an additional language reaches the noted 10% threshold, a development and roll-out plan will be put in place to provide new supports.

The 3rd most populous language is Bengali, which accounts for less than 3% of Michigan's English learners in the tested grades of 3-8 and 11.

> ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

Response

Michigan provides state assessments in the following languages and content areas: Spanish, Arabic – social studies (5, 8, 11) and science (4, 7, 11) Spanish – mathematics (grades 3-8)

> iii. Indicate the languages identified in question 3(i) for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

Response

Michigan provides state assessments for English learners in the languages present to a significant extent in the participating student population (Spanish and Arabic) with one exception. Michigan does not offer Arabic mathematics assessments as stakeholder feedback deemed it unnecessary. As noted in A.3.i, Michigan will annually monitor the need for languages other than English in our assessment system. If a language other than Spanish and Arabic reach the 10% threshold, MDE will develop a roll-out plan to add the additional resources in any additional languages.

> iv. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including by providing
>
> ■ The State's plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);
>
> ■ A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and
>
> ■ As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

Response

a. Although Michigan does not provide mathematics assessments in Arabic, students are able to have an on-the-spot interpreter. The MDE has published

guidance on how to provide on-the-spot Arabic translations for students taking the mathematics assessments online and those taking the paper/pencil version. The majority of the English Learners in Michigan have oral language proficiency in their native language but are not literate in that language. Providing an oral translation of the mathematics assessment takes into account the oral language proficiency English Learners whose native language is Arabic have.

b. Michigan has sought to answer the question of "do we need to create an Arabic mathematics assessment" through several avenues: discussions with the Accessibility Advisory Committee, discussions with the English Learner Advisory Committee, direct contact with an LEA with a significant number of English learners whose native language is Arabic, and through surveys of LEAs. Every year, the MDE distributes a survey to all LEAs with English learners whose native language is Arabic to assess the need of the community regarding the development of an Arabic mathematics assessment. In addition, LEAs are instructed to contact the Assessment office with requests for Arabic mathematics assessments.

c. Feedback garnered from efforts described above indicate a mathematics assessment in Arabic is not necessary and would not prove helpful. Current guidance to districts is that they notify the MDEs Office of Standards and Assessment if/when there is a need for an Arabic mathematics assessment. The MDE has not received any requests for Arabic mathematics assessments to date; the current practice of allowing the mathematics assessments to be orally translated is sufficient.

4. **Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):**

At the time of Michigan's original submission, Michigan was still engaged in discussions with the legislature, the governor, and our State Board of Education and we submitted three possible options. As June 30, 2017 was the deadline for a decision, we now have direction—Michigan will implement for all schools, a transparency dashboard produced annually, coupled with an index-based system to identify schools for comprehensive support, targeted support, and additional targeted support schools on a three -year identification cycle which MDE we will then triage into our levels of district support. (partnership districts, early warning districts, selected support districts and general support districts).

The transparency dashboard is Michigan's preferred option to report a more holistic, data-driven story of what is happening in our local schools. The dashboard is being developed for parents and includes many elements beyond what is required under ESSA. The dashboard will be implemented over multiple phases, with the initial phase being rolled out at the same time as Michigan's index-based identification system. More details on the transparency dashboard can be found in

Michigan's public outreach is augmented by the Parent Dashboard for School Transparency, which includes more than 20 different parent-focused school measures, and which can inform decision-making and encourage richer conversations about school progress.

The Michigan School Index ~~identification~~ system supports developed to meet the requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act strives to balance numerous legal requirements, policies, and ideals. The system also seeks to balance accuracy and simplicity and be valid and reliable. The ~~Michigan Department of Education (~~MDE~~)~~ has worked to develop a single unified system that meets both state and federal requirements.

We note ~~at this time~~ that we are submitting a system for identifying schools for comprehensive, targeted, and additional targeted support ~~schools~~ that is compliant with federal statute without going beyond federal statute. ~~We intend to continue working with stakeholders, as well as with our legislature and governor, to refine these identification approaches and may submit amendments in the future based on those conversations.~~

Michigan's School Index ~~accountability~~ system supports ~~is also aligned to~~ the principles and, goals of, ~~and~~

~~strategies in the~~ Michigan's Top 10 Strategic Education Plan ~~State in 10 Years initiative~~. Specifically:

- Guiding Principle – ~~Data and accountability will be used to help drive resources and focus improvement activities for students and educators. Attention will be on transparency in support of key goals for the entire system to make Michigan a Top 10 state for education.~~ All students have access to high-quality instruction regardless of their gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, race, economic status, native language, or physical, emotional, and cognitive abilities to close the student achievement and opportunity gaps that currently exist.
- Goals – ~~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.~~ Expand early childhood learning opportunities; Improve early literacy achievement; Improve the health, safety, and wellness of all learners; Expand secondary

learning opportunities for all students; Increase the percentage of all students who graduate from high school; Increase the percentage of adults with a post-secondary credential; Increase the numbers of certified teachers in areas of shortage; and Provide adequate and equitable school funding.

- ~~Strategy – Implement an assessment and accountability system that reduces the impact of high-risk factors while helping ensure equitable resources. This includes a state accountability and support system that focuses on transparency and high standards of accountability for all schools, and that holds schools accountable for closing achievement gaps while dramatically improving systems of support and capacity-building for struggling and chronically low-performing schools~~.

In the last 15 years, accountability has transformed from the dichotomous and prescriptive system of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under NCLB, covering only mathematics and English language arts, to less-prescriptive systems encompassing all assessed content areas and focused on closing achievement gaps, to today where there are familiar requirements and components with much more flexibility to develop a system that provides a more state-directed approach and fit.

Overview: There are seven components within the School Index ~~identification~~ system. Each component is based on a 0-100 point, percent of long-term goal met index. These components cover the five indicators required under ESSA, as well as the separate participation requirements for content area assessments and the English language proficiency assessment. This section describes each component briefly. Individual components are covered in detail in separate business rules documents.

Participation Component: There are two standalone participation components within the accountability system. ~~Both components~~ They function in the same manner; however, they cover different assessments. One of these components covers participation in the content area assessments (currently MSTEP, MI-Access, PSAT 8/9, and SAT) used to determine results within the proficiency and growth components. The other component covers participation in the English language proficiency assessment (WIDA ACCESS for ELLs) used to determine results within the English Learner (EL) Progress component.

Proficiency Component: The proficiency component aggregates student proficiency across two content areas: English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Scores are included from M-STEP, PSAT 8/9, SAT, and MI-Access assessments. ~~We~~ MDE notes ~~at this time~~ that federal law only allows for the inclusion of math and ELA in the identification system. ~~We intend to seek a waiver for this in the future, and also to continue to include science and social studies in our transparency dashboard.~~

Growth Component: The growth component aggregates the percent of students whose student growth percentiles (SGPs) meet or exceed their adequate growth percentile (AGP) growth target across two content areas: English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. SGPs are only calculated using scores from like assessments measuring the same content standards (e.g., M-STEP to M-STEP), and are only

computed using SAT, PSAT 8/9, M-STEP, or MI-Access Functional Independence (FI) scores.

Graduation Rate Component: The graduation rate component uses the same adjusted cohort calculation used in previous accountability systems (as required under ESSA). Four-, five-, and six-year cohort graduation rates are calculated and used in determining an overall graduation rate for the school.

English Learner (EL) Progress Component: The English Learner (EL) progress component is a new component under ESSA for the general accountability system. Previously under NCLB and ESEA flexibility, EL progress was monitored through a separate accountability system (AMAOs; Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives). In contrast, ESSA folds in EL progress as a component of the larger accountability system. The EL progress component considers students showing progress if one of the following is demonstrated using the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs assessment:

- Not currently English proficient but showing adequate growth
- English proficient

Only the overall WIDA score is used in these calculations. In order for a WIDA score to be included, a student must have valid results in all four domains assessed (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Unlike the other components, this component is not disaggregated by subgroup as it only applies to English Learner students.

Additional Indicator of School Quality/Student Success Component: An additional indicator of school quality/student success is a new accountability system concept under ESSA. Michigan's accountability system is using five subcomponents within this component to represent school quality/student success. The subcomponents used are dependent on the school's grade configuration.

Schools with 11th and/or 12th grades:
- Chronic Absenteeism
- 11-12 Advanced Coursework: AP/IB/Dual Enrollment/CTE Program Completer
- Postsecondary Enrollment

Schools without 11th and/or 12th grades:
- Chronic Absenteeism
- Access to Arts/Physical Education
- Access to a Librarian/Media Specialist

    i. Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(c)(c)(2)):

        a. List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B).

Response

Michigan's School Index identification system and transparency dashboard includes

14

all required subgroups: American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; Two or More Races; White; Economically Disadvantaged; English Learners; and Students with Disabilities.

> b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

Response

~~Michigan is also including a subgroup comprised of the students in the bottom 30% of academic achievement for reporting purposes only.~~ Michigan utilizes other public reporting to share information beyond the statutorily required subgroups. The accountability system only uses what is statutorily required.

c. Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student's results may be included in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an English learner.
   □ Yes
   ■ No

Response

Michigan will not include the results of former English learners with the results of current English learners in any indicator calculations for accountability purposes.

d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:
   ☒ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or
   ☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or
   ☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.

Response

Michigan annually enrolls approximately 1000 recently arrived English learners. The experience of the SEA and LEAs in which these students enroll has been a challenge under previous and existing regulations due to the numbers of students arriving as refugees. At this time, we are selecting option 1 listed above (applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i).

~~Michigan proposes using a realistic exception for recently arrived English learners that addresses the challenges of these students while maintaining accountability. Michigan proposes the following exception: Year one: exempt from ELA assessment, student takes English Language Proficiency Assessment and is included in English Language Progress indicator. Year two: student takes ELA assessment and ELP assessment and is included in English Language Progress indicator. Year three: student takes ELA assessment and ELP assessment and is included in Academic Growth and English Language Progress indicators. Year four: student takes ELA and ELP assessments and is included in Academic Proficiency, Academic Growth, and English Language Progress indicators. Michigan notes that this option is not possible given the current statute and will be seeking a waiver in order to implement its preferred option for the inclusion of recently arrived English learners in the accountability system.~~

ii. <u>Minimum N-Size</u> (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)):

a. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

Response

~~The transparency dashboard will be employing Michigan's current reporting n-size of 10.~~ The <u>School Index</u> ~~index-based~~ system used in calculating the metrics for <u>identifying schools for</u> comprehensive, targeted, and additional targeted support ~~schools~~ will use an n-size of 30.

b. Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

Response

Michigan's minimum n-size of 30 meets widely accepted and studied statistical practices for ensuring reliability. The minimum n-size is the same for all student subgroups in each indicator and is based upon investigation of research and scholarly papers that indicated the number thirty was large enough to yield statistically reliable results. The compromise between the competing goals of more disaggregated reporting and greater statistical reliability is to maintain the minimum number of students at 30. MDE is not alone in choosing an ~~N~~<u>n</u>-size of 30<u>,</u>~~.~~ ~~It appears that~~ <u>as</u> many other state~~'~~<u>s</u> accountability systems have come to the same conclusion. The minimum n-size of 30 ensures subgroups remain an integral piece of a school's identification and annual meaningful differentiation within the accountability system.

c. Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.

Response

Michigan conducted an analysis of student and student subgroup inclusion at various n-sizes. Based on the analysis, a recommendation was made to lower the n-size. Lowering the n-size would increase the inclusion of students within subgroups and subgroups within schools throughout the accountability system, thereby increasing transparency. <u>Feedback was solicited from stakeholders</u> ~~Stakeholders solicited feedback through~~ electronic surveys, conferences, and ESSA-specific feedback sessions. Feedback was mixed with concerns around reliability of the accountability system. ~~We have appended our stakeholder engagement summary (Appendix E).~~ This is how MDE arrived at the compromise of reporting down to 10 students for transparency purposes, yet<u> </u>

maintaining an ~~N~~n-size of 30 students for inclusion in the index-based accountability system.

    d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.[3]

Response

Michigan's reporting n-size is 10. To protect personally identifiable information, Michigan utilizes suppression for data elements not reaching the threshold as well as top and bottom coding for values less than 5% and greater than 95%.

    e. If the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

Response

Michigan's publicly reported information is masked for any group with fewer than 10 students. Schools access student-level data and calculations through a secure web-based application.

    iii. Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)):

    a. Academic Achievement. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))

        1. Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Response

~~Michigan is aligning its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress with an initiative to become a top 10 educational state in 10 years, by the 2024-25 school year. This State Board of Education-approved initiative was~~

---

[3] Consistent with ESEA section1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974"). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report "Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information" to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

Michigan's long-term goals and measures of interim progress support both its Top 10 Strategic Education Plan in 10 strategies and as well as ESSA principles of reducing achievement gaps, as because all students and each subgroup of students have the same long-term goals and

measures of interim progress. Michigan's The long-term goal used in Michigan's School Index System is to raise the statewide averages to meet the 2021 2016-17 statewide proficiency rates at the 75th percentile in English language arts and mathematics by the end of the 2031-32 2024-2025 school year, to coincide with Michigan's Top 10 in 10 timeline.

Michigan's goals are ambitious and purposeful. Student performance on our state assessments

reflects standards that challenge students to:

- Understand subject matter more deeply
- Learn how to think critically
- Apply what they learn to the real world
- Make learning more relevant in their lives

Our goals reflect the challenging standards (first assessed in 2014-15) and are realistic in the expectation for continual academic improvement to proficiency through the next 10 years.

The index-based system derives an index value based on the percentage of the proficiency target a school attains. Index values based on a percentage of target met for the other ESSA indicators are also calculated and together with the proficiency index value, rolled into an overall index value used in the identification

of schools for additional supports. ~~The~~ MDE will also provide these baseline targets to schools and districts for use in their school and district improvement planning, require them to integrate that information into their comprehensive needs assessment process, and provide them reporting on their progress toward those goals.

Long-Term Goals for Academic Achievement

Subject	Student Group	Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2024-25~~ Long Term Goal (2031-32)
ELA	All Students	~~49.14%~~ 41.47%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	~~40.78%~~ 7.69%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	Asian	~~70.34%~~ 60.71%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	Black or African American	~~23.26%~~ 20.05%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	Hispanic Or Latino	~~36.15%~~ 34.09%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~53.54%~~ 12.50%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	Two or More Races	~~46.76%~~ 38.89%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	White	~~56.05%~~ 46.67%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	~~32.83%~~ 33.33%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	English Learners	~~22.25%~~ 15.39%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
	Students with Disabilities	~~18.87%~~ 16.13%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
Math	All Students	~~37.55%~~ 28.00%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	~~28.50%~~ 3.70%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
	Asian	~~68.19%~~ 50.67%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
	Black or African American	~~12.43%~~ 5.94%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
	Hispanic Or Latino	~~23.63%~~ 20.21%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~41.85%~~ 12.50%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
	Two or More Races	~~34.42%~~	~~47.55%~~

		22.64%	43.94%
	White	~~43.95%~~ 32.58%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	~~21.92%~~ 20.16%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
	English Learners	~~21.04%~~ 7.32%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
	Students with Disabilities	~~15.57%~~ 10.62%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%

NOTE: Subgroups already meeting the long-term goal must, at a minimum improve current performance.

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.

Response

See Appendix A

3. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps.

Response

Measures of interim progress in each subject area are aligned to the long-term goals in order to derive ambitious yet realistic checkpoints. While challenging, expecting equal outcomes for all students and subgroups will help Michigan identify struggling areas and allocate resources to support access to quality educational opportunities for all students.

b. <u>Graduation Rate.</u> (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))

1. Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Response

~~As described under Academic Achievement, Michigan is aligning its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress with an initiative to become a top 10 educational state in 10 years (ending in 2024-25 school year). Previous points regarding Michigan's 10 in 10 guiding principles, goals and strategies also apply to graduation rate.~~

~~As described under Academic Achievement, Michigan's long-term goals and measures of interim progress support its Top 10 in 10 strategies as well as graduation rate objectives because all~~ <u>All</u> students and each subgroup of students have the same long-term goals and measures of interim progress.

~~Michigan's~~ <u>The</u> long-term goal <u>used in Michigan's School Index System</u> is to raise the statewide average to the <u>2021-22</u> ~~2015-16~~ statewide four-year graduation rate at the 75th percentile baseline target. This component includes graduates who earn regular diplomas within four years of entering high school.

<u>Measures of interim progress are aligned to the long-term goal in order to derive ambitious yet realistic checkpoints.</u> ~~Measures of interim progress are aligned to the long-term goal in order to derive ambitious yet realistic checkpoints.~~

<u>Michigan's long-term graduation rate goals are ambitious because the expectation is to move the majority of students and subgroups to attaining a graduation rate of 93% within the next ten years. The current four-year graduation rate average for Michigan is just under 80%.</u>~~Michigan's long-term graduation rate goals are~~

ambitious because the expectation is to move the majority of students and subgroups to attaining a graduation rate of almost 95% within the next ten years. The current four-year graduation rate average for Michigan is just under 80%.

Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

Subgroup	Baseline Value (2021-22)	2024 25 Long-term Goal 25) (2031-32)
All students	79.79% 81.25%	94.44% 93.00%
American Indian or Alaska Native	70.88% 100%	94.44% 93.00%
Asian	90.77% 100%	94.44% 93.00%
Black or African American	67.31% 75.68%	94.44% 93.00%
Hispanic or Latino	72.07% 82.14%	94.44% 93.00%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	76.67% 100%	94.44% 93.00%
Two or More Races	74.74% 86.36%	94.44% 93.00%
White	83.48% 82.84%	94.44% 93.00%
Economically Disadvantaged	67.48% 74.55%	94.44% 93.00%
English Learners	72.14% 80.56%	94.44% 93.00%
Students with Disabilities	57.12%57.14%	94.44% 93.00%

Note: Subgroups already meeting the long-term goal must, at a minimum, improve current performance.

The four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is calculated for the school as a whole and for any valid subgroups (n-size 30 or greater), all with a 2021-22 2015 16 baseline value and ending in 2031-32 2024 25. 94.44% 93.00% is the baseline and the long-term goal value derived from finding the current graduation rate at the 75th percentile. An overall graduation rate is calculated by aggregating weighted averages across the cohorts within each student group. Then the student groups are rolled up using a simple unweighted average to obtain the overall graduation rate.

2. If applicable, describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, including (i) baseline data; (ii) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious; and (iv) how the long-term goals are more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

Response

~~The long-term goals for the extended year graduation rates were established to align with Michigan's initiative to become a top 10 educational state in 10 years (ending in the 2024-25 school year).~~ The five- and six-year graduation rate targets are ~~will be 96.49%~~ 95.76% and 96.34% ~~97%~~ respectively. The long-term goal is to raise the statewide averages to meet the current extended year graduation rate averages at the 75th percentile at the end of 2031-32 ~~2024-2025~~. All students and each subgroup have the same long-term goal value within each extended year graduation rate and the same length of time to reach these goals. Within each subgroup ~~we will take~~ each cohort's actual value will be ~~and~~ divided by the target value to obtain the percent of target met. Within each subgroup, a weighted average of the percent of target met will ~~would~~ be calculated across the three cohorts. That weighted index across the cohorts will ~~would~~ be based on a 50-30-20 weighting; that is, four- year graduation rate weighted at 50%, five- year graduation rate weighted at 30% and six-year graduation rate weighted at 20%. Once the three cohort graduation rates have been combined by a weighted average for each subgroup, those values are rolled up using a simple unweighted average to a single overall building graduation index.

Five-year extended cohort graduation rate

Subgroup	Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2024—25~~ Long-term Goal (2031-32)
All students	~~81.99%~~ 87.50%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%
American Indian or Alaska Native	~~70.58%~~ 100%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%
Asian	~~91.81%~~ 100%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%
Black or African American	~~69.36%~~ 87.50%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%
Hispanic or Latino	~~73.68%~~ 88.24%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%

Subgroup	Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2024—25~~ Long-term Goal (2031-32)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~76.92%~~ 100%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%

Subgroup	Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2024—25~~ Long-term Goal (2031-32)
Two or More Races	~~78.54%~~ 100%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%
White	~~85.75%~~ 88.14%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%
Economically Disadvantaged	~~71.51%~~ 81.58%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%
English Learners	~~76.84%~~ 86.21%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%
Students with Disabilities	~~62.24%~~68.18%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%

Six-year extended cohort graduation rate

Baseline Year	Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2024-25~~ Long-term Goal (2031-32)
All students	~~81.25%~~ 89.80%	~~97%~~ 96.34%
American Indian or Alaska Native	~~68.50%~~ 100%	~~97%~~ 96.34%
Asian	~~90.97%~~ 100%	~~97%~~96.34%
Black or African American	~~66.63%~~ 90.27%	~~97%~~ 96.34%
Hispanic or Latino	~~73.49%~~ 90.38%	~~97%~~ 96.34%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~76.92%~~ 100%	~~97%~~ 96.34%
Two or More Races	~~79.36%~~ 100%	~~97%~~ 96.34%
White	~~85.71%~~ 91.30%	~~97%~~ 96.34%
Economically Disadvantaged	~~71.01%~~ 85.11%	~~97%~~ 96.34%
English Learners	~~76.14%~~ 89.47%	~~97%~~ 96.34%
Students with Disabilities	~~63.41%~~ 73.68%	~~97%~~ 96.34%

Note: Long term goals are the same for all students and subgroups. The long-term goal is set using the corresponding adjusted cohort values at the 75th percentile in the baseline year. Subgroups already meeting the long-term goal must, at a

minimum, improve current performance.

3. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in Appendix A.

Response

See Appendix A for measures of interim progress related to graduation rates.

4. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.

Response

Michigan has the same expectations of all students, regardless of student subgroups. Our long-term goals and measurements of interim progress reflect these expectations.

c. English Language Proficiency. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))

1. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment including: (i) baseline data; (ii) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency; and (iii) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

Response

Michigan's Entrance Protocol is based on a questionnaire (Home Language Survey) given to the parents/guardians at the time of enrollment related to identification of the student's native tongue as well as identification of the primary language in their home environment. If either are non-English then a student is administered Michigan's EL Screener, the WIDA Screener ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT). The exception to this is for students enrolling as Pre-K who may be ages 3-5. Identification for services for Pre-K students is based solely on one affirmative answer to the Home Language Survey that a language other than English is native tongue or primary method of communication in the home.

Students For students in Kindergarten – 12th grade, students scoring below particular thresholds and proficiency on the WIDA Screener W-APT are recommended for to be entered into EL services. Scoring thresholds across English language development skill areas vary within year for Kindergartners as expectations for appropriate early childhood and first language acquisition skills increase. Additionally, K-12 students scoring above proficient thresholds are further assessed by a local district's Reading assessment that can be selected from a pre-defined set of state approved Reading assessments. Students who may have been screened, identified for services but transfer out of the state of Michigan, potentially returning to their home countries, may be re- screened upon returning to Michigan. Educators are requested to consider the time out of country as well as language of instruction while out of country in the event that language atrophy has occurred.

Michigan continually re-evaluates the Entrance Protocol for areas of clarification, improvement, and is working with a statewide EL stakeholder group to better define protocol elements for potential ELs who may also be students with disabilities.

Applicable timelines for English Learner Progress (ELP) were informed will be determined by an empirical policy study but will be limited to no more than seven years, to align ELP with the overall accountability timeline and Michigan's Top 10 in 10 initiative. We expect all students, regardless of skill level, to make progress. Progress will be determined by showing either satisfactory levels of growth or having already achieved proficiency. We expect every student to either show the growth or the proficiency.

This information is also included on the transparency dashboard.

> 2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.

Response

Research-based student level targets for ELs are established based on initial performance level. Michigan is anticipating that EL students would be proficient within a maximum of six-years, adjusting downward for students demonstrating higher levels of proficiency. The six-year time frame was established based on a review of existing research findings. EL research cited in Appendix C shows this to be a valid measure.

Michigan has determined that a student's EL progress attainment target (AT), will be defined as a 4.5 4.8 composite proficiency level (PL) on the ACCESS for ELs 2.0 assessment. Michigan will define increases in the percentage of all current ELs making progress in English language proficiency (ELP) as ELs that meet the ELP composite cut scale score (SS) within the established timeframe consistent with a student's baseline composite PL (see Student-Level Interim Growth Targets Table below). Thus, the state will consider a student's composite PL on the first annual ACCESS for ELs 2.0 assessment to determine the number of years that a student has to reach proficiency, then set targets for interim progress based on entering grade-level composite SS accordingly. Under this model, students achieving a composite PL of 4.5 4.8 or higher on their initial ACCESS assessment (Year 1) have met their growth target. The maximum number of years that students have to attain proficiency is six years. This decision is a result of significant stakeholder input and empirical research in language acquisition.

Michigan regularly reviews the EL exit criteria and may adjust criteria based on the following factors (1) under or over identification, (2) alignment to expected achievement on subject area tests, (3) alignment to current research, or (4) changes to the assessments.

Interim ELP Growth Targets

Each student's AT is the SS at a PL ~~4.5~~ 4.8 at the grade level for the year that they are expected to reach attainment. The number of years a student has to reach the AT varies from three to six years depending on the Year 1 baseline PL. Each student's interim growth targets are calculated annually for the adequate growth percentile (AGP) portion of the student growth percentile (SGP) R package. The table below illustrates the model.

English Learner ACCESS Growth Targets – Annual Calculation Method

Year 1 Baseline ACCESS Composite Point	Year 2 Growth Targets	Year 3 Growth Targets	Year 4 Growth Targets	Year 5 Growth Targets	Year 6 Growth Targets
~~4.5~~ 4.8 or higher	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4.0-4.74	SS at year two on the student's AGP curve	SS for PL ~~4.5~~ 4.8 two grades out (AT)	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.0-3.9	SS at year two on the student's AGP curve	SS at year three on the student's AGP curve	SS for PL ~~4.5~~ 4.8 three grades out (AT)	SS for PL 4.5 four grades out (AT)	N/A
2.0-2.9	SS at year two on the student's AGP curve	SS at year three on the student's AGP curve	SS at year four on the student's AGP curve	SS for PL ~~4.5~~ 4.8 four grades out (AT)	N/A
1.0-1.9	SS at year two on the student's AGP curve	SS at year three on the student's AGP curve	SS at year four on the student's AGP curve	SS at year four on the student's AGP curve	SS for PL ~~4.5~~ 4.8 five grades out (AT)

Notes on the chart above:

1. The "Year 1 (Baseline) column gives initial composite proficiency level (PL) on WIDA ACCESS for ELLS. This determines the maximum expected for the student to reach English proficiency, as measured by the Attainment Target (AT).

~~1.~~2.   Attainment Targets (AT) are highlighted in yellow.

~~2.~~3.   Students receiving a performance level (PL) of 4.5 or higher on their initial ACCESS assessment (Year 1) are considered to have met their growth target.

~~3.~~   4. Students scoring below r.t on their Year 1 ACCESS assessment have between two to five years to reach attainment, depending on their initial PL.

~~4.~~   5. Each student's attainment growth target is the scale score (SS) at a PL 4.5 at the grade level for the year that they are expected to reach attainment.

~~5.~~   6. Each student's interim growth targets are calculated annually using the adequate growth percentile (AGP) portion of the student growth percentile (SGP) R package. An SGP is a quantitative description of a student's observed growth in comparison to other students taking the same assessment and having similar starting points. An AGP is a quantitative description of the growth necessary to be consistently achieved to reach proficiency in a set number of years.

~~6.~~   7. This method allows for a variable growth trajectory depending on each student's progress over time while still requiring that the AT be reached within the required number of years. The annual reset allows the individual student's interim SS targets to reflect the amount of growth that the student has made in a year. This yearly reset recognizes the nonlinear growth that students at varying proficiency levels make within a year's time.

Long-term goals for English language progress

Note: Measurements of interim progress can be found in Appendix A, table D

Subgroup	Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2024-25~~ (2031-32) Long-term Goal
English learners	~~46.41%~~ 23.07%	~~59.26%~~ 43.33%

Note: The long-term goal is set using the corresponding EL progress value at the 75th percentile in the baseline year.

Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))

a.   Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State's discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

Response

The Academic Achievement indicator uses a 100-point index and is calculated by subject area (English language arts and mathematics) for all students and disaggregated for any valid subgroups (n-size of 30 or greater) in grades 3-8 and 11 for all schools giving the state assessments. The subject areas are weighted by the number of student records in each subject area. This roughly equates to a 50/50 weighting between ELA and math as Michigan students are assessed in both content areas in grades 3-8 and 11. In order to include 95% or the number of students assessed in this indicator (whichever is greater), the participation rate is multiplied by the proficiency rate when the participation rate is below 95%. The calculations and measures are the same for all schools in all LEAs across the state except those schools designed to serve special populations as outlined below. The indicator's target is based on the state's long-term goals as outlined in section A.4. Index points are allocated based on the percentage of the target or long-term goal met. For example, a school achieving a proficiency rate equal to half of the long-term goal would earn 50% of the points for this indicator. The following formula is used to calculate the index value for this indicator:

(Participation Adjusted Proficiency Rate) ÷ (Target Proficiency Rate)

Note that if a school or subgroup exceeds the long-term goal, the index value is capped at 100. This is true of all indicators.

~~We note that at this time, we are removing science and social studies from the index system in order to be compliant with ESSA requirements, but intend to seek a waiver to be allowed to use them in this manner. Also, we will continue to display information related to science and social studies on our transparency dashboard.~~

Growth is calculated by subject area (English language arts and mathematics) for all students and disaggregated for any valid subgroups (n-size 30 or greater) in grade 11 for all high schools giving the state assessments. ELA and math are weighted roughly equal in the growth index as the weighting is based on the number of student records in each subject area. 11th grade students are assessed in both ELA and math on the SAT. Michigan uses the student growth percentile as the basis of

its growth measure. The calculations and measures are the same for all high schools in all LEAs across the state except those schools designed to serve special populations as outlined below. The indicator's target is based on the state's long-term goals as outlined in section 1.

While a quantitative measure of growth ~~(SGPs)~~ has some value on its own, the greater value comes when a student's quantified growth ~~(SGP)~~ is compared to an adequate growth target, which is how much growth would be necessary for a student to reach proficiency in a set timeframe. Michigan's measure of adequate growth is an adequate growth percentile (AGP) which is the student growth percentile (SGP) growth curve necessary for a student to consistently reach or exceed in order to attain proficiency in a set timeframe. Michigan has used a timeframe of three years to attain proficiency in the past and will continue to do so while studying student growth data to reaffirm this policy.

The following steps are used to calculate the index value:

1. Calculate FAY SGP participation rate for the content area and student group:

   [Aggregate Number Having SGPs] ÷ [Aggregate Number of FAY enrolled expecting SGPs]

2. Aggregate the number of students meeting adequate growth (i.e. the number of students where their SGP >= their AGP).

3. Calculate adequate growth rate:

   (Aggregate number meeting adequate growth) ÷ (Aggregate number of FAY enrolled students having SGPs)

4. Calculate participation adjusted adequate growth rate:

If FAY SGP Participation Rate is < 95%, then multiply Adequate Growth Rate by FAY SGP Participation Rate. ~~A more~~ An expanded way of showing this calculation would be:

   (FAY Having SGPs/FAY enrolled expecting SGPs) x (FAY Meeting Adequate Growth/FAY Having SGPs)

   If FAY SGP Participation Rate is >= 95% then Adequate Growth Rate.

5. Calculate [Percent Target Met]:

   (Participation Adjusted Adequate Growth Rate) ÷ (Growth Target)

[Percent of Target Met] is capped at 100%.

~~The transparency dashboard will also include reporting on student proficiency and growth. School values in proficiency and growth will be displayed with state and peer group values.~~

b. <u>Indicator for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools (Other Academic Indicator).</u> Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

Response

The Academic Progress indicator uses a 100-point index and is calculated by subject area (English language arts (ELA) and mathematics) for all students and disaggregated for any valid subgroups (n-size 30 or greater) in grades 3-8 for all elementary and middle schools giving the state assessments. ELA and math are weighted roughly equal in the growth index as the weighting is based on the number of student records in each subject area. 3rd-8th grade students are assessed in both ELA and math on the M-STEP. Michigan uses the student growth percentile as the basis of its growth measure. The calculations and measures are the same for all elementary and middle schools in all LEAs across the state except those schools designed to serve special populations as outlined below. The indicator's target is based on the state's long-term goals as outlined in section A.4.

While a quantitative measure of growth (SGPs) has some value on its own, the greater value comes when a student's quantified growth (SGP) is compared to an adequate growth target, which is how much growth would be necessary for a student to reach proficiency in a set timeframe. Michigan's measure of adequate growth is an adequate growth percentile (AGP) which is the student growth percentile (SGP) growth curve necessary for a student to consistently reach or exceed in order to attain proficiency in a set timeframe. Michigan has used a timeframe of three years to attain proficiency in the past and will continue to do so while studying student growth data to reaffirm this policy.

The following steps are used to calculate the index value for this indicator:

1. Calculate FAY SGP participation rate for the content area and student group:

   [Aggregate Number Having SGPs] ÷ [Aggregate Number of FAY enrolled expecting SGPs]

2. Aggregate the number of students meeting adequate growth (i.e., the number of students where their SGP >= their AGP).

3. Calculate adequate growth rate:

   (Aggregate number meeting adequate growth) ÷ (Aggregate number of FAY enrolled students having SGPs)

4. Calculate participation adjusted adequate growth rate:

If FAY SGP Participation Rate is < 95%, then multiply Adequate Growth Rate by FAY SGP Participation Rate. A more expanded way of showing this calculation would be:

(FAY Having SGPs/FAY enrolled expecting SGPs) x (FAY Meeting Adequate Growth/FAY Having SGPs)

If FAY SGP Participation Rate is >= 95% then Adequate Growth Rate.

5. Calculate [Percent Target Met]:

(Participation Adjusted Adequate Growth Rate) ÷ (Growth Target)

[Percent of Target Met] is capped at 100%.

> c. Graduation Rate. Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of (i) how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; (iii) how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; (iv) if the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator; and (v) if applicable, how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25).

Response

The Graduation Rate indicator uses a 4, 5 and 6-year adjusted cohort method graduation rate. The Graduation Rate indicator uses a 100-point index and is calculated for all students and any valid subgroups (n-size 30 or greater) in all schools that graduate students using the adjusted cohort methodology.

Michigan's long-term goal is to have 75% of schools and 75% of student subgroups meet the 2020-21 2015-16 statewide four-year graduation rate at the 75th percentile. This component includes graduates who earn regular diplomas within four years of entering high school.

Measures of interim progress are aligned to the long-term goal in order to derive ambitious yet realistic checkpoints.

The index value represents the percent of the long-term goal achieved. In other words, a school attaining a graduation rate equal to or above the long-term goal of 94.44% for all students and each valid subgroup would attain 100% of the index, or 100 points.

Within each subgroup we will take each cohort's actual value and divide by the target value to obtain the percent of target met. Within each subgroup, a weighted average of the percent of target met would be calculated across the three cohorts. That weighted index across the cohorts would be based on a 50-30-20 weighting; that is, four- year graduation rate weighted at 50%, five-year graduation rate weighted at 30% and six-year graduation rate weighted at 20%. Once the three cohort graduation rates have been combined by a weighted average for each subgroup, those values are rolled up using a simple unweighted average to a single overall building graduation index.

~~The transparency dashboard also includes graduation rates for the school, state, and peer group.~~

> d. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator. Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State's definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.

Response

The English Learner Progress indicator uses a 100-point index and is calculated using all students currently identified as English learners. Students demonstrating adequate growth (SGPs) or achieving a composite performance level of ~~4.5~~ 4.8 or higher on the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs ~~2.0~~ are considered as meeting their growth target. Michigan defines adequate progress as those students earning a composite scale score within the timeframe established using a student's initial WIDA ACCESS for ELLs ~~2.0~~ composite performance level. For example, a student achieving a composite performance level between 3.0 and 3.9 on their initial assessment is expected to attain~~ing~~ English language proficiency within four years. A student with a SGP value equal to or greater than their adequate growth percentile (AGP) is considered as meeting their growth target. Students scoring in the lowest performance level range on their initial assessment (1.0-1.9) have a maximum of six years to attain proficiency. Research cited in Appendix C shows this to be a valid measure.

The following steps are used to calculate the index value for this indicator:

1. Calculate FAY SGP participation rate for the content area and student group:

   [Aggregate Number Having SGPs] ÷ [Aggregate Number of FAY enrolled expecting SGPs]

2. Aggregate the number of students meeting adequate growth (i.e., the number of students where their SGP >= their AGP).

3. Calculate adequate growth rate:

   (Aggregate number meeting adequate growth) ÷ (Aggregate number of FAY enrolled students having SGPs)

4. Calculate participation adjusted adequate growth rate:

If FAY SGP Participation Rate is < 95%, then multiply Adequate Growth Rate by FAY SGP Participation Rate. A more expanded way of showing this calculation would be:

(FAY Having SGPs/FAY enrolled expecting SGPs) x (FAY Meeting Adequate Growth/FAY Having SGPs)

If FAY SGP Participation Rate is >= 95% then Adequate Growth Rate.

5. Calculate [Percent Target Met]:

(Participation Adjusted Adequate Growth Rate) ÷ (Growth Target)

[Percent of Target Met] is capped at 100%.

~~English Learner Progress will also be shown on the transparency dashboard. Values for the school, a peer group, and the state will be reported.~~

> e. <u>School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)</u>. Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

Response

Michigan proposes a ~~four~~<u>five</u>-part additional indicator component:

i. K-12 Chronic Absenteeism

ii. K-8 Access to Fine ~~a~~<u>A</u>rts, Music, <u>and</u> Physical Education, ~~and~~

~~ii.~~<u>iii.</u> <u>K-8 Access to</u> a Library Media Specialist

~~iii.~~<u>iv.</u> 11th-12th Grade Advanced Coursework<u>;</u> and

~~iv.~~<u>v.</u> High School Postsecondary Enrollment Rate.

The School Quality/Student Success indicator is based on a 0-100 point, percent of target met index. It is the building's average percent of school quality/student success targets met, averaged across student groups and each of the applicable school quality/student success subcomponents.

Each of the individual sub-indicators are also based on 0-100 point, percent of target met indices. The individual sub-indicator indices are calculated separately and then combined into a single school quality indicator index by a weighted average using the weights below. If a sub-indicator does not have enough data to be included then its weighting is redistributed proportionally amongst the

remaining school quality sub-indicators such that the remaining sub-indicators retain their relative proportion to one another.

Michigan is setting long-term goals for each sub-indicator of the School Quality/Student Success indicator using the same methodology as the other indicators used in calculating an overall index – that is, long-term goals are set at the 75th percentile of the statewide average for each sub-indicator using 2021-22 ~~2016-17~~ as the baseline year. Long-term goals are aligned to the state's time frame for its long-term goals in other parts of the School Index, ~~Top 10 in 10 initiative,~~ meaning the expectation is for the long-term goal to be attained by 2031-32 ~~2024-25~~.

School Quality/Student Success Sub-indicators and Weights

School Quality Sub-Measure	Weight Within School Quality Indicator	Weight Within Overall System
K-12 Chronic Absenteeism	29%	4%
K-8 Access to Arts/Physical Education	29%	4%
11-12 Advanced Coursework	21%	3%
Postsecondary Enrollment	14%	2%
K-8 Access to a Librarian or Media Specialist	7%	1%

The K-12 Chronic Absenteeism indicator uses a 100-point index and is calculated using all students enrolled in a school for at least 10 days. At least 10 students must be enrolled for this indicator to be calculated. Calculations are done for all valid subgroups (n-size 30 or greater). Chronic absenteeism is defined as missing at least 10% of a student's scheduled enrollment. The indicator will use the inverse of this measure, in order to positively align to the 0-100 indices calculated for the other indicators in the index system. That is, the index will indicate the number of students not chronically absent within a school. The long-term goal for this indicator is set by finding the 75th percentile of the 2021-22 ~~2016-17~~ statewide distribution ~~average~~ of not chronically absent students. This equates to 73.83% of students not being chronically absent within a school. ~~Data are still being finalized for this indicator, however the long-term goal should be approximately 94%.~~ Research cited in Appendix D shows this to be a valid measure.

The K-8 Access to Arts/Physical Education Indicator uses a 100-point index. This measure is the ratio of students to educators instructing courses in the fine arts (dance, music, theater or performance and visual arts) and physical education (defined as health, physical education, recreation and sex education). Educator full-time equivalency (FTE) values are used in the computation of the ratio. At least 10

students need to be enrolled for this measure to be calculated. Calculations are done for all valid subgroups (n-size 30 or greater). This measure is calculated for all K-8 schools. The long-term goal for this sub-indicator is set by finding the 75th percentile of the 2021-22 ~~2016-17~~ statewide average of the student to educators instructing courses in the fine arts and physical education. The expectation will be for students to have increased access to these educators, realized through attaining the long- term goal by 2031-32 ~~2024-25~~. This equates to a ratio of 124.6:1 within each school containing any grade levels K-8. ~~Data are still being finalized for this indicator, however, the long-term goal should be approximately 116:1.~~ Analysis has shown ratios to be somewhat normally distributed with ratios ranging from 4 ~~10~~ to 2,230 ~~1100~~ students per FTE for roughly 91% ~~98%~~ of K-8 schools. The average ratio is approximately 187 ~~340~~ students per FTE~~, which is less than one FTE per average Michigan school enrollment of 237 students~~. All K-8 buildings in Michigan currently have at least a partial Arts/PE educator FTE, making this a valid and comparable statewide measure. The variation in ratios centered around an average slightly lower ~~higher~~ than the average building size allows for meaningful differentiation throughout the state. Research cited in Appendix D provides evidence for the use of this measure.

The K-8 Access to a Librarian/~~ or~~ Media Specialist indicator uses a 100-point index to indicate student access to librarians and media specialists. As above, staff ~~full-time equivalency (FTE)~~ FTE values are used to compute a ratio of students to staff employed as lLibrarians/~~ or~~ mMedia sSpecialists. A minimum of 10 students need to be enrolled for the ratio to be calculated. All valid subgroups (n-size 30 or greater) will have a calculated value. The long-term goal for this sub-indicator is set by finding the 75th percentile of the 2021-22 ~~2016-17~~ statewide average of the students to staff employed as lLibrarians or mMedia sSpecialists. This equates to a ratio of 125:1 within each school containing any grade levels K-8. The expectation will be for students to have increased access to these staff, realized through attaining the long-term goal by 2031-32 ~~2024-24~~. ~~Data are still being finalized for this indicator, however the long-term goal should be approximately 461:1. Almost all (99.6%) of K-8 schools have at least a partial librarian/media specialist FTE, making this a valid and comparable statewide measure.~~ Analysis has shown ratios ranging from 80 ~~123~~ to 6,700 ~~4000~~ students per FTE for roughly 97% of K-8 schools, with a non-zero staff FTE, with ~~an average~~ a median ratio of roughly ~~880~~ 820 students per FTE. The current data support the reality in many districts where lLibrarians and mMedia sSpecialists are spread thinly amongst multiple buildings. This is an aspirational measure showing improvement over time, with the percent of staff FTE rising from 20% to 26% over the last six years. The distribution of ratios amongst virtually all K-8 schools allows for meaningful statewide differentiations and additional years of data should display increasingly greater differentiations. As schools become more aware of the implications of how they report school Librarians, more partial FTEs are expected to be reported for Librarians in Michigan schools, driving increased differentiation. Research cited in Appendix D provides evidence for the use of this measure.

The 11-12 Advanced Coursework indicator uses a 100-point index. This measure is

the percentage of all 11th and 12th grade students in the school successfully completing advanced coursework (Dual Enrollment, Early Middle College, Career and Technical Education (CTE), Advanced Placement (AP), and International Baccalaureate (IB)). At least 10 students need to be enrolled for this measure to be calculated. The long-term goal for this sub-indicator is set by finding the 75th percentile of the 2021-22 ~~2016-17~~ statewide average of the students successfully completing advanced coursework. This equates to 52.15% of 11th and 12th grade students successfully completing advanced coursework within each high school. The expectation will be for students to have increased success in completing advanced coursework in their 11th and 12th grade years. This will be realized through attaining the long-term goal by 2031-32 ~~2024-25~~. ~~Data are still being finalized for this indicator and a long-term goal value is not yet available. An amendment to this plan will be submitted as soon as the value is available.~~ An analysis of students enrolled in 11th or 12th grade in 2021-22 ~~2015-16~~ shows a bi-modal distribution, with a majority of schools ~~just under half of schools~~ with 11th and 12th grades (~~557 or 47%~~ 1078 or 83%) having students participating and completing advanced coursework. The mean percentage of 11th and 12th grade students successfully completing advanced coursework is 31%. ~~less than 19% of students successfully completing advanced coursework. Roughly 38% or 454 schools have between 40% and 79% of enrolled 11th and 12th grade students successfully completing advanced coursework. Of the 557 schools having less than 19% of students, 358 had no students successfully completing advanced coursework.~~ Access to advanced coursework options was a stakeholder concern, particularly for small or rural schools, however all students in Michigan have access to 55 regional career and technical education centers and programs throughout the state, as well as Michigan Virtual, a non-profit school which offers 23 ~~22~~ AP classes online as part of its virtual course catalog. Additionally, 377 Michigan high schools currently offer access to an Early Middle College Program, which can culminate with the student earning an Associate's degree.

These programs and courses are available to all Michigan students, either locally or virtually, and are valid, reliable, and comparable measures. Analysis has shown from 0-100% of a school's students successfully completing advanced coursework, making this a meaningfully differentiated measure. Calculations are done for all valid subgroups (n-size 30 or greater). Research cited in Appendix D shows this to be a valid measure.

Finally, Postsecondary Enrollment is ~~will be~~ calculated for each high school, and ~~will~~ leverages Michigan's longitudinal postsecondary data and reporting to represent the percentage of students enrolling in postsecondary education within key time points. Postsecondary enrollment within 12 months after graduation from high school is calculated for high school graduates of all public schools in Michigan, matching against Michigan's Student Transcript and Academic Record Repository (STARR) Collection, and national college enrollment data from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). A limitation of the NSC is that most, but not all colleges and universities across the country provide data to NSC. If a Michigan public high school graduate attends one of the colleges and universities that does not provide data to

NSC, this could result in inaccurate college enrollment totals for a school. High school graduation data is collected from Michigan high schools after the high school year closes and are matched against college enrollment records in STARR and NSC. Demographic categories for postsecondary enrollment (gender, race/ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, English language learners, homeless, migrant, and student with disabilities) are based on the student's high school record. MDE chose challenging but attainable goals for Post-secondary Enrollment, consistent with the methodology used to set goals within the overall Index system. The long- term goal for this sub-indicator is set by finding the 75ᵗʰ percentile of the 2021-22 ~~2016-17~~ statewide average of students enrolling in a post-secondary option within 12 months of graduating high school. This equates to 64.37% of students enrolling in a post-secondary option within 12 months of high school graduation. The expectation will be for students to have increased enrollment in post-secondary options, realized through attaining the
long-term goal by 2031-32 ~~2024-24~~. ~~Data are still being finalized for this indicator and a long-term goal value is not yet available. An amendment to this plan will be submitted as soon as the value is available.~~

Analysis of two years of data (~~2013-14 and 2014-15~~ 2018-19 and 2021-22) of public high school graduates in Michigan showed that there was differentiation of schools in the percentage of graduates enrolling in college (2 or 4 year) and universities both with "all students" included, as well as by subgroup. The percentage of high school graduates enrolling in postsecondary schooling within 12 months ranged from 0% to 100% of students for all students, as well as for each subgroup, providing further evidence of this

indicator's differentiation of public schools across Michigan. Research cited in Appendix D shows this to be a valid measure.

~~These indicators will also be used in the transparency dashboard where school, peer group, and state values will be reported.~~

Michigan Students Enrolled in Postsecondary Education within 12 Months of High School Graduation

Percentage of "All Students" Within a High School Building Enrolled in Postsecondary Education within 12 Months of Graduation	Number of Schools (% of Total) ~~2013-14~~ 2018-19	Number of Schools (% of Total) ~~2014-15~~ 2021-22	Total ~~2013-2015~~ 2018-19 and 2021-

			22
0-19	~~92 (9.47)~~ 201 (20.14)	~~135 (13.55)~~ 252 (24.75)	~~227 (11.53)~~ 453 (22.47)
20-29	~~89 (9.16)~~ 78 (7.82)	~~83 (8.33)~~78 (7.66)	~~172 (8.74)~~ 156 (7.73)
30-39	~~66 (6.79)~~ 49 (4.91)	~~66 (6.63)~~ 82 (8.06)	~~132 (6.71)~~ 131 (6.49)
40-49	~~67 (6.89)~~ 81 (8.12)	~~59 (5.92)~~ 114 (11.20)	~~126 (6.40)~~ 195 (9.67)
50-59	~~114 (11.73)~~ 143 (14.33)	~~144 (14.46)~~ 183 (17.98)	~~258 (13.11)~~ 326 (16.17)
60-69	~~221 (22.74)~~ 194 (19.44)	~~202 (20.28)~~ 130 (12.77)	~~423 (21.49)~~ 324 (16.07)
70-79	~~184 (18.93)~~ 155 (15.53)	~~165 (16.57)~~ 82 (8.06)	~~349 (17.73)~~ 237 (11.76)
80-89	~~104 (10.70)~~ 92 (9.22)	~~112 (11.24)~~ 63 (6.19)	~~216 (10.98)~~ 155 (7.69)
90-100	~~35 (3.60)~~ 25 (2.51)	~~30 (3.01)~~ 14 (1.38)	~~65 (3.30)~~ 39 (1.94)
Total	~~972~~ 998	~~996~~ 1,018	~~1,968~~ 2,016

Response

Michigan's index-based identification system designates a single index value (0-100 points) based on school performance in up to seven areas: Proficiency, Growth, Graduation Rate, English Learner Progress, School Quality/Student Success, General Participation, and English Learner Participation. The School Index system provides annual meaningful differentiation for all public schools. The School Quality/Student success component includes a K-12 percent not chronically absent (students with on-track attendance) subcomponent, a K-8 student access to arts/physical education subcomponent and a K-8 student access to Librarians/Media Specialists subcomponent, all three of which help ensure all schools, particularly K-2 schools, are included. In addition, the English Learner Progress component helps ensure all schools are included, regardless of grade level.

General Participation and English Learner Participation have standalone indicators in addition to non-participation in state assessments being included in the calculations used to determine proficiency and growth rates for subgroups and schools (as mentioned in these indicators' respective sections). The inclusion of standalone participation components was done to continue to provide transparency on a school's and subgroup's participation rates. The standalone participation indicators use a traditional calculation of valid assessment scores divided by the number of enrolled students during the appropriate assessment window. These indicators follow the same rules used for all other indicators within Michigan's index-based identification system – based on a percentage of the target met. These indicators use a set target of 95%, and any school meeting or exceeding the participation target will receive an index score of 100 for this indicator.

An overall index value is calculated based on a weighted average of a school's performance in the individual components. Component performance is calculated by finding the percentage of the component target met. This method allows for partial credit in meeting a target. All students and any valid subgroup (n-size 30 or greater) are included in the component calculation. Student subgroups are weighted equally and are averaged into a component level index value. Components, or indicators, are then averaged according to their weights to attain an overall summative index value. All public schools, including public charter schools are included in Michigan's identification system.

The following formula is used to calculate a school's overall index value:

$$\frac{((\text{ Growth \% of Target Met}) \times (\text{Growth Weight})}{}$$
$$+ (\text{Proficiency \% of Target Met}) \times (\text{Proficiency Weight})$$
$$+ (\text{School Quality \% of Target Met}) \times (\text{School Quality Weight})$$
$$+ (\text{Graduation Rate \% of Target Met}) \times (\text{Graduation Rate Weight})$$
$$+ (\text{English Learner (EL) Progress \% of Target Met}) \times (\text{English Learner (EL) Progress Weight}) + (\text{CA Assessment Participation \% of Target Met}) \times (\text{CA Assessment Participation Weight})$$
$$+ (\text{ELP Assessment Participation \% of Target Met}) \times (\text{ELP Assessment Participation Weight})))$$

$$\div (\text{Number of Components Having Data}) \times (\text{Sum of Weights from Components Having Data})$$

Initial modelling of Michigan's index-based system shows a distribution of index values as follows (percentage/number schools): 90-100 = 23% (634); 80-89 =29% (804); 70-79 = 22% (612); 60-69 = 13% (348); Below 60 = 14% (383).

~~In the transparency dashboard, information will be presented in each category. That information will be contextualized with three related values: state average, average of comparison schools, and the school's average.~~

> b. Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

Response

Michigan has set initial weights for all seven of its indicators. Many schools will not have all seven indicators due to school configuration or demographics. In cases where schools have fewer than seven indicators, the weights from the missing indicators are reallocated to the remaining indicators proportionally according to the initial weighting of all seven indicators. The table below shows three example schools: a school with all indicators, a school without a graduation rate, and a school without EL Participation and EL Progress indicators.

Indicator	Initial Weighting	No Graduation Rate Weighting	No EL Participation and Progress Weighting
Academic Achievement	29%	32.22%	32.58%
Academic Progress	34%	37.78%	38.20%
Graduation Rate	10%	N/A	11.24%

English Learner Progress	10%	11.11%	N/A

Indicator	Initial Weighting	No Graduation Rate Weighting	No EL Participation and Progress Weighting
School Quality/Student Success	14%	15.56%	15.73%
General Participation	2%	2.22%	2.25%
English Learner Participation	1%	1.11%	N/A

The initial weightings of the seven indicators are set by policy. In cases where an indicator does not have enough data to be included, its weighting is redistributed to the remaining indicators so that the indicators' relative weight to one another is preserved (i.e., so that the policy decision set with the initial weightings is preserved).

c. If the State uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a. above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (e.g., P-2 schools), describe the different methodology or methodologies, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.

Response

In past years, MDE has convened external stakeholders in order to identify quality indicators of effective alternative education and to recommend accountability measures appropriate for such schools for a fully separate, opt-in alternative to Michigan's index-based identification system. These stakeholder groups have suggested that traditional accountability systems may be insensitive to the challenges faced by many alternative education-focused entities. At this time, Michigan will continue to include alternative education-focused entities in its index-based identification system per federal requirements; however, MDE will continue to seek flexibility that would allow for a separate system of annual meaningful differentiation for alternative-focused entities. ~~Traditional accountability systems may be insensitive to the challenges faced by many alternative education-focused entities. In response, Michigan has committed to developing a new, voluntary, parallel system of accountability for alternative education programs based on an application and relevant school demographics.~~

~~Due to the limitation of the Every Student Succeeds Act, Michigan will seek a waiver for the system that has been in development for the last two years. At this time, Michigan will include alternative education-focused entities in its index-based identification system. The following description is provided in the interest of transparency, and to continue the development process of this parallel system.~~

~~This will be a fully separate opt-in alternative to Michigan's identification system, where all schools that qualify are eligible to choose this parallel path.~~

~~Over the past two years, MDE has convened external stakeholder in order to identify quality indicators of effective alternative education and to recommend accountability measures appropriate for such schools. Accountability for alternative schools would begin with a one-year pilot followed by full implementation. The student population comprising these alternative schools will exclusively contribute to the alternative accountability system.~~

     vi.   Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))

        a. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State's methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

Response

The lowest performing five percent of Title I schools are ~~is~~ identified using the 0-100- point index derived from all seven ~~six~~ accountability system indicators (proficiency, growth, graduation rate, English learner ~~language~~ progress, school quality/student success, and general and English learner assessment participation). The overall index, as described previously in this plan, is weighted based on the indicators that exist for each school.

Schools missing indicators will have weights proportionally redistributed to existing indicators.

Michigan will initially identify Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools using data from the 2016-17 2017-2018 school year for programming in the 2017-18 2018-2019 school year.

COVID-19 related accountability waivers have caused Michigan to alter its identification schedule. Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools that are among the lowest performing 5% of all schools were most recently identified in fall 2022.

> b. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the State's methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

Response

Michigan will identify all public high schools in the state failing to graduate one-third or more of its students by using the 4-year cohort graduation rate.

Michigan will identify Comprehensive Support and Improvement Sschools for CSI using data from the 2016-17 2017-2018 school year.

COVID-19 related accountability waivers have caused Michigan to alter its identification schedule. Schools identified for Comprehensive Support that failed to graduate one-third or more of their students were most recently identified in fall 2022.

c. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years, including the year in which the State will first identify such schools.

Response

Michigan will identify all public schools in the state that receive Title I, Part A funds and that have been pre-identified as meeting Additional Targeted Support criteria have a subgroup of students that, on its own, would lead to identification for as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School by using the subgroup component of our overall identification system and finding all schools with subgroups that meet the criteria for of a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School.

Our MDE's methodology is similar to that used to identify the lowest performing five percent of schools. 0- 100-point indices are calculated for all valid subgroups. Any subgroup with an overall index value less than or equal to the highest overall index value in the lowest performing five percent of schools will identify the school containing that subgroup for CSI as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School if it, after first being identified for additional targeted support, continues to have subgroups meeting the criteria discussed above after six four years.

Schools receiving additional targeted support were identified in 2018-19 and if having not satisfied the statewide exit criteria, be identified for CSI in 2022-23.

COVID-19 related accountability waivers have caused Michigan to alter its identification schedule. School identified for CSI that were initially identified for ATS and failed to exit that status were most recently identified in fall 2022.

> d. <u>Frequency of Identification</u>. Provide, for each type of school identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.

Response

Michigan will identify schools in the lowest performing 5% and schools failing to graduate one third or more of its students for all types of Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools at least once every three years. Michigan will identify schools that were initially identified for Additional Targeted Supports for CSI if they fail to exit Additional Targeted Schools status after six years.

Michigan will identify these schools, and will then use those identifications to triage all of our districts into four levels of support:

- Partnership districts. These are districts with significant numbers of comprehensive support schools, as well as other districts that the MDE is required to serve through other statutory requirements.

- Early Warning districts. These are districts with a) relatively low numbers of comprehensive support schools and/or b) significant numbers of schools that are near the comprehensive support cutoff. Selected Support districts. These districts request specific supports from the MDE based on their comprehensive needs assessment. This is also a place where we would use the targeted support schools list to reach out to specific districts with

support for their low performing subgroups.

- General Support districts. These districts receive all of the MDE's general supports and policy rollout.

    e. <u>Targeted Support and Improvement</u>. Describe the State's methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii))

Response

Michigan will annually identify any school with one or more "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students by using the statewide accountability system described elsewhere in this application.

Any school that has one or more subgroups with index values in the bottom 25% within each applicable component will be identified for TSI. They are only identified if they were not already identified for CSI or ATS. The district will help schools develop and monitor a plan for TSI. Targeted Support, in essence, serves as an "early warning" for Additional Targeted Support.

Targeted schools are identified every year and are schools with at least one subgroup that is performing as poorly as all students in any of the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools statewide. They are only identified if they are not already identified as a comprehensive support or additional targeted support school. The district will help schools develop and monitor a plan for targeted support and improvement. Targeted support, in essence, serves as an "early warning" for additional targeted support.

    f. <u>Additional Targeted Support.</u> Describe the State's methodology for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. (ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

Response

Michigan's methodology for identifying schools for additional targeted supports starts with the population of schools initially identified for TSI. Schools updated for TSI that have any student subgroup performing at the same level as the lowest performing 5% of schools are identified for ATS. These schools have subgroups consistently underperforming across multiple measures, and MDE has chosen to consider multiple measures encompassing one year of data, using a composite

indicator, rather than encompassing multiple years of data to define consistent underperformance.

Michigan will first identify schools for ATS using data from the 2017-18 school year. Schools identified for additional targeted supports in 2017-18 will have five years to exit this status. Subsequent identifications of schools for ATS will happen every six years, to align with Michigan's cycle of identifying schools for CSI. Schools identified for ATS supports will be eligible for early exit of their status after three years, provided they meet exit criteria at the time.

COVID-19 related accountability waivers have caused Michigan to alter its identification cycles. Schools were most recently identified for ATS in fall 2022 and will next be identified in fall 2028.

~~Our methodology is similar to that used to identify the lowest performing five percent of schools. 0-100-point indices are calculated for all valid subgroups. Any subgroup with an overall index value less than or equal to the highest overall index value in the lowest performing five percent of schools will identify the school containing that subgroup as an Additional Targeted Support School.~~Michigan will first identify Additional Targeted Support Schools using data from the 2017-2018 school year ~~and identify subsequent schools every three years thereafter~~.

g. Additional Statewide Categories of Schools. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

Response

Michigan chooses not to include additional statewide categories of schools. ~~Michigan intends to continue the Reward School designation. Michigan does not submit methodologies for this at this time, and will derive these labels from our core accountability system after running the new system and seeking additional stakeholder discussion~~

    vii.   Annual Measurement of Achievement *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))*: Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

Response

~~In addition to ESSA requirements, the inclusion of assessment participation aligns with Michigan's Top 10 in 10 strategies.~~ The inclusion of a high participation rate requirement will help Michigan reduce the impact of high risk factors, including poverty, and will provide equitable resources to meet the needs of all students to ensure that they have access to quality educational opportunities.

There are two standalone participation components within the proposed accountability system. Both components function in the same manner, however they cover different assessments. One covers the assessments used to determine results within the achievement and growth components; the other covers the assessment used to determine results within the English Learner Progress component.

The calculation to determine the percentage of the participation goal met is: ((Sum of students with valid assessment scores/Sum of students within assessed grades during an assessment window)/Component goal).

In order to satisfy the ESSA requirement that at least 95% of students are included in the academic achievement ~~proficiency~~ calculations, participation rates are included in determining the percentage of both the growth and proficiency targets met. Only students with full academic year (FAY) status are included in proficiency and growth calculations. The proficiency and growth calculation used to populate a subgroup's performance in a specific content area includes the participation rate (due to requirements that at least 95% of students are included in the calculation). The calculation is: (Participation rate of full academic year students) x (proficiency or growth rate of full academic year students), or to break it out further: (FAY tested/FAY enrolled) x (FAY proficient or met growth/FAY tested).

~~Schools that continually have challenges meeting the 95% participation requirement will be eligible for additional supports through our Partnership District work.~~

    viii.   Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement *(ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))*

        a.   Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the

Response

Exit criteria for schools identified for CSIfor Comprehensive Support Schools: tThe school is no longer is identified by the system for CSI as a Comprehensive Support School in no more than three four years, and has demonstrated improvement in math and ELA proficiency rates over two years. This ensures schools are exited by making academic progress and not simply being replaced in the lowest-performing 5% population by other schools' declining performance. We note that we will continue to examine data and work with stakeholders, and may submit an amendment for modified exit criteria in the future.

b. Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

Response

Exit criteria for schools receiving Additional Targeted Support: tThe school is no longer is identified by the system as needing Additional Targeted Support in no more than six four years and has demonstrated improvement in math and ELA proficiency rates over two years in the subgroup or subgroups for which the school was initially identified. This ensures schools are exited by making academic progress and closing achievement gaps. We note that we will continue to examine data and work with stakeholders and may submit an amendment for modified exit criteria in the future.

c. <u>More Rigorous Interventions.</u> Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.

Response

Michigan meets this requirement by differentiating its support for districts with schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) across a continuum of levels between the Office of Educational Supports (OES) and Office of Partnership Districts (OPD). The levels will include Basic (OES), Partnership Agreement – Fundamental (OPD), Partnership Agreement – Essential (OPD), and Partnership Agreement – Intense (OPD). Districts with schools identified for CSI are assigned to a level of support based on the reason for which schools were identified. If a district has schools that are reidentified for CSI, the intensity of support will escalate to the next level on the continuum. If a schools is reidentified for CSI, and the district does not meet the entrance criteria for a Partnership Agreement (e.g., Alternative Education), requirements will intensify with the Basic level of support.

The table below outlines the continuum of support for districts with schools identified for CSI. ~~All LEAs with schools implementing a comprehensive support and improvement plan will be designated a state partnership school district. The partnership agreement will be with the entire LEA, and must specifically address the performance of the school(s) implementing a comprehensive support and improvement plan, but should consider the entire school district system.~~

~~Partnership school districts will be required, in conjunction with the SEA, to:~~

~~1)   Within 90 days, complete a comprehensive needs assessment and comprehensive support and improvement plan to address areas of need;~~

~~2)   Identify 3-5 benchmarks based on the comprehensive needs assessment that will be met within 18 months, and~~

~~3)   Identify outcomes that will be met at the end of a three-year period.~~

~~Benchmarks and outcomes must be specific for each school implementing a comprehensive support and improvement plan, and may include additional outcomes for the entire LEA. One required outcome of the comprehensive support and improvement plan must be that the school meets the state determined exit criteria at the end of three years. Schools that that fail to meet the exit criteria will be considered in breach of the partnership agreement and will be subject to the more rigorous actions under "Breach of Plan" described below.~~

~~Breach of Plan: The LEA is determined to be in breach if it fails to sign an agreement within 90 days after being designated a partnership school district. Failure to meet benchmarks at 18 months and outcomes at three years also constitutes a breach of the plan. The consequences of breaching the plan shall be identified at the time of entering the partnership agreement.~~

OPD			OES
INTENSE	**ESSENTIAL**	**FUNDAMENTAL**	**BASIC/BASELINE***
An OPD director participates in writing partnership agreements.	An OPD director participates in writing partnership agreements as needed.	An OPD director participates in writing partnership agreements as needed.	N/A- Partnership agreement is not applicable

Liaison communicates twice monthly with each district	Liaison communicates monthly with each district	Liaison communicates monthly with each district	Liaison communicates regularly with each district
Monthly meetings are held on-site with liaison, OPD director or assistant director, district leadership, and ISD personnel	At a minimum, every other month meetings are held on-site with liaison, district leadership, and ISD personnel	At minimum quarterly meetings are held on-site with liaison, district leadership, and ISD personnel	Liaison schedules regular meetings (virtual and/or in person) between liaison, district, and ISD partners.
Liaison is on-site twice a month	Liaison is on-site once a month	Liaison is on-site every other month	Liaison must communicate regularly with each district.
Liaison collaborates with MDE educational consultants across all offices, State-Wide Field Team (SWFT) representative, and ISD personnel to connect districts and schools identified for support to guidance, resources, professional learning and/or technical assistance that is available to help meet the identified needs and goals within their improvement plans.			
OPD is an integral part of the comprehensive needs assessment and Michigan Integrated Continuous Improvement Process (MICIP)			Liaison and ISD support team facilitate comprehensive needs assessment utilizing the Michigan Integrated Continuous Improvement Process (MICIP), including a root cause analysis, and connect district to resources based upon the data from this analysis.
Liaison facilitates Section 21(h) requests to ensure alignment with the partnership agreement			Liaison and ISD support team support writing the continuous improvement plan based on assess needs/root cause analysis to include funding considerations.
Liaison facilitates preparation for the Benchmark Review (BR) and Evaluation of Partnership Agreement (EPA)			In collaboration with the district, the liaison and ISD support team monitor implementation of the continuous improvement plan and ESSA requirements.

    d. <u>Resource Allocation Review</u>. Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

Response

MDE provides universal Resource Allocation Review guidance to all districts and

schools identified for support. This guidance assists the district/school as it prepares for the review, considers review options, and analyzes data (e.g., fiscal allocation and utilization, educator/leadership quality and longevity, climate and culture, and curriculum quality and implementation) for making its resource equity determination. For each LEA in the State serving a significant* number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, MDE periodically** reviews resource allocation to support continuous improvement. The periodic Resource Allocation Review conducted by MDE gathers state-level resource allocation and utilization data. This data is organized by MDE and may include an analysis of per pupil funding vs. pupil performance, district and school level expenditures, the consolidated application, grant draw-down reports, final expenditure reports, year-end reports supporting utilization of specific state categorical funds, and/or other applicable resource elements as described in the universal guidance. The data from the State's periodic review is shared in a meeting with the district as part of the district's needs assessment process. MDE will collaborate with the district team(s) in analyzing this data with other data collected to determine any resource inequities that need to be addressed in the appropriate improvement plan(s).

*Michigan defines "significant" as being two standard deviations or more from the mean (average) of a dataset. This definition applies to the count of schools within a district identified for support (CSI, ATS, or TSI)

** Michigan defines "periodic" to align with the three-year identification cycle for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).

The SEA will integrate a periodic resource and systems review process as an adjunct to the comprehensive needs assessment process to ensure a comprehensive approach to determining needs and planning appropriately and effectively to meet those needs for LEAs with a significant number or percentage of identified schools. The SEA already has in place an interagency Financial Independence Team (FIT). FIT consists of SEA school improvement staff, SEA state aid (state general fund allocation to LEAs) and Michigan Department of Treasury staff. This team provides training and technical assistance to Michigan LEAs that are in deficit status or have declining fund balances placing them at risk of entering deficit status. Overall FIT work emphasizes maintaining equitable resources across state and federal programs. The SEA has found a correlation between LEAs having one or more schools in the bottom 5% academically and the LEAs also being in deficit status or at risk of entering that status financially. SEA FIT staff are currently providing technical assistance to multiple LEAs that are in or at risk of deficit status and have at least one school in the bottom 5%.

Technical assistance includes assisting LEAs in writing LEA and school improvement plans that consider financial and academic needs and how each affects the other, while also developing systems to ensure the proper implementation of the written plans. Work has centered around the concept of making sound financial decisions that do not negatively impact continuous improvement or turnaround efforts in the LEA. Data is analyzed on staffing, programming, facilities, and other pertinent areas

~~to ensure that any academic gains are maintained despite the need to reduce budgets.~~

~~The SEA's current statewide system of support also includes the Blueprint for Turnaround, which is an LEA and building framework for addressing systems and increasing student achievement. The SEA intends to continue the usage of The Blueprint for Turnaround, which includes talent management, leadership, student support and instructional infrastructure components built on the consistent use of systemic communication, performance management and problem-solving protocols. These areas focus on the LEA having the personnel, resources, facilities, and systems necessary to provide high quality instruction.~~

e. <u>Technical Assistance.</u> Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

Response

For each LEA in the State serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, Michigan provides technical assistance through the partnership district model. The partnership district model's vision and approach are to establish a collaborative, less-compliant focused method to facilitate academic achievement improvements for districts with the lowest-performing schools, while also building the capacity of the district and its partners to sustain turnaround efforts. Through such a collaborative approach, districts are better able to shift from an individual school's emphasis to a district-wide systemic focus to realize positive change.

The overall goal of the partnership district model is to improve student academic achievement through the development and completion of a partnership agreement created collaboratively between the local district/public-school academy (PSA), community partners, intermediate school districts/regional education service agencies (ISD/RESA), public-school academy authorizer (if applicable), and MDE. The intent is to improve district systems using a combination of local and state supports/resources to help communities provide each student with the access and opportunity for a quality education. The partnership district model puts a broad spectrum of technical expertise and resources in the hands of the districts/PSAs and allows them to use community and state-level support systems to drive instructional improvement. ~~Consistent with Section 1111(d), the SEA will review all LEA comprehensive support school plans to determine if a developmentally-appropriate, evidence-based intervention (EBI) has been selected. Plans will also be reviewed for evidence of the completion of a comprehensive needs assessment. The needs assessment will identify the unique needs of the school and achievement gaps, in addition to mapping current assets and resources through an environmental scan. Once the specific needs and achievement gaps are identified, the school will select an appropriate EBI.~~

The SEA is in the process of developing an approved list of evidence-based interventions. That list will be completed prior to the beginning of the 2018-19 academic year. However, technical assistance will include a focus on helping LEAs learn a process for EBI selection rather than just selecting options from a list. LEAs will develop these skills within the framework of implementation science, with particular emphasis on the connections to multi-tiered systems of support.

All districts with Title I Comprehensive Support Schools will be assigned an SEA approved Implementation Facilitator. The Implementation Facilitator will be knowledgeable about evidence-based school turnaround/continuous improvement strategies as well as research-based systems improvement. The Implementation Facilitator will work with LEA and building leadership to identify high quality Tier One instruction in all classrooms, including early childhood (where applicable), and take steps to improve instruction when needed.

For districts with Partnership Agreements with MDE and for districts that opt into the Early Warning System partnership with MDE, the Implementation Facilitator will coordinate with the MDE partnership district liaison to implement the agreements. Work will focus on the unique aspects of the partnership district agreement and how these align with and support the general and SEA defined requirements for comprehensive support schools.

The Implementation Facilitator will work with LEA and building staff to ensure there are systems in place to support students' non-academic needs. The Implementation Facilitator will provide support to the LEA staff and building leadership to complete a new needs assessment and create and monitor the implementation of a revised comprehensive support and improvement plan. If there are multiple schools implementing a comprehensive support and improvement plan within the LEA failing to meet benchmarks, the SEA shall choose whether to impose the same consequence on each school that has failed or to employ different consequences for each. In the case of Partnership Districts (as noted above), the Implementation Facilitator will ensure collaboration and alignment with the partnership agreement. In addition, the LEAs will participate in SEA directed partnership meetings that will include ongoing support in selecting, implementing, and monitoring/evaluating evidence-based interventions.

f. **Additional Optional Action.** If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

Response

As referenced under More Rigorous Interventions, Michigan differentiates its support for districts with schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) across a continuum of levels: Basic, Partnership Agreement – Fundamental, Partnership Agreement – Essential, and Partnership Agreement – Intense. For any LEA with a significant number of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria, the intensity of support will escalate to the next level on the continuum within the partnership district model. If an LEA in a Partnership Agreement – Intense level is re-identified, reconstitution may be imposed. ~~The SEA has elected to not initiate additional improvement actions based on the additional 3% reservation for direct student services. This decision was reached for two reasons. First, SEA leadership and staff believe most, if not all, of the activities are already allowable through Title I Part A and Title II Part A funding to LEAs.~~

~~Reserving this amount at the SEA level would reduce LEA flexibility in using Title funds to meet their individual needs. Second, adding an additional 3% to the already increased 7% reservation in this section significantly reduces LEA allocations statewide. The SEA intends to avoid any potential negative impact that reduced funding may have on LEAs and schools that are on the cusp of comprehensive or targeted support status.~~

5. **Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)):* Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the SEA with respect to such description.[4]**

Response

The rates reported in the table below demonstrate that students of color and students from low-income families in Title I Schools in Michigan have observably inequitable access to teachers rated "effective" based on local evaluation systems and experienced teachers. As explained in Michigan's Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators (2015), the MDE's analysis of available data suggests that research-based national trends are evident in Michigan schools serving student populations with significant numbers of students of color and students from low-income families:

- High numbers of inexperienced teachers at high-needs schools is a result of

high turnover and low retention.

- As many as a third of teachers leave after their first three years of teaching and over 40% leave within the first five years.

- Educator workforce quality and stability is impacted by teacher supply, teacher distribution, teacher recruitment, support for new teachers, and the school environment.

- Teachers plan to stay longer in schools with a positive working environment, independent of the school's student demographics.

- Teachers stay when they have a school leader who ensures that the school works properly, provides instructional leadership, and is an inclusive decision-maker.

- Teachers stay when there are high levels of collegial support that includes having an environment of respect and trust, formal structures for collaboration and support, and a shared set of professional goals and purposes.

The rates reported in the table below demonstrate that students of color and students from low-income families have greater access to teachers working in-field than their peers.

Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators in Title I Schools

STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by an **ineffective** teacher	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an **out-of-field** teacher	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an **inexperienced** teacher	Differences between rates
Low-income students	4.5%	2.6%	6.4%	-0.5%	13.0%	2.9%
Non-low-income students	1.9%		6.9%		10.1%	
Minority students	6.3%	4.8%	6.0%	-1.0%	14.3%	4.2%
Non-minority students	1.5%		7.0%		10.1%	

---

[4] Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

Public Reporting

Michigan will report the metrics in the table above on the Transparency Dashboard described in section A.4 above pursuant to federally required timelines.

Indicators of an Effective Teaching Environment
Michigan's vision of educator effectiveness is inclusive of a number of key supports for students and educators; by themselves, labels of "effective" or "ineffective;" "experienced" or "inexperienced;" and "in-field" or "out-of-field" are reductive point-in-time measures of the current performance or status of an individual educator. Inequitable access, however, is not a matter of labeling individual educators. The MDE believes that the causes of inequitable access have more to do with the effectiveness of the teaching environment in which educators function and less to do with point-in-time labels marking individual educators.

Educator effectiveness is the end-goal of a process of continuous improvement, for both the individual educator via local systems of evaluation and support and for the school and district via the comprehensive needs assessment. An effective teaching environment is one in which many supports for students and educators are present; an ineffective teaching environment is one in which few supports for students and educators are present. There is no precise definition or measurement of an effective teaching environment, but there are measurable indicators that help the state, districts, and schools identify where they are strong and what challenges they face so that they can continuously work toward a more effective teaching environment.

To that end, the MDE plans to phase in additional indicators identified in the table below in order to better and more accurately measure factors that correlate more and less strongly with inequitable distributions of teachers and better inform and tailor the identification of strategies to close access gaps at the state and local levels. These indicators will be measured and reported in order to provide LEAs with information to make thoughtful decisions about improvements in their educator workforce; these indicators will not be used as accountability indicators for public reporting.

Measure	Tier	Availability
Teacher effectiveness labels	1	A
Teacher (in)experience	1	A
Teachers out-of-field	1	A
Disproportionality in Identification for Special Education Services	1	A
School leader effectiveness labels	1	A
Teacher diversity	1	A
Teacher retention/mobility	1	A/B

School leader retention/mobility	1	A/B
School leader (in)experience	1	B
Effective implementation of educator evaluations	2	C
Student discipline, suspension, and expulsion	2-3	B
School culture and climate	2-3	B/C
Teacher leader roles and opportunities	2-3	B/C
Compensation	2-3	B/C

Measure	Tier	Availability
Teacher absenteeism	2-3	C
Professional learning programming	3	C
Induction and mentoring programming	3	C
Cultural competency/Racial bias	3	C

Table Key: *Tier*:   1=available now; 2=available in one to three years; 3=undetermined

                      Availability: A=finished data source; B=raw data; C=no current collection

6. **School Conditions (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(C)):* Describe how the SEA agency will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning, including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.**

Response

Michigan is redeveloping its comprehensive needs assessment process using a Multi-tiered System of Support approach to focus on the whole child, which includes supporting schools in doing a data-based review of all of the conditions that relate to student learning, including school safety, discipline, bullying/harassment, and student health (inclusive of physical, mental, behavioral, and social emotional health). Based on the needs identified through this analysis, Michigan LEAs will be supported with a series of current evidence-based practices, including 1) positive behavior intervention supports, 2) the implementation of Michigan's anti-bullying policy and practices, 3) school health and safety programs, and 4) Family and Community Engagement 5) Staff Wellness

7. **School Transitions *(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D))*: Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.**

Response

Michigan already has in place the Michigan Merit Curriculum, which requires all students to take coursework in mathematics, English/language arts, science, social studies, foreign language, and fine arts. Michigan also has rigorous career and college ready standards in mathematics, ELA, and science, and are updating our social studies standards currently. These govern the learning expectations for all students K-12.

We are in the process of developing social-emotional learning standards for K-12. Michigan also has early childhood standards of quality for prekindergarten, that supports a fully integrated comprehensive approach to learning across academic and developmental domains, which are aligned to the K-12 standards; as well as

early childhood standards of quality for infants and toddlers and out-of-school time learning. Additionally, the academic component of the "whole child" comprehensive needs assessment will push districts to evaluate to what extent they are making these opportunities available for all students and will provide the MDE with the opportunity to engage in technical assistance, as well as monitor these areas.

Michigan is in the final stages of developing a revised statewide literacy plan to support learners at all levels in developing strong, developmentally appropriate literacy skills. This plan builds upon work that is currently taking place to support a targeted set of literacy skills and reading competencies in early grades to ensure that students can demonstrate proficiency in English language arts by grade 3. This literacy plan specifically addresses learning transitions for literacy skills including:

- Birth to pre-school (focusing on developmental literacy skills and school readiness)

- Early literacy learning (PK-3 specific essential practices that focus on developing literacy skills

- Adolescent reading (grades 4-5, focusing on identify-based literacy competencies and "reading to learn" transitions from "learning to read"), and

- Disciplinary literacies (literacy skills across content areas in grades 6-12)

The plan not only addresses instructional practices to support these learning transitions to develop literacy competencies, but also addresses professional learning supports for educators, administrative support to implement such practices in schools and districts, and parent and community engagement supports to ensure that all stakeholders are supporting learner needs as children transition through the education system.

Along these lines, Michigan is also focusing on district-level implementation of multi-tiered systems of support. While the strategy is not new, it has often been employed as an implementation structure for targeted programming in Michigan, largely around early literacy or behavioral expectations for students. Michigan is redefining MTSS components and is incorporating a number of structures at the district level to ensure that implementation addresses building-to-building transitions, including transitions to middle and high school. Michigan is also developing a series of supports for academic, attendance, behavioral, and social and emotional needs for learners. These are being implemented at the district level to ensure that screening, diagnosis for intervention efforts, and remediation are resolved for all learners throughout the system, fostering uniform supports throughout the education system.

Michigan state law requires local schools to provide an opportunity for students to begin developing an Educational Development Plan (EDP) in grade 7 and requires that every student have an EDP before entering high school, that will be reviewed and updated throughout the student's high school years, as circumstances warrant. The primary emphasis of the EDP is to develop a student's statement of career goals and a plan of action for reaching them. Through the student's EDP planning process students, with their parents, will be given individualized assistance in planning coursework to support progress toward educational and career goals, including awareness of careers that may be nontraditional for the student's gender, and opportunities offered through Career and Technical Education. As part of the EDP process districts will engage students and parents in discussing educational and career opportunities and available academic and financial supports that may be available to minority students, students with disabilities, English learners, and low-income students. Districts also will be provided with access to resources to help them think about ways to accommodate the needs of their gifted/talented students.

In CTE, we work extensively to encourage female students to enroll in instructional programs that are non-traditional for their gender. This is one of our annual performance measures for the USDOE as required in our federal Perkins funding. We receive federal funding to help support a gender equity consultant as well.

Finally, Michigan's Top 10 in 10 strategies around learner-centered supports include a focus on deeper learning and STEM/STEAM, with application for all students. We want to ensure that all Michigan students are accessing high-quality, meaningful, challenging learning experiences. We intend to use data to monitor our progress and can look at access across the various groups listed above.

As referenced earlier, a "whole child" comprehensive needs assessment is key to LEAs supporting the continuum of a student's education. In addition, as required by Michigan law, each child will complete, with input from his/her parent or guardian, and Educational Development Plan (EDP), no later than 8th grade which will be updated annually, to support individual planning for continuing education and a career by describing the pathway the student will follow to meet challenging State academic standards and career and technical standards. With this tool, a district can comprehensively identify needs, and then target programming and funding sources appropriately.

The SEA will assist LEAs, through technical assistance, in coordinating their work with other high-quality early childhood programs/services funded by the SEA that also require development of a needs assessment, including how the LEA blends and braids funding for early childhood programs and services, including home visiting, if it chooses to utilize funding for early childhood under the needs assessment. It will also work to raise awareness of the importance of transitions from all early childhood settings to elementary settings by having LEAs address transition supports, including transferring child records and comprehensive developmental screening services, within district improvement plans and elementary school

improvement plans in order to create transition plans that are informed by and supported by early childhood programs, schools, administrators, and families. Michigan will also provide technical assistance and guidance on developmentally appropriate practices for early childhood as well as early elementary grades. The ultimate goal is to ensure access to a system of high-quality learning settings across the P-20 continuum.

In partnership with the College Board, all Michigan students have free online access to the Khan Academy Platform, as early as grade 8. The Khan Academy tool provides resources to prepare students for success on the SAT later in high school and ultimately careers and college and includes a variety of career and coursework planning activities and tools.

B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

1. <u>Supporting Needs of Migratory Children</u> *(ESEA section 1304(b)(1))*: **Describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs and projects assisted under Title I, Part C, the State and its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through:**

   i. The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;

   ii. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;

   iii. The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and

   iv. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

Response

<u>Planning</u>: The MDE Migrant Education Team (MI MEP) follows the continuous improvement process when identifying the unique educational and other needs of migratory children and youth. In 2013, MI MEP convened a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA Committee to conduct the needs assessment and created a state delivery plan (SDP) with input from all stakeholders which included the analysis of the available academic, demographic and perception data.

The Three-Phase Model was used to facilitate the process. Phase I, "What is?" asks the questions of: "What is the data that we have? What does it tell us? What data do we still need to obtain a full picture of our migrant students and programs? Phase II, "Gather and Analyze Data", is the step where additional data is obtained and analyzed. In these discussions, stakeholders identify key barriers faced by migratory children and youth including preschool migratory children and migratory youth who have dropped out of school. Phase III, "Make Decisions", includes forming concern statements, documenting the unique needs, identifying data sources, writing need statements, as well as developing corresponding written objectives, strategies, and activities.

Various sources of data are used during the CNA process:

   (1) Local and state achievement data;

   (2) survey data on the perceptions of migrant children and youth, their parents and the staff that serve them;

   (3) other relevant demographic data; and

   (4) instructional and support services data.

Since the needs of migratory children and youth drive Michigan's migrant education programming, the analysis of available data occurs continuously. To support the needs of migratory children and youth, MDE's MEP Team jointly plans the State Delivery Plan (SDP) and its measurable objectives within the context of the State Consolidated Application to ensure the integration of migrant education services along with local, state and federal programming within each of local programs and statewide. This includes Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, Title III, and McKinney Vento.

In Michigan, local educational agencies are required to engage in a comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) process and submit a local plan that includes measurable objectives for all students and each of the subgroups including migratory children and youth. The local migrant education program's plan aligns with the state SDP. In this manner, local migrant education programs integrate the unique needs of migratory children and youth within the LEA plan. Furthermore, LEAs must demonstrate how these measurable objectives are funded and supported through the integration of local, state and federal supplemental funding sources using a coordinated program chart, "Goals Summary". An additional tool LEAs use during the planning process is the Title I, Part C Monitoring Indicators Checklist. This checklist helps LEAs ensure that they are following all program requirements including the integration of the full range of services from local, state and federal funds.

Program Planning: representation from the migratory education program by including the MEP team, local MEP stakeholders, and/or migratory community agency stakeholders on cross office committees and office stakeholder groups to ensure that joint planning at the state level occurs.

Local MEPs use their local CNAs and the state SDP to develop their migrant program design and services. As they plan, local MEPs take into consideration the other local, state and federally-funded program services available within the district and ensure migratory children and youth have equitable access to these programs. The migratory education provides supplemental instructional and support services to meet the needs not addressed through existing programs.

Other program services include but are not limited to: Title I, Part A; Title III Language Instruction for English Leaners and Immigrant Students; the McKinney-Vento Act; local and state Funded At-Risk programs; local and state funded bilingual programs; local and state funded Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs; preschool and early childhood programming; and adult or alternative education programs.

The availability of programs varies; however, district improvement and planning teams must include representation from the various programs in order to facilitate joint planning. In the absence of this representation, local MEPs must include these representatives during their CNA and MEP services design processes. The MEP measurable program objectives and outcomes ensure that the unique needs of migratory children and youth are addressed by including local and state

achievement measures for reading and math, measures of English language proficiency, parent perception data relating to accessibility of supports, graduation and dropout rates, access to early childhood education programming, rates of identification and provision of services for out of school youth as well as the use of MSIX to improve interstate and intrastate coordination. These objectives and outcomes are included in the state SDP.

Implementation: The MI MEP Team coordinates efforts and collaborates with Title I Part A, Title II, Title III and McKinney Vento program teams who are housed in one Unit (Special Populations) under one Manager and in one office (Field Services). Teams of consultants, representing the Consolidated application, review the migrant education applications in the context of the Consolidated Application and LEA plans and ensure that migratory children and youth have access to all local, state and federal funds and integrate Title I Part C supplemental funds. When planning MV programming the needs of migratory children and youth, who are homeless, are addressed including removing barriers to the full range of services available to all children and youth as required by law. Technical assistance is provided to local program leadership and teams on how to layer the supports funded by local, state and federal funds to equitably, effectively and timely support migratory children and youth toward achieving program measurable objectives and outcomes. Both Title I Part C and Title III have one State director and two consultants (one per program). Through formal cross-office meetings and informal conversations, the MEP and Title III team collaborate on policy development, program development and program implementation to address the needs of migratory children and youth who are English learners. The Title III State Advisory Committee includes representatives from the local Title I Part C directors as well as the State Migrant Director and Consultant. All discussion regarding English learners incorporate the needs of ELs who are migratory in terms of entrance to, exit from the EL program, supplemental language instruction educational program (LIEP) as well as quality teachers that support language development and parent engagement services.

MI MEP implements joint planning among local, state, and federal education programs through its joint Consolidated Application monitoring process of local programs. Each local program must implement strategies around collaboration with social service agencies, dental providers, health care providers, CAMP/HEP programs, local college outreach, and USDA meal programs.

When monitoring LEAs, a team from the Offices of Field Services uses common Monitoring Indicators that align with each state and federal program requirements to examine the extent of fidelity of program implementation and integration of services and supports for all students including migratory children and youth. A Monitoring Indicators Checklist is used to monitor and review the migrant education program in detail led by the MI MEP team along with representatives

from the Title I, II, III to ensure all aspects of the program requirements are being implemented guided by the CNA and in alignment with the SDP and local plans.

MI MEP addresses the unique needs of preschool migratory children as articulated in its SDP in collaboration and coordination with Office of Great Start (Early Childhood) and MI Migrant HeadStart through targeted meetings and via the Interagency Migrant Services Committee. Additionally, MI MEP Team collaborates with SDP stakeholders as well as Consolidated Application team, to achieve the statewide measurable program objectives and outcomes for preschool migratory children. MI MEP Service Delivery Plan includes a goal and measurable objectives that address the unique needs of preschool migratory children as follows:

- The percent of migratory children reported as participating in structured early childhood programs, via preschool status in the Migrant Education Data System and in Migrant HeadStart, will increase by 2% annually.

- The percent of migratory parents reporting that their children, birth to five, receive prevention and intervention health services will increase by 2% annually.

To meet the SDP measurable objectives for preschool migratory students, each local program, in accordance with its CNA, is required to:

- Improve coordination between local MEPs and Early Childhood programs; provide developmentally appropriate preschool services, health and other supportive services for eligible preschool migratory children during the regular year and in the summer program through coordination with Migrant HeadStart and MI Great Start School Readiness Program (GSRP); and assist parents with access to early childhood programming registration and meaningful engagement.

- Ensure MEP funded preschools integrate English Language development and school readiness in their summer program designs.

- All migrant families whose children participate in Early Childhood Education programs will receive referrals (as defined by Migrant Education) and gain access to prevention and intervention health services.

To address the unique needs of migratory children who have dropped out of school, MI MEP Team implements activities to meet the statewide goal of increasing access to instruction for out of school youth (OSY) to improve their basic life skills.

- The graduation rate of migrant high school students, (including GED completion) will increase by at least 2% annually.

- The number of identified and served migrant Out of School Youth needs to increase by at least 2% annually.

To meet the SDP measurable objectives for OSY migratory youth, each local program, in accordance with its CNA, is required to:

- Local MEPs and ID&R centers will network with local agencies and growers within each community to ensure identification of out-of-school youth and provide information and instruction to OSY on community services, eligibility for services, and ways in which to access services.

- Provide professional development and resources to local MEPs regarding secondary and post-secondary education.

- Increase parental outreach and engagement for parents of students in high school or GED programs.

Evaluation: The MDE Migrant Education Team completed a formal statewide evaluation in spring of 2016. As part of the continuous review process, local MEPs, ID&R Centers and community stakeholders engaged in analyzing the state MEP evaluation. Then they examined and updated their local CNAs. These CNAs were shared and informed revisions and updates for the state CNA and SDP. Throughout these discussions, stakeholders focus on key barriers faced by migratory children and youth including preschool migratory children and migratory youth who have dropped out of school. The written CNA and SDP documents are being revised in the 2016-17 migrant year.

The MI MEP along with the OFS Consolidated application team will monitor local programs against the expected MEP Monitoring Indicators (including the ones that address equitable access and integration of services) to ensure local programs are integrating local, state and federal resources and coordinating the supports and services effectively to ensure SDP measurable objectives and outcomes are met. MI MEP Team will continue to evaluate how well MEP services are integrated with other local, state and federal programs by conducting a formal evaluation of its program every three years, and annual review and analysis of the interim and final program reporting by its MEP local programs.

As stated in the program evaluation plan, each MEP local team as well as the MI MEP team will monitor students' progress toward achieving the determined measurable objectives and outcomes. They will ensure fidelity of implementation of the planned strategies and activities that support program objectives and make necessary adjustments without compromising the outcomes. On an annual basis, the MI MEP Team and stakeholders will review local and summative state assessments to determine whether the measurable objectives and outcomes, set in the SDP for migratory children and youth who dropped out of school, have been met and plan technical assistance and interventions accordingly.

2. **Promote Coordination of Services (ESEA section 1304(b)(3)): Describe how the State will use Title I, Part C funds received under this part to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year.**

Response

The MDE Migrant Education Team reserves a portion of the Title I, Part C state allocation for state level identification, recruitment and reporting efforts. These efforts support local MEPs with interstate and intrastate coordination. Michigan's Migrant Education Data System (MEDS) supports the collection and sharing of pertinent school records including information on demographics, enrollment, course history, academic achievement, health and mobility. MEDS files are transmitted to MSIX nightly.

Local MEPs and ID&R Centers use trained data entry specialists to input data. Data not collected in MEDS is pulled directly from state information systems and transmitted through MEDS to MSIX. Local MEPs use MSIX to facilitate accurate placement of migratory students, review "home" state assessment results for instructional services, verify educational interruptions during the regular year, and identify other needs such as health, language or special education services. The ID&R Centers process the MSIX notifications received from other states or other MEPs within Michigan. Local MEPs as well as ID&R Centers use MSIX notifications as well as the Consolidated Student Record.

To ensure timely transfer of migratory student records and continuity of education, local MEPs send transcripts with students when they move, contact receiving schools and monitor transcripts when students return to ensure transfer was completed. Michigan schools do not charge fees for the transfer of migrant student records.

Michigan works closely with states and countries from which students migrate to Michigan. Approximately one third of Michigan's migratory children and youth come from Texas and approximately one third from Florida. The remaining one third is made up of children making qualifying moves intrastate as well as moves from a variety of other states and countries. The MDE Migrant Team strongly encourages local migrant education programs to collaborate directly with programs and schools in other states. Each year, Michigan has representation at Texas's Interstate conference and NASDME so that local programs can directly connect and network with staff that serves our shared students.

3. **Use of Funds (ESEA section 1304(b)(4)): Describe the State's priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds, and how such priorities relate to the State's assessment of needs for services in the State.**

Response

The MDE Migrant Education Team's priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds are defined in the state Identification and Recruitment Plan and the Service Delivery Plan which addresses the unique needs identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment. One priority is identification, recruitment, and reporting of all eligible migratory children and youth, including preschool migratory children and migratory youth who have dropped out of school.

Another priority is implementation of the state Service Delivery Plan. This plan includes the implementation of Common Summer Curriculum and Assessments; increasing the use of instructional strategies that support English language development during both the regular school year and summer; coordination of unique instructional and support services with other local, state and federal programs; support for increasing collaboration, networking and coordination between local programs and with other non-profit and governmental agencies including early childhood programs and programs designed to reduce dropout such as credit accrual and CTE; and the meaningful engagement of parents in all aspects of the MEP program; as well as the technical assistance needed to support the SDP implementation. While focusing on these priorities, the MDE Migrant Education Team along with local MEPs, ensure that migratory children and youth identified as priority for service are served first.

Children who are not priority for service and still within their three years of eligibility are served next based on need and the availability of funds by local MEPs. Finally, students identified for continuation of services are served if funds and services remain available to support the identified needs. The MDE Migrant Education Team established statewide procedures for local MEPs to follow in making priority for services (PFS) determinations. These PFS determinations are reviewed and approved at the state level. Local MEPs use a common PFS template to record the data used in making the determination. This documentation is maintained at the local level and available to state approvers upon request.

Migratory children and youth who are identified as priority for services are those migratory children who have made a qualifying move within the previous 1-year period and who:

(1) are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the challenging State academic standards; or

(2) have dropped out of school.

A child is failing if they are identified as having at least one at-risk factor. These risk factors are identified on the PFS template and local MEPs receive training to ensure

accuracy. These risk factors include local and state academic achievement results, English learner status, qualifying for special education services or early childhood at-risk programs, content area grades, course completion, and grade retention

C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

1. **Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs** (ESEA section 1414(a)(1)(B)): Provide a plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

Response

In Michigan, the Part D Program currently serves 11841 children and youth in juvenile detention facilities, and State run training schools. The Subpart 1 has 2 subgrantees that do treatment, education, or detention. Subpart 2 has 75 subgrantees that do treatment, education or detention. The needs of the students and facilities involved in Part D are based upon identified offense categories and general and typical behavior centering around sex-offense, mental health, serious and chronic offense and general delinquent behavior. Most students are behind in academics and many display special education needs (1771) and LEP (44). The priorities for Michigan's Part D program are treatment, education and transition based on: 1) Michigan's Part D data in the SY 2014-15 Consolidated Performance Report, 2) the results the latest statewide needs assessment, and 3) the results of official program evaluation and of subgrantee monitoring results conducted in the 2015-16 of the Part D Program. Transition Services Status: ESEA and now ESSA have required that a transition specialist be employed by Subpart 1 facilities. Currently, Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and Michigan Department of Corrections (DOC) have at least one transition specialist. The specialist role is somewhat narrowly defined in working with youth to create employment documents, communicate with a parole/probation officer and coordinate intake and release of students. They also communicate and build relationships with community resources, including, but not limited to, secondary schools, higher education, apprenticeship training, Michigan Rehabilitation Services, Michigan Protection and Advocacy Service and various community charity funded agencies, such as Goodwill Industries, Project Focus Hope, the Salvation Army and Habitat for Humanity. About 70% of subpart 2 facilities have a transition specialist, the roles currently like the roles of the subpart 1 specialist. To assist in the transition of children and youth from local educational agencies (LEAs) to correctional facilities, the MDE requires LEAs to develop an Education Development Plan (EDP) for each student, in consultation with the student, the student's parent/guardian, school district of residence, and a team of professionals with knowledge of the student's educational, behavioral, social/emotional, and health needs to identify appropriate instructional and non-instructional support services. The EDP must include information on the student's current mastery of state academic standards, requirements still needed to graduate from high school, and the services needed to facilitate successful completion including any special education services.

The following is the statewide goal related to transition services (from LEAs to facilities or vice versa):

Goal 1. To improve the transition of children and youth to and from the juvenile justice system to/from locally operated programs in their community.

Objective 1.1: At least 90% of care and education documents will be sent or received within 10 days of a youth change of placement.

Strategy 1.1.1: If requested documents are not received in the specified time, a certified letter will be sent and/or a logged phone call will be made on the 15th day after the initial request.

Strategy 1.1.2: If requested documents are not received by the end of 15 days, a written notice will be sent to the judge and/or parole/probation officer requesting assistance in obtaining the documents.

Objective 1.2: At least 90% of students leaving a Neglected or Delinquent facility will be involved with further education (High school or college or career training (apprenticeship), employed, or the like within 30 business days under the guidance of a community social services agency and the facility transition specialist.

Strategy 1.2.1: The transition team, comprised of stakeholders, will create an Educational Development Plan (EDP) that will include the parents' and student's input

Strategy 1.2.2: The transition team will contact the entities that have been identified in the transition plan and establish a written agreement that defines their role in the treatment of the student

Strategy 1.2.3. The transition team will consult, where appropriate, with other education professionals including special education teachers, and Career and Technical education teachers or administrators to identify effective methods to support the student's transition to further education and/or a career.

Objective 1.3: The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will create or utilize a system for monitoring community involvement of students released from a Neglected or Delinquent facility in yearly increments of 20% of students tracked for 2 years.

Strategy 1.3.1: MDE will use the Unique Identification Code (UIC) to monitor and track students who were or are identified as post release from a delinquent or neglected facility, do not have a diploma or GED to determine post release activities regarding employment, education and community involvement.

Strategy 1.3.2: CEPI will provide data analysis support for relevant stakeholders.

2. <u>Program Objectives and Outcomes</u> (ESEA section 1414(a)(2)(A)): Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program.

Response

Below are the goals, objectives, and strategies for the Part D program for school years (SY) 2017-2022. Goal 1 is listed above while addressing improvement of transitions of children and youth. The Title I, part D State Team will monitor progress, fidelity of implementation and determine technical assistance and supports to local programs for the next SY in an action plan. It is the intent of MDE to expect large facilities of greater than 60 students who have long term residency, of at least 6 months, to engage students in a curriculum that promotes obtaining a regular high school diploma. With smaller facilities, there will be opportunity for students to immerse in blended learning options (seat time and online) to complete coursework leading to a regular high school diploma. <u>Status of Student Assessment</u>: Presently, each neglected or delinquent facility utilizes an assessment, but the tool is different in most of them. Students are usually not present for the time the State MSTEP content assessments are administered, so there is no comparability among facilities. Establishing a common assessment among all facilities can provide access if the assessment is online and students' results can be available to receiving facilities immediately to assist with instructional placement and interventions.

Goal 2: Improve the assessment process and instructional opportunities for all delinquent and neglected students.

Objective 2.1: All students will be tested with a common assessment within the first 5 days of entry (unless results of testing in a previous placement are available within the past 30 days) and will be assessed in 30-day intervals in math and reading to report progress. At least 60% of students will demonstrate progress or improvement when comparing pre- and post-test results.

Strategy 2.1.1: During 2016-17, an assessment team will evaluate 3-4 standard assessment tools and recommend 1-2 of them for appropriate fit to the type of students for which it will be used.

Strategy 2.1.2: The assessment will be distributed to facilities for implementation in School Year 2017-18.

Strategy 2.1.3: Data obtained will be used to complete the CSPR for Title ID, subparts 1 and 2. <u>Current status of Instructional Services for general and Special Education Students</u>: Many facilities have fewer than 20 students at any given time. If the facility maintains a ratio of

10:1 students to teacher, many facilities employ 2 or fewer teachers. To meet the requirements of IDEA, facilities are to provide a spectrum of services based upon the number of special and general education classes the IEP determines, as well as the needs of students who require a teacher consultant. Because these facilities cannot provide up to 4 teachers, services are compromised to the level of what is available. Services are defined by the structure of the facility rather than the needs of the students. Facilities with populations of greater than 20 still struggle finding appropriate special education personnel and general education staff. Many teachers are teaching out of their certification. A systematic delivery of career experiences is done haphazardly or not at all. The transition team is beginning to search resources to provide career exploration or technical experience with classes designed to familiarize students with potential career exposure. There needs to be a consistent presentation of opportunities to all facilities so that students can appreciate the match of interests with career opportunities.

Goal 3: General and Special Education Services and career/technical education will improve.

Objective 3.1: All students will receive services based upon a needs assessment and an IEP if appropriate.

Strategy 3.1.1: Facilities will contract with Special Education teachers from the local LEA or ISD (RESA) for appropriate services based upon the student IEP

Strategy 3.1.2: Facilities with the help of their fiscal agents will develop policies and procedures to guide their education delivery system based upon IDEA or curriculum requirements.

Strategy 3.1.3: Facilities will provide free, appropriate, and rigorous academic services to all students, including special education students, that is delivered by licensed/certified teachers.

Strategy 1.1.4. Facilities will implement or develop a rigorous curriculum aligned with state standards and offer regular high school diplomas to the greatest degree possible.

Objective 3.2: All students will engage in career exploration in their first 60 days of residency.

Strategy 3.2.1 All students will be exposed to career interest/experience with programs such as Career Cruising and Michigan Occupational Information System (MOIS).

Strategy 3.2.2: All students who have completed the occupational survey will be provided hands-on experience after leaving the facility

or engage in training through apprenticeship or community college enrollment.

D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

1. <u>Use of Funds</u> (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(A) and (D)): Describe how the State educational agency will use Title II, Part A funds received under Title II, Part A for State-level activities described in section 2101(c), including how the activities are expected to improve student achievement.

Response

Theory of Action and Guiding Principles for Supporting Michigan's Educator Workforce

Michigan believes that if its system measures and analyzes the factors that improve and impede the delivery of effective instruction and use that information to target evidence-based supports for educators while sending the message, loud and clear, that Michigan values its educators and the vital role they play in maintaining a healthy society, then Michigan will grow and retain the educator workforce that it needs to produce equitable and high outcomes for Michigan's students. Michigan's approach to state level activities funded by Title II, Part A, then, is to focus on high-impact supports for educators to improve instruction and leadership, particularly in districts and other educational settings where there are multiple factors impeding the delivery of effective instruction. Michigan's decision-making regarding state investments is guided by the following set of principles:

- Educators are the most important resource in our education system, with research supporting teachers as the most important, and principals as the second most important, in-school factor in student outcomes.
- The quality of teaching and leadership is a key driver of equitable education outcomes for all of Michigan's students.
- In order to achieve equity, special attention and focus must be provided to supporting the educator workforce in Michigan's lowest-performing schools and Michigan's schools that serve significant populations of high-poverty and high-minority students. Equity in the quality of teaching and leadership, as well as the overall health of Michigan's educator workforce, depends on coordination of policies to attract, prepare, develop, support and retain effective educators.

The MDE has been working over the past 18 months to evaluate its educator workforce priorities with the goal of creating greater coherence and alignment with evidence base and promising practices. Over this time, the MDE has partnered with the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL) at the American Institutes for Research to use GTL's Talent Development Framework for 21st Century Educators to improve both internal and external alignment and make decisions about policy priorities. That work supported the development of the MDE's Top 10 in 10 Plan's educator workforce goals and priorities. The activities and investments described in this section reflect Michigan's established priorities as a result of this work.

Investments Overview Michigan plans to use its Title II, Part A state resources to support work in four areas:

- Cultivating and building strong partnerships between specific districts and educator preparation program providers
- Ensuring that educators have strong, supported transitions from their preparation programs through their early years in the profession
- Providing relevant, evidence-based professional learning and development for career educators
- Developing career pathways to expand the reach of highly effective teaching and leadership while providing opportunities to retain high-performing teachers and leaders in classrooms and buildings.

The MDE will utilize up to 1% of the total Title II, Part A allocation for administration of Title II, Part A grant funds to districts, consistent with ESEA section 2101(c)(2), including technical assistance for recipients and fiscal monitoring

The MDE will utilize 4% of Michigan's Title II, Part A allocation to provide resources for the above-named investment activities for teachers, consistent with ESEA section 2101(c)(4).

The MDE will reserve the additional 3% of the 95% of Michigan's total Title II, Part A allocation committed to subgrants to LEAs to provide resources for the above-named investment activities for principals and other school leaders, consistent with ESEA section 2101(c)(3).

Activities funded with Title II, Part A State Activities grants will be evaluated to ensure effective use of funds and make ongoing determinations about the efficacy of these activities in achieving Michigan's overall educator workforce goals

The Foundation for Support: Strategic District – Educator Preparation Program Partnerships

Michigan's data shows that, while many LEAs in the state experience relative stability in their educator workforce, certain districts – particularly those serving large populations of students of color and students from low-income families – experience significant challenges in recruiting and retaining a stable cadre of teachers and leaders. Additionally, stakeholder feedback received by the MDE both prior to and during the ESSA State Plan development process reflects that LEAs often observe a disconnect between the skills and competencies that a new educator needs upon entering a classroom and the skills and competencies that many novice educators demonstrate when exiting pre-service preparation programs. In response to these factors, Michigan plans to invest resources in facilitating the development of strategic partnerships between specific LEAs and EPPs, especially for the benefit of LEAs identified as Partnership Districts and/or LEAs with low-performing schools as identified by the accountability system. Partner EPPs may be traditional programs within institutions of higher education (IHE), experimental programs within IHEs, or alternate route preparation programs

operated by IHEs or non-affiliated nonprofit organizations, in accordance with Michigan law (MCL 380.1531i).

These partnerships will focus on strategic recruitment of candidates and context-specific clinical and residency-based preparation for both teachers and leaders according to the needs of the partner LEA. The MDE's role will be three-fold:

- Provide seed funding to support the cultivation and evaluation of partnerships between EPPs and high-needs districts as described above, including rigorous program evaluation
- Provide activity-based guidance and technical assistance, based in part on the program evaluation activities of seed funding, to assist additional LEAs and EPPs forge strong partnerships to support the development of a strong local educator workforce
- Evaluate and respond to potential policy barriers

Seed Funding

The MDE will provide seed funding to LEA/EPP Partnerships, prioritized within the group of high-needs districts by districts' identification of educator workforce needs via their comprehensive needs assessment (CNA). This funding may be used by recipients to establish, build, or refine strategic partnerships based on recommended practices for effective partnerships[5], including: aligning needs, vision, and goals; building trust and relationships; sharing data; selecting and training teacher and principal mentors; aligning and improving coursework with district language and needs; and continuously improving programs. Programs established by recipients of seed funding will be independently evaluated to recommend ongoing program improvements and share learning broadly to benefit non-funded partnerships.

Guidance and Technical Assistance

The MDE will work to provide activity-based guidance and technical assistance to support the development of strategic LEA/EPP Partnerships for districts that do not qualify for seed funding but identify aligned workforce priorities via their CNA. Initially, this guidance and technical assistance will take the form of various activities, including guidance documents, webinars, and consulting, based on promising practices. As these promising practices are enriched by the program evaluations of funded partnerships described above, the guidance and technical assistance will become more individualized, and may more intensively involve the developed expertise of both EPP and LEA staff from funded partnerships.

Eliminate Policy Barriers

While it is not possible at this point in time to identify specific policy barriers to the successful implementation of LEA/EPP Partnerships, the MDE is committed, via its Partnership District work, to actively evaluating and addressing issues that may

---

[5] Education First. *Ensuring High Quality Teacher Talent: How Strong, Bold Partnerships between School Districts and Preparation Programs are Transforming the Teacher Pipeline*. (2016). This report may be accessed online at http://education-first.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Ensuring-High-Quality-Teacher-Talent.pdf.

arise throughout the course of implementation of the partnerships. The MDE is willing to provide flexibility when and where it can to ensure that appropriate candidates may enter programs within these partnerships; that the context-specific, clinical, and residency aspects of the programs are prioritized; and that program graduates are ready for success within the partner LEA or other educational provider. Further, the MDE is committed to using the rigorous, independent program evaluations to build evidence to recommend, when and where appropriate, that codified policy barriers be reconsidered.

Starting Strong: Supported Transitions for New Teachers and Leaders
The early years of teaching and leading are critical to both effectiveness and persistence in the educator professions. Ample research demonstrates that the effectiveness of teachers significantly increases over the first one to three years in the profession and that experience continues to correlate with positive outcomes for students and colleagues through a teacher's career[6]. Nationally, on average, 50% of new principals are not retained beyond their third year[7] and over 40% of new teachers depart the profession within the first five years.[8] Michigan has identified supported transitions for teachers and leaders as a priority to both driving the effectiveness of new teachers and leaders and ensuring that new educators experience levels of support to retain them in their professions so that students may benefit from increased access to effective educators via the stability of an effective workforce.

Michigan uses the term "supported transitions" to refer to programs that build upon the pre-service experience and learning of teachers and leaders and continue to provide intensive mentoring, coaching, and access to targeted professional learning through the first one to three years in the classroom or building. Supported transitions include two primary, and sometimes overlapping, programs:

- Residency-based preparation, either via traditional or alternate route preparation programs; and
- Mentoring and induction.

Residency-Based Preparation
The definition of residency-based preparation for both teachers and principals is given in section D.6 below. As funded through the LEA/EPP Partnerships described above in this section, the MDE will use Title II, A state resources to seed-funded partnership programs to identify and train mentor teachers and leaders who work alongside pre-service educators prior to certification and continue to mentor and support the same educators through their early years in the profession. Mentors

---

[6] Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. *Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of the Research* (Palo Alto: Learning Policy Institute, 2016). This report can be found at https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/our-work/publications-resources/%20does-teaching-experience-increase-teacher-effectiveness-review-research.
[7] *CHURN: The High Cost of Principal Turnover.* (School Leaders Network, 2014). This report can be found at http://connectleadsucceed.org/sites/default/files/principal_turnover_cost.pdf.
[8] Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & Stuckey, D. (2014). *Seven trends: the transformation of the teaching force, updated April 2014. CPRE Report (#RR-80)*. (Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania, 2014).

and EPP staff work alongside one another to ensure consistency in the new educators' transitions from pre-service to the profession and mutually benefit from one another in developing mentor and coaching skills and continuously informing the content and delivery of the preparation coursework and experiences. LEA/EPP Partnerships may use seed funding to provide pay incentives to mentors and/or to provide paid full-year residencies to pre-service educators.

Mentoring and Induction

Recognizing that LEA/EPP Partnerships may support only a small proportion of new teachers, especially in the next few years, the MDE will also work to support the establishment and improvement of mentoring and induction programs for all new educators in all LEAs. The MDE will encourage LEAs to utilize LEA Title II, Part A subgrants to support mentoring and induction activities when an LEA's CNA identifies this as a local need to improve effectiveness and retention. The MDE will also work with professional organizations and educator preparation programs to develop activity-based guidance and technical assistance for LEAs in developing and implementing local high-quality mentoring and induction programs.

Maintaining Effectiveness: Professional Learning and Development

The MDE plans to support local LEAs in making decisions about local professional development offerings tied to developmentally appropriate evidence-based practices, the CNA, and local educator evaluation systems. The core of MDE's approach to Title II, Part A-funded professional learning to support state priorities is described in section D.6 below. In addition to the activities described in that section, the MDE will:

- Encourage LEAs to use Title II, Part A subgrants to:
  - Tie professional learning activities to their locally-adopted educator evaluation systems so that teachers and leaders receive individualized professional learning experiences tied to meet needs identified in their evaluations
  - Collaborate with the providers of early childhood education programs that feed into the LEA to provide joint professional learning opportunities that help to align early learning and early elementary learning and create systems of support and collaboration for all educators of children birth – 3rd grade
  - Include paraprofessionals in professional learning activities alongside teachers of record to build the skills of the paraprofessionals and support consistency in general and supplementary services
- Use Title II, Part A funds to develop, or fund development of, professional learning opportunities for principals that focus on:
  - Implementing teacher evaluations with an emphasis on providing high-quality feedback that improves the effectiveness of classroom instruction

o Developing, implementing, and sustaining school-based distributed leadership models as described below

Strengthening the System: Career Pathways and Distributed Leadership

While we know that effective teaching and leadership are the most important in-school factors in improved student outcomes, we cannot incentivize, either intentionally or unintentionally, a hero-culture model that attributes student success to the herculean efforts of individual educators. Teachers and leaders are heroes, certainly, and we need to make sure that they can sustain their heroic contributions to society over the course of a career. Given what is known and referenced above about turnover and retention among teachers and leaders, it is incredibly unwise to attempt to measure and make decisions about the effectiveness of individual educators without attending to the work cultures in which they teach and lead. An individual teacher cannot take it upon him- or herself to develop all the skills needed for success through personal dedication without burning out. An individual principal cannot effectively attend to student culture, instructional leadership, building management, and the inevitability of everyday activities without burning out. Effective instruction and leadership has the best chance of occurring and sustaining itself within a work culture that differentiates roles and responsibilities to ensure that, collaboratively, a school staff can provide students with access to all the benefits of an effective learning environment.

Career pathways for teachers -- including teacher leadership roles, hybrid roles, mentoring, and other opportunities that build on exemplary classroom practice-- can play an important role in establishing a supportive and enduring work environment that cultivates and sustains effective teaching. A survey of research on teacher leadership shows that these roles and opportunities can dramatically improve student outcomes, provide more frequent feedback and supports for new teachers, improve professional learning for all teachers, and improve teacher retention.[9] Michigan's focus on career pathways for principals and other school leaders is more targeted to the identification and development of effective mentor leaders who are both effective leaders in their own right and have the knowledge and ability to effectively support new and struggling colleagues in becoming effective leaders.

These career pathways play an important role in establishing and sustaining distributed leadership models within school buildings. Distributed leadership in this State Plan refers to a model of management within a school wherein the principal shares the traditional set of school leadership tasks with other staff in a manner that is coordinated and led by the principal. There is no singular model of distributed leadership; however, to be effective and sustainable, specific roles for teacher leaders within the model must be tied to specific identified priorities and

---

[9] TeachStrong. *TeachStrong Policy Proposal: Principle 9: Create Career Pathways*. (2016) This report can be found at https://cdn.teachstrong.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/26112426/TeachStrongPrinciple-CareerPathways.pdf.

then the teacher leaders must be afforded the time, support, and resources to make the role effective.[10]

To support the establishment and success of career pathways for teachers and leaders as elements of distributed school leadership models, the MDE will use Title, II, Part A state resources to

- Support teacher leadership networks and models throughout the state (see below);
- Support principal mentor networks and models throughout the state (see below);
- Develop and provide professional learning for school leaders in establishing and sustaining school-based distributed leadership models; and
- Provide activity-based guidance for various models and ancillary supports of teacher leadership and distributed leadership, including staffing models and differentiated compensation strategies.

Teacher Leadership Networks

The MDE plans to select and employ, via a competitive process, teacher(s)-on-loan and/or summer teacher fellows to work closely with MDE staff to develop the goals and priorities of the statewide focus on teacher leadership and career pathways. This work will include:

- Development of a network of teacher leadership organizations throughout the state to support local implementation;
- Development of guidance for LEAs and principals in identifying and cultivating the skills and dispositions of teacher leaders;
- Coordination of teacher leader voices in regional- and state-level policy; and
- Ongoing development and expansion of state-level support for teacher career pathways.

Principal Mentor Networks

The MDE will work closely with Michigan's professional organizations to Develop guidance for LEAs in identifying and cultivating the skills and dispositions of effective principal mentors and Provide professional learning opportunities, including communities of practice, for high-potential principals to become mentors.

---

[10] Leading Educators. Leading from the Front of the Classroom: A Roadmap to Teacher Leadership that Works. (The Aspen Institute: 2014). This report can be found at https://static1.squarespace.com/static/56b547861bbee07c38617729/t/56cf7b6140261d3fa3796842/1456438113595/AES_LE_Leading-From-the-Front_101614.pdf.

2. **Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(E)): If an SEA plans to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), describe how such funds will be used for this purpose.**

Response

As described in section D.1 above, the MDE plans to target the investment of Title II, Part A state funds in Partnership Districts and LEAs with low-performing schools as identified by the accountability system, which historically demonstrate an overlap with schools identified as providing disproportionate access to effective teaching for students of color and students from low-income families. The table below provides a crosswalk between the probable causes of disproportionate access describe in section A.5 above and the use of Title II, Part A funds described in section D.1 above. Additionally, some strategies identified in Michigan's Plan to Ensure Equitable access to Excellent Educators (2015) will be continued and may be supported by Title II, Part A funds. These strategies are also indicated in the table below.

Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences in Rates	Strategies Funded with Title II, Part A Funds
Pre-service preparation of teachers and leaders that leaves new teachers and leaders unprepared for the challenges of classrooms and schools	LEA/EPP Partnerships and supported transitions: see section D.1 above
High turnover and low retention of teachers and leaders	LEA/EPP Partnerships, supported transitions, professional learning, and career pathways: see section D.1 above
Ineffective hiring practices	Targeted supports for human resources processes via Partnership District initiative
Challenging working conditions for teachers and leaders	Supported transitions, professional learning, and career pathways: see section D.1 above
Negative narrative regarding public education and the teacher and leader professions	Continue implementation of the #proudMIeducator campaign using Title II, Part A state activities funds; Phase 2 of the campaign will begin in spring/summer 2017 and extend through the following year and beyond, providing supports to regions within Michigan to personalize the message and cultivate community support; Phase 3 of the campaign will begin in spring/summer 2018 with a target completion date of spring/summer 2019 and the

Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences in Rates	Strategies Funded with Title II, Part A Funds
	establishment of a common, statewide educator recruitment platform. Phase 1 of the campaign, which started in September 2016, focused on the development and dissemination of video, blog, and social media content celebrating the stories of individual educators. This work was completed by a third-party-funded policy fellow (recruited and paid by Leadership for Educational Equity). A small amount of state funds were used on video production costs. It is anticipated that Title II, Part A funding will be used in Phase 2 to support materials and resources to engage business and community organizations in providing supports for educators and in Phase 3 to support the cost of building and maintaining a statewide educator recruitment portal.
Inequity to schools that cultivate an effective environment for teaching	Conduct and roll out additional analyses of indicators of effective teaching environments

3. **System of Certification and Licensing (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(B)): Describe the State's system of certification and licensing of teachers, principals, or other school leaders.**

Response

Michigan law requires a person employed in an elementary or secondary school with instructional responsibilities shall hold a certificate, permit, or occupational authorization valid for the positions to which he/she is assigned. The MDE Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) is responsible for ensuring qualified educators by implementing requirements for their initial preparation and certification, and certificate renewal based on appropriate professional development to enhance instruction and achievement for all students. In 2015-2016, Michigan public schools employed over 111,000 teachers and administrators to provide education services to more than 1.5 million students enrolled in the K-12 public and nonpublic schools in Michigan. The MDE issues and maintains accurate certification on all teachers, administrators, school counselors, and school psychologists.

The MDE currently issues the following types of educator certificates:

- For teachers, Provisional (Standard), Interim Teaching, Professional Education, Advanced Professional Education, Interim Occupational, and Occupational Education certificates;

- For administrators, an Administrator certificate; and

- For other school personnel, a School Counselor license and a School Psychologist certificate.

All educator certificates issued by the MDE requires satisfactory completion of an educator preparation program and passage of a licensure assessment. The MDE reviews, approves and monitors all educator preparation providers and programs both to ensure alignment to State Board of Education standards for educator preparation and to support high-quality outcomes. For teachers, there are currently 32 approved Michigan teacher preparation providers offering traditional, university/college-based preparation programs in 95 discipline areas, as well as five alternate route providers. For administrators, there are currently 22 approved Michigan administrator preparation providers offering traditional, university/college-based preparation programs for certification at the school or central office level, as well as four professional associations offering alternate routes to administrator certification and certificate enhancements in four specialty areas. Finally, there are nine approved Michigan school counselor preparation providers and six approved Michigan school psychologist providers; all are university-based, and no alternate route programs exist for these credentials.

Upon successful completion of an approved teacher preparation program and passage of all appropriate licensure assessments (including an assessment of basic skills in reading, writing and mathematics), teacher candidates may be recommended for an initial Provisional (Standard) teaching certificate, which is valid for six years and may be renewed for additional three-year periods contingent upon completion of professional learning requirements specified in the Teacher Certification Code. Teachers may progress from a Provisional (Standard) teaching certificate to a Professional Education certificate contingent upon completion of professional learning requirements specified in Michigan legislation and the Teacher Certification Code, as well as an accumulation of effective or highly effective educator effectiveness ratings. A Professional Education certificate is valid for five years, and may be renewed for additional five-year periods contingent upon completion of professional learning requirements specified in the Teacher Certification Code. Teachers may also progress to an Advanced Professional Education certificate upon achievement of National Board Teacher Certification or successful completion of an approved teacher leader preparation program. Teachers entering the profession via an alternate route are first recommended for an Interim Teaching certificate, and upon successful completion of the alternate route program and at least three years of successful teaching, may be recommended for an initial Provisional (Standard) teaching certificate. More detailed information on these teacher certification requirements, including Interim Occupational and Occupational Educator certification, may be found in Michigan's [Teacher Certification Code](#).

Upon successful completion of an approved administrator, school counselor or school psychologist preparation program and passage of all appropriate licensure assessments, candidates may be recommended for an initial Administrator certificate, School Counselor license, or School Psychologist certificate. Each of these credentials is valid for five years, and may be renewed for additional five year periods contingent upon completion of professional learning requirements specified in the administrative rules governing each respective credential. Further details on requirements for these certificates may be found in Michigan's [Administrator Certification Code](#), Administrative Rules for [Certification and Licensure of School Counselors](#) and for the [School Psychologist Certificate](#).

The MDE monitors educator placements in K-12 public schools to ensure that schools are staffed with individuals possessing the appropriate credentials for the positions in which they are placed. State Aid penalties are issued to school districts found to be placing educators in positions for which they do not hold appropriate credentials.

4. **Improving Skills of Educators (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(J)): Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in order to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly children with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels, and provide instruction based on the needs of such students.**

Response

Overview
Consistent with Michigan's theory of action and overall approach to supporting excellent educators, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will utilize Title II, Part A State Activities funds (section 2101(c)(4)) to support professional growth and development for teachers and Title II, Part A State-Level principal and school leader reserved funds (2101(c)(3)) to support professional growth and development for principals and school leaders. The MDE does not plan to use the funds to develop isolated programs of induction and mentoring, professional learning, and compensation and advancement for educators; rather the funds will support these activities via the overall approach described in section D.1 above.

Induction and Mentoring
Induction and mentoring is one element of Michigan's focus on supported transitions for teachers and leaders, described in greater detail in section D.1 above. A large investment will be made to develop and implement context-specific clinical and residency-based preparation programs. These programs will serve only a fraction of the new teachers and leaders entering the workforce, however, and therefore a smaller investment of state activities funds will be made to support the development and implementation of local district induction programs for new teachers and leaders who are not supported via residency programs. This investment will focus on the development of activity-based guidance for districts

that addresses the quality standards for induction and mentoring programs and evidence-based models of implementing induction and mentoring programs. To acknowledge and be clear regarding the discrepancy in size of state investment and potential number of new educators served, the larger investment will be made to serve fewer new educators because of the potential for context-based clinical and residency-based to close equity gaps and provide high-impact models for replication; the smaller investment will be made to serve more new educators because the planned supports are more cost-effective and appropriate for the many districts who experience far lower rates of educator attrition.

This guidance will be supplemented and enriched by strategic partnerships formed between districts and EPPs, through which EPPs may play a key role in providing induction and mentoring support to new educators – particularly to those educators who may have completed their pre-service training with the partner EPP. Depending on the scope of the partnership, the EPPs may also play a key role in training mentor teachers in districts or other educational settings to provide high-quality ongoing induction and mentoring support. The district may also identify, develop, and support its own mentor teachers as part of a commitment to developing robust career pathways and opportunities for teachers. Both district-EPP partnerships and career pathways for teachers are discussed in greater detail in section D.1 above.

Professional Learning
Michigan's approach to developing a statewide professional learning system is still under development. The Michigan State Board of Education adopted the Learning Forward Policy and Standards for Professional Learning in 2011, and the MDE has since worked to support districts in developing and implementing programs of professional learning that meet these evidence-based standards. With the adoption of the Top 10 in 10 Goals in 2016, the MDE has also signaled a commitment to developing high-quality professional learning for educators that meets evidence-based standards to support the implementation of various priority initiatives. This approach to professional learning also supports the development of a coordinated birth-age 8 aligned professional development system that ensures that educators have the skills and knowledge to support young children's learning.

For each of the initiatives identified, the MDE will collaborate with various partners, including Intermediate School Districts (ISD), professional organizations, and instructional designers, to develop professional learning modules that are available to all early childhood and school educators on-demand. These modules will address the professional learning appropriate to the educator's role in the initiative and may be available free of charge or fee-based, depending on the availability of funds to support the initiative.

The MDE has begun several initiatives over the last 18 months to support the specific learning needs of students, including students with disabilities, English learners, struggling readers, and students who are gifted and talented. These

initiatives will continue implementation and refinement concurrent with the implementation of Michigan's ESSA State Plan. Each initiative includes efforts to improve the skills of teachers, principals, and other school leaders in identifying specific learning needs and delivering effective instruction based on those needs. The following three initiatives provide a sample of the targeted professional learning supports that are in place to ensure educators have the skills necessary to implement the initiatives with fidelity. (Note: These are provided only as examples and do not outline all future professional learning efforts.)

- ***Michigan's Statewide Focus on Early Literacy***
  Michigan's Governor, Legislature, and Department of Education have all prioritized a need to ensure that all students are proficient in reading by the completion of 3rd grade. In addition to identifying this goal in statewide plans, legislators have recently passed a student retention bill that connects high stakes consequences to this outcome for learners, educators, and schools. In order to support effective implementation of the effort, the MDE and statewide partners have developed professional learning tools and supports around the use of screening and diagnostic tools to drive individual student programming, establish appropriate practices for learners with identified challenges for reading, and school learning support processes to support high quality instruction around core competencies and skills in English Language Arts (ELA) and reading. The state has also developed a literacy coach network to support a unifying and comprehensive learning focus for classroom educators. These literacy coaches are supporting professional learning in districts utilizing a set of online learning modules for educators focusing on these skills.

- ***Multi-Tiered Systems of Support***
  The MDE recently identified a need to move toward a unified set of components of multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) throughout schools across the state. The effort is using a transformation zone approach from implementation science to develop state, regional, and local implementation teams that are being used to design and develop a systemic infrastructure. Through the use of a Transformation Zone, changes will be initiated in three ISDs with several districts and schools, errors will be detected and corrected rapidly, barriers will be identified and eliminated, and implementation supports will be established in districts and schools. The Transformation Zone provides the opportunity to develop capacity and understand the implementation infrastructure needed to support the selection, professional learning, coaching, and fidelity assessment of educators using MTSS as well as refine the components of MTSS. We need to understand what is required to support and sustain change over time to guide successive cohorts of educators in implementing the core components of MTSS.

- ***Blueprint for Turnaround***
  The Blueprint for Turnaround is a system development effort focusing of district level support of low-performing schools and schools with significant achievement gaps. The effort relies on a cohort and network-based model of professional learning, largely for district and building leadership in the districts adopting the model. The professional learning involves l role-specific and stage-specific professional learning, as cohort groups and individualized for the district context, to district executive leadership to establish self-regulating systems focusing on implementing newly developed instructional practices, system processes, and curricula in schools. Instructional teams utilize frameworks to identify learning needs for students at each grade level based upon a common set of learning activities and assessments designed by the instructional leaders in the school and district. Reflection on instruction and analysis of student learning artifacts are used to drive professional learning communities, and these then feed outcomes to the leadership, who in turn design the next professional learning focus for these communities. The process uses educator development of instructional routines and short-term outcomes to inform and drive the process repeatedly, all while building the systems and protocols for implementation in a 2-3 year time span.

The MDE is interested in exploring the establishment and use of micro-credentials for teachers and leaders to personalize the professional learning of educators based on their interests, career aspirations, and educator evaluations. While a practice with some promising outcomes but many questions yet to be answered, micro-credentialing could provide early childhood and school educators with focused and intensive professional learning opportunities in specific content, pedagogy, and/or leadership skills. This process could potentially provide the opportunity for educators to add micro-credentials to professional certificates after meeting certain benchmarks as an indication of the mastery of that professional skill or content knowledge.

Compensation and Advancement
The MDE will make an important investment of Title II, Part A State Funds in the cultivation of career pathways for teachers, both within local districts and statewide, as described in more detail in section D.1 above. One facet of that work will be the development of activity-based guidance to support the development and implementation of systems of differential pay within districts based on teacher roles and duties. Michigan does not maintain or enact a statewide salary schedule; thus this guidance will serve to assist districts in making decisions about local systems of performance management and pay. The MDE will also encourage LEAs to utilize blended/braided state and federal resources (e.g., Child Care Development Fund, ESSA Title II, state funding) to achieve greater pay equity for a

more stable and tenured workforce across early childhood and early elementary grades.

Summary

Michigan intends to utilize Title II, Part A State Activities funds (section 2101(c)(4)) to support professional growth and development for teachers and Title II, Part A State-Level principal and school leader reserved funds (2101(c)(3)) to support professional growth and development for principals and school leaders. Funded activities that will complement activities described in other parts of section 5 of this State Plan include

1. Activity-based guidance for the development of local induction and mentoring programs;

2. On-demand professional learning modules to support implementation of identified state priorities;

3. The exploration of the use of micro-credentials for teachers and leaders; and

4. Activity-based guidance to support the development of local systems of differential pay based on teacher leader roles and responsibilities.

5. **Data and Consultation (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(K)): Describe how the State will use data and ongoing consultation as described in ESEA section 2101(d)(3) to continually update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A.**

Response

State Activities

As described throughout sections D.1, D.2, and D.4 above, the MDE will design and implement program evaluations for all major activities funded under Title II, Part A. The timeline below demonstrates how this ongoing program evaluation will be integrated into overall implementation and shape ongoing programming.

2017-2018

*LEA/EPP Partnerships
- Develop goals, criteria, and requirements for LEA/EPP seed funding Supported Transitions
- Develop and publish guidance for LEAs on local induction and mentoring programming

*Professional Learning
- Develop and publish guidance for LEAs on local use of Title II, Part A funds for professional learning
- Develop and publish guidance for LEAs on coordinated professional learning opportunities for early childhood programs staff and LEA early elementary staff

- Develop and publish guidance for LEAs on integrated professional learning for paraprofessionals
- Determine form and manner for pilot investment in micro-credentialing

*Career Pathways
- Begin MDE Teacher-Leader-on-Loan/Teacher Leader Fellows Program
- Identify partner professional organizations to lead Principal Mentor Network

2018-2019

*LEA/EPP Partnerships
- Identify initial funded LEA/EPP Partnerships
- Begin program evaluation of funded Partnerships

*Supported Transitions
- Work with funded LEA/EPP Partnerships to build residency and mentorship models
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on local induction and mentoring programs

*Professional Learning
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on coordinated professional learning opportunities for early childhood programs staff and LEA early elementary staff
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on integrated professional learning for paraprofessionals
- Implement pilot investment in micro-credentialing with rigorous program evaluation

*Career Pathways
- Develop guidance for LEAs on developing and implementing school-based distributed leadership models
- Develop pilot funding program for implementation of local distributed leadership models, including differentiated compensation for teacher leadership roles

2019-2020

*LEA/EPP Partnerships
- Continue funding and program evaluation of initial LEA/EPP Partnerships
- Report on early learning from program evaluation activities

*Supported Transitions
- Continue to refine residency and mentorship models
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on local induction and mentoring programs

*Professional Learning\
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on coordinated professional learning opportunities for early childhood programs staff and LEA early elementary staff

- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on integrated professional learning for paraprofessionals
- Continue implementation of pilot investment in micro-credentialing with rigorous program evaluation and report on early learning

*Career Pathways
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs in developing and implementing school-based distributed leadership models
- Identify initial awards for local school-based distributed leadership model pilots
- Begin program evaluation for local school-based distributed leadership model pilots

2020-2021

***LEA/EPP Partnerships**
- Continue funding and program evaluation of initial LEA/EPP Partnerships
- Final report from program evaluation activities
- Use program evaluation to modify and improve second round of program funding to support LEA/EPP Partnerships

*Supported Transitions
- Continue to refine residency and mentorship models
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on local induction and mentoring programs

*Professional Learning
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on coordinated professional learning opportunities for early childhood programs staff and LEA early elementary staff
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on integrated professional learning for paraprofessionals
- Continue implementation of pilot investment in micro-credentialing and finalize program evaluation to determine continued investments/policy direction regarding micro-credentialing

*Career Pathways
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs in developing and implementing school-based distributed leadership models
- Identify initial awards for local school-based distributed leadership model pilots
- Begin program evaluation for local school-based distributed leadership model pilots

2021-2022

***LEA/EPP Partnerships**
- Identify second round of funded LEA/EPP Partnerships
- Begin second round program evaluation of funded Partnerships

*Supported Transitions
- Continue to refine residency and mentorship models

- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on local induction and mentoring programs

*Professional Learning
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on coordinated professional learning opportunities for early childhood programs staff and LEA early elementary staff
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs on integrated professional learning for paraprofessionals

*Career Pathways
- Support activity-based guidance for LEAs in developing and implementing school-based distributed leadership models
- Continue funding for local school-based distributed leadership model pilots
- Continue program evaluation for local school-based distributed leadership model pilots

Subgrants to LEAs

The data collected from the comprehensive needs assessment, as well as ongoing information from the accountability system, will allow the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) to work with each LEA to ensure that they are getting results as indicated in their improvement plans. MDE's monitoring will include the monitoring of the intended outcomes described in the improvement plans. It is anticipated that improvement plan outcomes for Title II, Part A will focus on the recruitment, retention, and development of educators in order to improve the LEA's overall workforce. MDE will use the most recent data collections for this monitoring. The state will annually review its data collection to make improvements in the implementation of the consolidated state plan.

As we review improvement plans and their impact, we will be assisting LEAs to conduct a higher quality needs assessment, strengthen their plans and their implementation. The measures we have included in our accountability system and on our transparency dashboard, as well as the additional data provided as described in section D.2 above, will help the MDE to monitor implementation of the SEA plan overall. As districts submit their plans on a three or five year cycle, we will engage with them in technical assistance, data monitoring, and program evaluation, focusing more effort on the plan implementation and less on the plan itself. This will allow a district to course correct without losing ground. We plan to integrate a focus on process data, and implementation data, so that districts can engage in the gather, study, plan, do cycle more frequently. Stakeholder input, process and outcome data are critical to the continuous improvement process. The SEA will monitor statewide outcomes and fidelity of implementation of the state plan annually. This annual review will be informed by stakeholders, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders, parents, community partners, organizations

representing the aforementioned groups, and other organizations or partners with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purpose of Title II. The annual review will result in adjustments to the state consolidated plan implementation to ensure progress towards achieving program outcomes.

6. **Teacher Preparation (ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(M)): Describe the actions the State may take to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders based on the needs of the State, as identified by the SEA.**

Response

Overview

Consistent with Michigan's theory of action and overall approach to supporting excellent educators, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will utilize Title II, Part A State Activities funds (section 2101(c)(4)) to support the co-construction and implementation of context-specific residency-based preparation programs for teachers and Title II, Part A State-Level principal and school leader reserved funds (2101(c)(3)) to support the co-construction and implementation of context-specific residency-based preparation programs for principals. These funds will be spent in the context of district partnerships to provide residencies, not directed toward educator preparation institutions to spend on their programs generally.

While the MDE continues to work with all of Michigan's educator preparation program providers in the transition from National Council for Accreditation of Teachers of Education (NCATE) and Teachers of Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) accreditation processes to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) accreditation standards and process to ensure more rigorous, research-based, and relevant preparation for all teachers and leaders, the Title II, Part A-funded work described in this section will focus narrowly on providing support for establishing and improving educator pipelines for Michigan's Partnership Districts and districts with low-performing schools as identified by the State accountability system.

This work will be further prioritized among these districts based on an analysis of each district's educator workforce needs via the comprehensive needs assessment (CNA). Partnership Districts and districts with low-performing schools as identified by the State accountability system that demonstrate high rates of teacher and/or leader vacancies; hard-to-staff grade levels, content areas, and/or educational settings; and high teacher and/or leader turnover will be the sites for MDE-facilitated collaboration with teacher preparation and administrator preparation program providers to co-construct context-specific preparation programs that prepare educators in clinical settings and culminate in a residency. The roles and functions of district/preparation provider partnerships are further described in section D.1 above.

Context-Specific Preparation

Michigan's educator preparation providers (EPP) have worked hard to continuously improve the content, rigor, and methods of their programs. While maintaining a favorable national reputation for producing high-quality educators, Michigan's EPPs are not immune to frequent feedback from some of Michigan's own school districts that their graduates are not ready for the realities of the classrooms, schools, and other educational settings they enter as new teachers and leaders[11], especially when those classrooms and schools serve large populations of students of color and students from low-income families. Veteran teachers and school and district leaders raised this issue many times throughout the development of this Consolidated State Plan, through action teams, stakeholder feedback groups, surveys, and forums.

Michigan posits that this lack of readiness occurs because educator preparation programs focus mainly on universal preparation, seeking to ready candidates for work in both all districts and no district in particular. In doing so, candidates face extremely steep learning curves in developing the ability to adapt their content and pedagogy to contexts and settings for which they were not rigorously prepared. Context-specific education, then, refers to preparation programs that "work diligently to help prospective teachers (and leaders) tailor instructional curricula and practices to the specific experiences and interests of the students in that context." This "encompasses the racial, economic, and cultural particularities," "localized knowledge about routines, procedures, and curriculum," and "the larger federal and state policy context" in which the district or geographic region for which the candidates are being prepared operate.[12]

Foundational to the co-construction of effective context-specific preparation is a strong and strategic partnership between the EPP and the district, described in greater detail in section D.1 above. This partnership ensures that EPP program staff and instructors are well-informed about, or even embedded in, the district and gives the district the ability to co-create and shape the content and delivery of the preparation program. This co-creation is especially important in shaping preparation for educators based on the specific learning needs of the students in the district, including targeted preparation to meet the needs of significant populations of students with disabilities and English learners. Michigan's data on the provision of an equitable educator workforce, presented in section A.5 above, demonstrates that students of color and students from low-income families are disproportionately served by inexperienced teachers, suggesting that schools serving these students experience higher rates of turnover, continuously replacing departing teachers with new, inexperienced teachers, who then also leave.

---

[11] http://statenews.com/article/2017/01/teacher-shortage-in-us

[12] Hammerness, K. & Matsko, K. *Unpacking the "Urban" in Urban Teacher Education: Making a Case for Context-Specific Preparation*. (Journal of Teacher Education, November 2013).

Emerging evidence suggests that context-specific preparation results in higher retention rates for teachers.[13] Thus, the investment of Title II, Part A funds in context-specific preparation seeks to better prepare educators for the classrooms, schools, and other educational settings they enter; improve educator retention rates; and close gaps in equitable access. Funded programs, however, must also deliver context-specific preparation in programs that include intensive clinical experiences and an extended residency.

Clinical and Residency-Based Preparation

A growing body of research correlates both clinical preparation and residencies with future educator effectiveness and retention.[14] "Clinical preparation" is used throughout this State Plan to mean educator preparation coursework delivered within a school to provide pre-service educators the opportunity to observe, analyze, and practice content and pedagogy with students and alongside master teachers.

"Residency" is used throughout this State Plan to mean a program for pre-service teachers that "for at least one academic year, provide(s) prospective teachers:

   a)   significant teaching experience working alongside an effective teacher of record; and

   b)   concurrent instruction by LEA personnel or faculty of the teacher preparation program in the content area in which the teachers will become certified or licensed.

   c)   effective teaching skills as demonstrated through completion of the residency program or other indicator as determined by the State."[15]

A program for pre-service school leaders that "for at least one academic year, provide(s) prospective principals or other school leaders:

   a)   sustained and rigorous clinical learning in an authentic school or educational setting;

   b)   evidence-based coursework, to the extent the State determines in consultation with LEAs that evidence is reasonably available;

   c)   ongoing support from an effective mentor principal or school leader;

   d)   substantial leadership responsibilities; and

   e)   an opportunity to practice and be evaluated in a school setting."[16]

---

[13] Freedman and Appleman (2009); Quart et al. (2004 & 2008); Tamir (2009 & 2013)

[14] The Sustainable Funding Project. *For the Public Good: Quality Preparation for Every Teacher.* (New York, NY: Bank Street College of Education, June 2016).

[15] US Department of Education*. Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title II, Part A: Building Systems of Support for Excellent Teaching and Leading*. (Washington, DC, 2016).

[16] Ibid.

The partnership between the EPP and the district, noted above, provides the context-specific setting and location for the clinical experiences and residencies. Mentor teachers and school leaders are selected from the district using rigorous selection criteria, described in greater detail in section D.1 above, and collaborate with EPP staff through the duration of a candidate's preparation.

Supported Transition

The programs described above will be expected to include an extended period of mentoring and support for new teachers and leaders as they complete preparation programs and transition into full-time roles as fully certified and endorsed teachers of record, principals, and other school leaders. The supported transition period of the context-specific clinical and residency-based preparation programs will be similar to traditional induction and mentoring programs in providing opportunities for observation and feedback, coaching, co-teaching, and other mentoring. The added benefit will be that these opportunities will continue to be provided within the same district and by the same EPP and district staff who supported the educators during their pre-service training, making the transition an extension of the educators' training rather than a new program in a new place.

Benefits for All Districts and Educator Preparation Providers

This investment in educator preparation program strategies is purposely narrow, focusing State Activities resources where they are needed most to close equity gaps. This work will, however, produce potential benefits for all Michigan schools, districts, and other educational settings. As these programs are co-constructed, implemented, and evaluated, the MDE will develop activity-based guidance in the form of presentations, toolkits, and workshops that share lessons learned and promising practices for districts and EPPs that want to invest resources in establishing context-specific clinical and residency-based educator preparation programs. This guidance may be developed and supported in collaboration with partner organizations, including intermediate school districts, professional organizations, and organizations representing institutions of higher education and educator preparation programs.

Summary

Michigan intends to utilize Title II, Part A State Activity funds and Title II, Part A State-Level principal and school leader reserved funds to support the development and implementation of context-specific clinical and residency-based teacher and school leader preparation programs. These programs:

- Are co-constructed by districts and EPPs;

- May be traditional or alternate route programs;

- Are responsive to the specific needs of the district, ensuring that candidates are prepared to meet the needs of the specific population of students in the specific community in which the district is situated;

- Help to build the capacity of experienced and mentor educators to independently sustain supports for pre-service and novice teachers and leaders;

- Will be prioritized and funded for Partnership Districts and districts with low-performing schools as identified by the accountability system that identify educator pipeline and preparation needs as part of their CNA;

- Will be independently evaluated for effectiveness and ongoing program improvement; and

- Will produce resources that can be used by all Michigan districts to establish similar programs in partnership with EPPs.

E. Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

1. **Entrance and Exit Procedures (ESEA section 3113(b)(2)): Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.**

Response

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) established a common and standardized Entrance and Exit Protocol (EEP) in 2011/12 in consultation and partnership with the EL/Title III Advisory Committee who represents members of local educational agencies, schools, parents and institutions of higher education across the state. The EEP constitutes the official MDE standardized road map for identifying, placing and exiting English learners from the local Language Assistance program and Title III supplemental Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP). The MDE conducted systematic training on the EEP to all local educational agencies and monitors fidelity of its implementation since three Monitoring Indicators pertain to the EEP. EL Identification Process: In 1975, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) created a sample Home Language survey (HLS) that was approved by the Board of Education and adheres to the three HLS questions that have been approved by the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) in their compliance work under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974. The MDE expects all LEAs and Schools to ask these questions, and screen the students whose parent/guardian responded to one or more of these questions with a language other than English. The Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) administer their HLS for all newly enrolled students for the purpose of identifying students of non-English background. The WIDA Screener, a valid and reliable ELP assessment, is administered, within 30 days of student's enrollment, to those students that identify a language other than English in the HLS. Parents are notified of results and description of EL services in a language they understand, and if a written translation is not provided, an oral interpretation is made available whenever needed. Parents have an opportunity to opt out of the EL program or particular EL services in the program but students continue to take the annual ELP assessment until they demonstrate proficiency and meet the state exit criteria. Placement tests require that those administering and scoring them receive training. SEA and LEA guidelines describe who will administer and score assessments, and the required training to ensure valid and reliable results. Michigan's entrance and exit criteria published in the MDE common Entrance and Exit Protocol (EEP) document are as follows: Criteria for entrance: Since WIDA has a Screener with limited ability to detect English proficiency on all domains for grades PreK-2, the

MDE requires administering the WIDA Screener along with a state-approved literacy assessment to determine eligibility for entrance and exit from the EL program. The following are the specific entrance and exit criteria by grade span. Preschool: LEAs must follow developmentally, linguistically and culturally appropriate screening procedures to identify English Learners in preschool. Currently, and since WIDA Consortium does not have an appropriate Screener for four-year-olds, the HLS guides the decision making toward eligibility of preschoolers for English language assistance program and supplemental Title III language instruction educational program services. Kindergarten & First Grade (Before December 1): Kindergartners score below Exceptional (29 raw score) on the WIDA Screener in Listening and Speaking. The first graders score below Exceptional (29) on the WIDA Screener in Listening and Speaking or below 13 in Reading or below 15 in Writing as well as below grade level on state approved literacy assessment. Kindergarten- Second Grade (After December 1) Kindergartners score below Exceptional (29 raw score) or below 13 in Reading or below 15 in Writing as well as below grade level on state approved literacy assessment. First / second graders score below 5.0 on one or more domains (listening, speaking, reading, or writing). Additionally, K-2 graders score below grade level on state-approved local literacy assessment. Third- Twelfth Grade: Students score below 5.0 on one or more domains (listening, speaking, reading and writing) or if they are below grade level in reading or writing. The school administers one of the state-approved literacy assessments to determine if the student is at grade level in reading. Criteria for Exit- Grades K-12: Students must receive a composite score of 5.0 or higher on the annual WIDA: ACCESS for ELLs, and minimum scores of 4.5 in all four domains and demonstrate grade level proficiency in literacy. The current WIDA Alternate ACCESS assessment used in MI does not have the necessary accommodations that would enable students with severe cognitive, hearing or visual impairments to fully participate in the state ELP assessment and demonstrate valid measures on their progress toward English proficiency in all domains. The WIDA Consortium has not yet resolved this dilemma. The MDE has convened a representative group of its Title III Advisory committee to recommend common entrance/ exit procedures and assessments that are valid and reliable for these students.

2. **SEA Support for English Learner Progress** (ESEA section 3113(b)(6)): Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:

      i. The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State's English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and

      ii. The challenging State academic standards.

Response

Section 1 lists long-term goals for all student subgroups that coincide with Michigan's Top 10 in 10 timeline. MDE will convey the following expectations to local programs to ensure ELs meet the proposed long-term goals and make interim progress:

1. Continue to enroll EL preschoolers in Title III programs to ensure providing English language development and literacy supports in the early years.

2. Deliver research-based instructional practices to ELs that develop their academic language and literacy skills while infusing language and content objectives in lesson preparation and delivery. Details regarding professional learning opportunities are in the next section.

3. Implement evidence-based professional development plan focused on second language development and bilingual instruction to support classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators and other personnel to build their capacity and skill set.

4. Support coaching and mentoring as recommended by Knight and Marzano to ensure sustained, ongoing, and job-embedded professional learning for teachers of ELs statewide.

5. Address the needs of long terms ELs by utilizing the seven basic principles and eight program components delineated by Laurie Olson titled "Meeting the unique needs of long term English learners" published by the National Education Association in 2014.

6. Support newly arrived adolescent ELs by providing flexible course scheduling, teachers skilled and regularly trained in: EL and immigrant-related supports, basic adolescent literacy interventions coupled with language and other interventions, content instruction designed to fill gaps in academic learning, extended learning opportunities and credit accrual/recovery options.

7. Ensure all LEAs provide ELs access to Title I and other state /federal supplemental funds and services including literacy instruction, extended-learning time during the school year and summer, coordination of parent engagement plans, outreach and family literacy activities, connection with

family and social services, and provide supports to help students transition to college, careers, and practical life after high school.

8. Provide effective outreach to parents, families and the community of ELs through a needs assessment and active engagement of stakeholders in the planning, implementation and evaluation of proposed activities, supports and wrap-around services.

9. Support ELs with disabilities by following the Guidance issued by MDE and the training taking place in this area of need across the state.

10. Engage in continuous improvement, program monitoring and evaluation to ensure program activities are adjusted based on interim assessment results to meet the needs of students, families and staff.

3. **Monitoring and Technical Assistance (ESEA section 3113(b)(8)): Describe:**

    i.   How the SEA will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English proficiency; and

    ii.   The steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as providing technical assistance and modifying such strategies.

Response

Monitoring the Title III programs, LEAs and consortia of LEAs follows the same process applied when monitoring other federal funds (see 2.2B). The MDE will continue to monitor LEAs using current Title III Monitoring Indicators document that incorporates 50 best practices clustered into seven areas: Administrative responsibilities, Student identification, placement and exit, Teacher qualifications and professional development, Parent and community engagement, Instructional programs and assessment, Teacher qualifications and professional development, Program evaluation and continuous improvement. MDE uses risk-based identification of LEAs in need of monitoring to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements. The MDE's Title III team will review findings from onsite reviews to guide the planning of responsive technical assistance plans. MDE will also review the biennial Title III program evaluations and most current assessment data for each LEA (both English language proficiency and academic content area) to determine if they have met their interim proficiency objectives and provide differentiated technical assistance to address areas of need. LEAs that fail to meet their annual/interim objectives for two years or more, will be required to submit an improvement plan guided by language proficiency results and other academic achievement data. It is anticipated that some improvement plan outcomes will be stated as state assessment targets, some as district assessment targets (using local assessments), some as systems improvement targets (EL leadership and other personnel). LEAs will be required to disaggregate their EL

language proficiency assessment results by students with disabilities, long-term ELs or those with gaps in their education, and those who are recently arrived to ensure such students receive the necessary and immediate instructional supports and wrap around services. MDE will support LEAs as they monitor performance of former English-learners for four years to determine whether they are performing academically on par with their never-EL peers or whether gaps in achievement remain. Technical assistance includes assisting LEAs in writing quality local Title III plans that consider ELs' academic, social/emotional and health needs and determine how to utilize financial resources such as Title I, Part A, Title III, state and local funds to support ELs and recently arrived students. The MDE Title III Evaluation Tool will continue to be used to support fidelity of implementation of the local plans. Annual review of results and plan activities will be analyzed regarding staffing, programming, facilities, and other pertinent areas to ensure that any academic gains are maintained and adjustments in the local plans are made. Discussions and trainings on the allowable and most effective use of local and Title III funds will be provided with emphasis on strategies and examples of better coordination of all local, state and federal programs toward supporting ELs and newly arrived students. In partnership with Title III directors at the Intermediate School Districts (ISD) the MDE Title III Team will provide professional development and training opportunities for LEAs and school personnel (by region) on common procedures for identification/exit of ELs, robust services, training the trainer on evidence-based instructional approaches to serving ELs in early childhood and K-12 grades. The professional development topics MDE will provide include teaching academic language using SIOP, language and literacy strategies, standard-based writing strategies, formative language assessment and instructional unit planning. Regional trainings through webinars will be held annually to LEAs and consortia focused on specific technical assistance topics based on identified needs in each region, thus clustering the LEAs by 'low or high incidence' or by need. The ISD EL Consortia leads and the State Title III Team will plan and deliver these meetings and training sessions including the annual two-day directors' meeting and workshops provided annually each September as part of the Special Populations Conference. The MDE Title III Program website will be continually updated with information and resources for LEAs and school staff, ISD/Consortia coordinators and parents.   In order to be effective in terms of cost and impact, the MDE Title III Team has tapped into local staff from higher performing programs to help lower performing program peers. Local program staff has been receptive to this peer approach, which includes: Organizing professional development training based on the most common needs in low-performing programs, using program staff that has resolved similar challenges. Tap high-performing program teams to provide individual technical assistance to low-performing program teams with additional support from the MDE. In the same manner, empower Title III Consortia Leaders to support their members. Ask local programs to share their success stories about how they have shown either continuous or marked improvement, challenges they faced and overcame, and tips for other programs at the annual Special Populations statewide

conference. Local programs leadership is interested in and open to ideas from their colleagues at the local level. Using the desk/onsite monitoring report as a starting place, peer groups can help a program develop an appropriate improvement plan. For example, the MDE Title III Team may use a follow up day to the onsite review/monitoring visit for peer discussions. State staff finds out in advance which topics the program wants to target and invites peers doing well in those areas to participate and share practical ideas and practices. Peer approaches have the added benefit of rewarding high-performing programs with recognition while also providing direct assistance to low-performing programs. LEAs where strategies are not effective will receive targeted support and are required to adjust their strategies, curriculum, and intensity of supports to ELs based on deep data-dive. More intensive consequences may require long term professional development plan for program leadership and personnel.

F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

1. Use of Funds (ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A)): Describe how the SEA will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level activities.

Response

The Michigan Department of Education will distribute the State level set aside funds equally among the three offices that will support the work; Office of P-20 Data and Information Management, Office of Safe and Supportive Schools and Office of Education Improvement and Innovation. These funds will support staff with expertise in each of the three areas of Title IV, 1) Well Rounded Educational Opportunities, 2) Safe and Healthy Students, and 3) Effective Use of (Instructional) Technology.

The offices will collaborate to provide LEAs a combination of presentations and technical support around individual district Title IV plans. The presentations will provide the broad overview of how to utilize and maximize Title IV dollars using evidence based strategies to accelerate achievement and assist the districts in developing a clear plan, based on a comprehensive needs assessment that will focus on improving instructional technology, creating a safe and healthy educational environments and instructional strategies that focus on the well-rounded curricula.

Technical Assistance and Training will be provided for MDE staff and eligible LEA staff that will implement Title IV programs. This training will address the identification and implementation of identified evidence based initiatives tailored to the unique needs of individual fund recipients.

Additional collaboration will occur and be coordinated with the Office of Field Service consultants and managers that review and approve applications for the Title IV fund recipients. The consultants will review the application for selection, appropriateness, coordination and allowability of activities. The consultant will work closely with technical experts in each of the three offices and recommend additional technical support from those offices to meet the needs of LEAs.

As Michigan begins implementing the strategies to become a Top 10 state over the next 10 years, the ESSA will allow districts to focus on education that is targeted on development and delivery of well-rounded education programs and instruction for all students that is learner centered with a focus on deeper learning and STEM/STEAM. The MDE is supportive of the increased flexibility that the districts will have through the consolidation of previous programs into the Title IV single block grant. The grant will provide increased access for students to instruction and supports that interest them and are centered on their needs. Michigan currently has in place the Michigan Merit Curriculum, which requires all students to take coursework in mathematics, English/language arts, science, social studies, foreign language, and fine arts. Michigan also has rigorous career and college ready standards in mathematics, ELA, and science, and are updating our social studies

standards. These govern the learning expectations for all students K-12. Michigan also has early childhood learning standards which are aligned to the K-12 standards. Additionally, the academic component of the "whole child" comprehensive needs assessment will push districts to evaluate to what extent they are making these opportunities available for all students, and will provide the MDE with the opportunity to engage in technical assistance, as well as monitor these areas.

The expansion of allowable uses in the Title IV block grant along with current Michigan educational components will enable districts to focus funds on appropriate programs to enhance and increase instruction for well-rounded education for all students, provide for instruction that promotes the health of students and safe learning environments and effective use of technology. The MDE organized a cross section of units that could enhance and provide guidance on allowable Title IV activities to meet the desired outcomes described in ESSA legislation. The team created a guidance document for district and state consultants to determine the appropriate use of funds. With approximately 900 traditional and charter districts that have a wide range of needs, the schools will complete the revamped, streamlined and integrated comprehensive needs assessment. These individual school CNAs will roll up into the district determination of how to adequately distribute and target where to allocate the Title IV funds. For example, districts may choose to subsidize testing, improve technology infrastructure, hire an additional counselor, or teaching staff that focus on instruction in the arts, literacy, media, health and/or physical education or implement a district wide behavior plan.

This approach will eliminate the one size fits all that many districts implemented in the past. The flexibility to transfer the funds into other Title programs will provide a structure in which the most at risk or needy population in a district receives the appropriate support. This new block grant will provide the flexibility for districts to leverage and/or braid funds that create a streamlined comprehensive education for all students. Michigan will ensure that all students have access to high-quality, meaningful, challenging learning experiences. Below are listed some activities Title IV can support these initiatives based on needs, this list is not exhaustive or comprehensive. All LEAs receiving funds through Title IV will be subject to review and/or desk audits, including for compliance with meaningful consultation requirements.

Well Rounded Educational Opportunities

- Improved access to foreign language instruction

- Improved access to arts and music education to promote student engagement

- Improved access to physical education and health education

- College and career counseling

- Programming, instruction and increased student engagement in STEM

- Increased access to accelerated learning opportunities

- Increased instruction in civics, American history, economics, geography, government and environmental education.

- Supporting high-quality professional development for educators, school leaders, and administrators to personalize learning in order to improve academic achievement and increase student engagement

- Professional development on effective use of data

- Collaboration with other educators and community partners to improve instruction and extend learning beyond the classroom

- Personalized professional development for tailored, job-embedded support

- Discovering, adapting, and sharing high-quality resources (including openly licensed educational resources)

- Coaching

- Other – supports well-rounded educational

Additionally, through the student's Educational Development Plan (EDP) planning process students, with their parents, will be given individualized assistance in planning coursework to support progress toward educational and career goals, including awareness of careers that may be nontraditional for the student's gender, and opportunities offered through Career and Technical Education. As part of the EDP process districts will engage students and parents in discussing educational and career opportunities and available academic and financial supports that may be available to minority students, students with disabilities, English learners, and low-income students. In CTE, we work extensively to encourage female students to enroll in instructional programs that are non-traditional for their gender. This is one of our annual performance measures for the USDOE as required in our federal Perkins funding. We receive federal funding to help support a gender equity consultant as well.

Safe and Healthy Students

- Promote community involvement

- Promote and increase parent engagement

- Provide school-based mental health and counseling services

- Promoting supportive school climates to reduce the use of exclusionary discipline and promoting supportive school discipline

- Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

- Restorative Justice

- Wrap-around Services

- Service Learning

- Implementing high-quality early childhood programs/services

- Establish and/or improving dropout prevention programming

- Supporting re-entry programs and transition services for justice-involved youth

- Diversion Programs

- Implement programs for healthy, active lifestyles

- Implement programs to prevent bullying and harassment

- Implement a comprehensive education health program

- Supports student safety and violence prevention

- Research, develop, and implement innovative strategies to create learning objectives that include problem solving and collaboration (both within the classroom and community, as well as globally)

- Access to professional development

- Participation in a community of practice

- Other-supports safe and healthy students

Effective Use of Technology

- Professional development to build teacher capacity in identifying accessible resources and accessibility features

- Build technological capacity and infrastructure

- Carrying out innovative blended learning and blended/project based learning

- Providing students in rural, remote, and underserved areas with the resources to benefit from high-quality digital learning opportunities

- Delivering specialized or rigorous academic courses and curricula using technology, including digital learning technologies and assistive technology

- Other –supports effective use of technology

- Professional development communities and opportunities that encourage teachers to leverage technology for students to have an active role in choosing, achieving, and demonstrating competency in their learning goals

- Utilize available bulk purchasing programs for devices, equipment, software, platforms, digital instructional resources, and other non-recurring IT purchases to drive down cost through bulk purchasing, ensuring that resources and content are accessible

- Close the homework gap through provision of internet in the home, community partnerships, or outfitting busses with internet

- Carrying out innovative blended learning and blended/project based learning

- Providing students in rural, remote, and underserved areas with the resources to benefit from high-quality digital learning opportunities

- Professional development on how to implement online courses

- Virtual coaching to expand professional development opportunities for educators

- Professional development for STEM, including coding and game design

- Professional development on how to embed STEM (engineering design principles, computational thinking, app design) in other content areas

- Providing programming to improve instruction and student engagement in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM), including computer science, and increasing access to these subjects for underrepresented groups

- Quality professional learning for educators, including support for evaluation of these programs will work to improve developmentally appropriate instruction in STEM areas

- Increased access to these programs will come through intentional integration across these content areas to improve efficiencies in the system and allow for student deeper learning.

2. **Awarding Subgrants (ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B)): Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with ESEA section 4105(a)(2).**

    Response

    The current expectation for districts to access Title IV funds will be through the completion of an additional section that is part of a single consolidated grant application.   The formula allocation that is assigned to each district will be the same formula in which funds will be distributed for Title IV allocations. The Title IV section will enhance and support other Title programs. By including it in the consolidated application districts will be able to enhance and support services for students by integrating or aligning Title programming. This provides districts better access to and determination of how to distribute funds. Through completion of the comprehensive needs assessment schools will be better able to identify individual needs at the building level and districts, though consultation with the district field representative the LEA will be able to identify how to use Title IV dollars on one or all of the focus areas, with an emphasis on integration. All field service consultants have and will continue to receive support around the guidance document that was designed and crafted with input from a variety of offices at the department of education. The department has staff members that are resident experts available to help determine if the identified expenses are allowable according to the federal

requirements and provide additional support to the districts as they initiate the work. Additionally, districts may form consortiums to apply for the Title IV block grant. Districts that form or join a consortium must still adhere to supporting the identified needs in the CNA.

MDE has carefully considered the options to award LEAs funds for Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 thru either an allocation methodology, a competitive methodology or a combination allocation/competitive methodology. MDE has decided to use the straight allocation methodology for 2017-18 carefully following the process described in statute.

MDE intends to award the Title IV, Part A funds consistent with the following:

MDE:

a.) will award grants only to LEAs that received in the preceding fiscal year an award under ESEA subpart 2 of part A of Title I

b.) will not make LEA allocations in amounts less than $10,000;

c.) will ratably reduce allocations if all eligible LEAs cannot receive an award of at least $10,000.

G. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

1. **Use of Funds (ESEA section 4203(a)(2)): Describe how the SEA will use funds received under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for State-level activities.**

   Response

   The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will use at least ninety three percent (93%) of funds allocated for Title IV, Part B to award competitive 21st CCLC grants to provide services to students who attend schools that have been identified through a "whole child" comprehensive needs assessment that there is a need for funding in addition to other Federal and local funds to:

   - provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students, particularly students who attend low-performing schools, to meet the challenging State academic standards;

   - offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, service learning, nutrition and health education, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, arts, music, physical fitness and wellness programs, technology education programs, financial literacy programs, environmental literacy programs, mathematics, science, career and technical programs, internship or apprenticeship programs, and other ties to an in-demand industry sector or occupation for high school students that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and

   - offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children's education, including opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

   Michigan will use up to **two percent** of the of funds allocated for Title IV, Part B to support administration of the 21st CCLC grant program including ensuring a rigorous application and peer review process for awarding funds to subgrant applicants

   Michigan will use not more than **five percent** of funds allocated for the following activities:

   - **Program On-Site Monitoring.** MDE has developed a monitoring system and protocol for the 21st CCLC grants based on the approved *Michigan Out-of-School Time (MOST) Standards of Quality*.
     - An annual risk assessment will determine how often a grantee will be reviewed during the grant cycle.
     - An electronic monitoring system and on-site review protocols have been developed to facilitate reviews.

- o Each successful applicant is required to cooperate with MDE consultants during the grant review process throughout the multi-year period of the grant award.

- **Fiscal Monitoring.** Fiscal Monitoring will be conducted for all 21st CCLC grantees and will cover the following areas:

  - o Staff (highly qualified, background checks, time and effort, salaries, and payroll).

  - o Policies and procedures (internal controls).

  - o Fiscal management (cash management, payroll expenditures, budget, general expenditures, purchased services, and equipment).

  - o An annual risk assessment will determine how often a grantee will be reviewed during the grant cycle.

  - o An electronic monitoring system and on-site review protocols will be used to facilitate reviews.

- **Evaluation.**

  Statewide Evaluation: Each successful applicant must agree to participate in the statewide evaluation and to submit data as required by the statewide evaluator. MDE has contracted with Michigan State University as the statewide evaluator to:

  - o collect and report data required by the United States Department of Education;

  - o prepare an Annual Report Form on behalf of MDE for all grantees to use and to summarize those reports annually, incorporating a combination of EZReports web-based tracking data, Annual Report Form data, survey data, school records, and Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) data; and

  - o provide each grantee with its own submitted data in a standardized agreed-upon format for its own use.

  Participant families must be notified of the data collection requirement at enrollment. Each grantee will be required to budget a specified amount, per grantee, per site for EZReports software license and high-speed internet access must be available; further information regarding EZReports will be given to grantees if awarded. It is recommended that each site allocate four to five hours per week of personnel time for data entry.

  Measures of academic performance will be collected per student at least annually in partnership with the statewide student Center for Education Performance Information system. 21st CCLC Grant Programs will also be required to collect teacher surveys evaluating student performance including

grades, homework completion and behavioral measures. In addition, Michigan 21st CCLC grant programs will participate in a pilot to collect SEL measures as part of a validation study of the new Youth Program Quality Assessment.

Local Evaluation: Each grantee is required to hire a local evaluator. The project director or site coordinator may not serve as the local evaluator. MDE recommends that an applicant review the 21st CCLC Local Evaluator Guide at www.michigan.gov/21stcclc. At a minimum, the local evaluator will:

o Coordinate the collection and monitor the quality and completeness of required federal and state data. The instruments and collection systems that have been identified include:

- program data, such as enrollment, demographic, attendance, and activity information, to be entered into the EZReports web-based tracking system on an on-going basis;

- surveys from parents, students, teachers, and staff at the end of each school year; and

- school records data, including student grades, M-STEP/MME scores, school attendance, and disciplinary actions at the end of each school year.

o Guide the YPQI process.

o Assist the program with initial implementation.

o Use local data and the YPQA to guide a performance improvement process and a sustainability plan.

o Review with program staff 21st CCLC On-site Monitoring results in GEMS.

o Assist with the completion and submission of the Annual Report Form.

o Collect any additional data requested by the local grantee.

o Attend required MDE events, including MDE program on-site monitoring visits.

- **Quality Technical Assistance.** MDE will contract with training and technical assistance providers to support subgrantees with quality implementation and continuous program improvement.

- **Quality Assessment Training.** MDE has contracted with the Forum for Youth Investment/Center for Youth Program Quality (CYPQ) to provide Youth Program Quality Intervention (YPQI) training to grantees. Each site is required to participate in YPQI training and submit at least one YPQI Self-Assessment annually to the Forum for Youth Investment CYPQ. Sites may be required to participate in a program improvement process which includes external YPQA evaluation and quality coaching.

2. **Awarding Subgrants (ESEA section 4203(a)(4)): Describe the procedures and criteria the SEA will use for reviewing applications and awarding 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds to eligible entities on a competitive basis, which shall include procedures and criteria that take into consideration the likelihood that a proposed community learning center will help participating students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards.**

Response

Michigan 21st CCLC Review Process: The Michigan Department of Education will award subgrants through a rigorous competitive peer review process. Award selections are based on merit and quality, as determined by points awarded for the Review Criteria section and all based on all relevant information. The Application Information and Instructions and Review Criteria rubrics are used as a rating instrument in the review process. Eligible applicants include Local Education Agencies (LEAs), Community-Based Organizations, Faith-Based Organizations and other public or private entities, or a consortium of these entities. Eligible organizations are expected to collaborate when applying for funds. Priority will be given to applicants who propose services to schools that have been identified through a "whole child" comprehensive needs assessment and: are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities OR targeted support and improvement activities; enroll students who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models; and the families of students served. Michigan may award additional priority to applicants serving schools that: enroll a high concentration of low-income students; are eligible for Title I school-wide funding; did not meet proficiency targets for Math or ELA; or are located in select Prosperity Regions as defined by the State of Michigan. All funding is subject to approval by the State Superintendent. All applicants are notified of the Superintendent's action.

Additional Review Factors: In addition to the review criteria the State Superintendent may apply other factors in making funding decisions, such as: (1) geographical distribution; (2) duplication of effort; (3) duplication of funding; (4) evidence that an applicant has demonstrated successful implementation, organizational capacity, and systemic fiscal controls on previous projects; and (5) prioritization based on the State Board of Education Guiding Principles and Strategic Goals.

Grant Reviewers: MDE will designate a panel of peer reviewers who are knowledgeable in out-of-school time strategies and how to improve student achievement. To ensure reliable scoring, the panel will be trained prior to reviewing any proposals. Persons involved in the development of a proposal, or associated with an applicant or co-applicant submitting a proposal are ineligible to serve on this peer review panel.

Application Review and Approval: All applications are reviewed for eligibility requirements by staff of the MDE, Office of Great Start, Preschool and Out-of-School

Time Learning, 21st CCLC Program. All applications are then reviewed and rated by a peer review panel. Only those proposals meeting all the identified criteria and not exceeding the total amount of state allocated funds will be recommended for funding to the State Superintendent. All applicants will be notified **in writing** of the action taken by the State Superintendent.

Grievance/Appeal Process: The MDE grievance/appeal process is available upon request to the Office of Great Start/Preschool and Out-of-School Time Learning at (517) 373-8483.

An appeal of a MDE decision to not award a subgrant to an applicant under the 21st CCLC program may be filed with the United States Secretary of Education under section 432 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), 20 U.S.C. 1231b-2. However, under section 432(b) of GEPA, an appeal may be taken "only if such appeal is filed with the Secretary within twenty days after the applicant or recipient has been notified by the State educational agency" of its final decision. Any appeal filed with United States Secretary of Education must be copied to the MDE, Office of Great Start/Preschool and Out-of-School Time Learning.

H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

1. **Outcomes and Objectives (ESEA section 5223(b)(1)): Provide information on program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards.**

   Response

   The MDE is focused on supporting all districts in the state. The unique challenges that impact and affect rural students create many barriers to academic success. Many rural districts struggle to attract high quality personnel and/or retain them. Another impediment to success is the lack of resources needed to be competitive based on the state and federal allocations. Currently, the Title V funds in Michigan are well distributed across the state to an array of educational entities. The funds are currently distributed to 156 entities that meet the requirements to be eligible. Those entities represented are: Traditional schools/districts, Intermediate School districts, Charter School/Districts and BIA schools.

   The department will award funding to eligible LEAs. To be eligible, districts must be rural and meet the established poverty threshold. Distribution of funds will be awarded through a formula process. The allocation will be awarded to LEAs that have more children living in areas that have a higher concentration of economically disadvantaged families, or living in sparsely populated areas. The Title V allocation will allow for and enable additional resources to districts that incur the greatest costs to educate their students.

   Michigan has curriculum that is rigorous in all content areas, students have the opportunity to participate in online instruction and must participate in all statewide assessments. The district is measured based on the assessments and the established statewide accountability metrics with support provided to the school if it is labeled for statewide systems of support. Each school will complete the comprehensive needs assessment and the school improvement plan to establish an instructional focus in which the district can provide support through Title V funds.

   Below is a list of supports districts may initiate. This list is not exhaustive or comprehensive.

   - Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Education Agencies
     Example: A school district develops an entrepreneurial education program to supplement its civics curriculum.

   - Michigan Examples:

     o Increase student access to AP, IB and dual enrollment offerings. Activities may include appropriate staffing, collaboration with other districts or increased access to online offerings.

- o Increase student access to high quality afterschool and summer programming aligned to standards and career and college ready skills. Activities may include staffing, transportation, etc.

- o Increase student access to 21st work site placements. Activities may include the identification of worksites that may not be located in rural communities but allow students to work remotely from their rural communities.

- Supporting Effective Instruction
  Example: A school district pays the stipend for a prospective teacher to work alongside an effective teacher, who is the teacher of record, for a full academic year.

- Michigan Examples:

  - o Increase educator access to highly effective teachers by assigning mentors that are aligned with content area or instructional needs of teacher(s). Consider supporting at regional level as many rural schools only have one HS math teacher (for example) and effective mentors may have to be found outside of district.

  - o Incentivize pay for effective teachers.

  - o Increase educator access to high quality PD offered at regional STEM Centers and local universities. Stipends, sub costs, pay differentials.

  - o Incentivize participation of educators in professional organizations that support advanced PD (MCTM, MSTA, MRA and pay for participation in embedded PD offered by these organizations.

- Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students
  Example: A school district offers an afterschool enrichment program for English learners.

- Student Support and Academic Enrichment
  Example: A school district purchases a bully prevention program for all schools.

  - o Increase access to high quality digital content and software that allows students to work on personalized learning pathways, with support, at school and at home.

  - o Provide broadband access at home if not available to eliminate any "homework gap" issues. Explore the provision and use of broadband enabled devices for use at home in support of academic intervention and enrichment activities, collaboration with peers on projects, communication with tutors, mentors, teachers, etc.

- 21st Century Community Learning Centers
  Example: A school district purchases instruments to supplement schools' band and orchestra programs.

2. **Technical Assistance (ESEA section 5223(b)(3)): Describe how the SEA will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to help such agencies implement the activities described in ESEA section 5222.**

   Response

   The Michigan Department of Education is reshaping its internal resources to provide support to districts in a differentiated way. LEAs that are reaching their academic targets, based on state and local assessments, will be assumed to be implementing their continuous improvement process with fidelity. Therefore, these districts will be given greater flexibility and less MDE oversight. LEAs that are not reaching their academic targets will receive support from MDE to improve their CNA, alignment of the improvement plan with the challenges resulting from the CNA and technical assistance in the implementation of the plan. Districts with the greatest level of need (as demonstrated by low academic performance, but also other needs, such as financial) will be designated "partnership districts" and will receive intensive differentiated assistance, specific to their areas of need, in crafting and implementing tailored plans to improve student outcomes. Districts with certain areas of need-for example, large achievement gaps-will receive support and technical assistance in addressing those needs. In terms of the statewide system of support, districts with significant numbers of comprehensive support schools will be treated as partnership districts. MDE will use the statewide system of support to provide assistance through a combination of grants to LEAs, and statewide technical assistance grants. Michigan would like to take a moment to note the following: as we have engaged in government-to-government consultation with representatives from Michigan's twelve federally recognized tribes, we realize the importance of this consultation, both for the ESSA plan and in an ongoing way over time to ensure that we appropriately build and create meaningful tribal consultation, both in process and the product, to create a foundation for supporting our Native students. Therefore, Michigan has: Integrated references to tribal education departments throughout all foundational plan documents, to represent this commitment Committed to quarterly consultation between the SEA and the federally recognized tribes Committed to developing processes to engage in 1:1 consultation between the SEA and each federally recognized tribe individually Adopted as guidance the Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors: "Guidance to Michigan Department of Education Regarding Tribal Consultation in the Every Student Succeeds Act," with plans to use this as the core document to motivate consultation work between the SEA and the tribes as well as LEAs and tribes.

   MDE will provide technical assistance to LEAs who are eligible for funds under Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Programs to help with the implementation of activities described in ESEA section 5222. Assistance will be provided by Field Service consultants serving the regions in which the eligible LEAs are located. Specific supports will be determined by the needs identified in the LEAs' Comprehensive Needs Assessment and their continuous improvement plans.

- MDE will provide written guidance and overview at regional conferences for eligible rural LEAs on how to apply for and implement activities described in ESEA section 5222. The assigned regional field service consultants will be responsible for disseminating guidance and presenting information to each LEA eligible for Title V-B program funds.

- Upon receipt of rural LEAs applications for Title V-B funds, the assigned consultant will review and advise the eligible LEAs on strengthening their plans and implementation strategies for their program. Consultants will respond to questions within 48 hours of any request and monitor implementation by reviewing the status of draws on these funds. Consultants will discuss with RLIS eligible LEAs opportunities for coordinating various state, local and grant funding streams to maximize implementation of evidence based strategies that are most likely to impact student achievement gains.

- Regional consultants have the necessary background as educators to provide evidence based options to LEAs and have a portfolio of RLIS eligible LEAs that have used these strategies to accelerate achievement. The consultant will introduce interested LEAs to more effective LEAs so that they can network with each other to implement strategies effectively and avoid know pitfalls.

I. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B

1. **Student Identification (722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youth in the State and to assess their needs.**

    Response

    Michigan utilizes a regional model in its Homeless Education Program. Federal grant funds for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth (ECHY) are distributed competitively within three-year cycles to regional consortia of districts in every county in the state. Over 90% of public school districts (LEAs, PSAs, and ISDs) participate as subgrantees. Regional Grant Coordinators coordinate districts in their grant region, regardless of subgrantee status. This ensures that any child or youth who experiences homelessness anywhere in Michigan may be identified and receive services to support his/her educational success.

    The MDE State Homeless Education Team will conduct and facilitate these activities to improve the identification of homeless children and youth

    (1)   Assure that all LEAs (including PSAs and ISDs) designate a District Homeless Education Liaison, register this person's contact information in the Educational Entity Master (EEM) database, and update annually or as needed.

    (2)   Post this contact information on the SEA Homeless Education website, updating as necessary, so that the public and all school personnel have access.

    (3)   Develop and implement professional development programs for Regional McKinney-Vento (MV) Grant Coordinators, LEA MV Liaisons, MDE staff, state and local agencies, human services providers and advocates on eligibility requirements for MV rights and services, as well as the duties of LEA Liaisons to identify and serve homeless children and youth.

    (4)   Coordinate and collaborate with other MDE programs serving homeless children and youth.

    (5)   Develop partnerships with other federal, state and local agencies, service providers and advocates to build community awareness of the educational needs and rights of homeless children and youth and their families.

    (6)   Conduct regional and statewide needs assessments across all LEAs and regional MV grant consortia.

    (7)   With the engagement of local and regional homeless education liaisons and coordinators, develop and update annual action plans, strategies and activities to improve the Michigan Homeless Education Program, beyond compliance with the MV Act and ESSA guidelines and regulations.

(8)   Conduct monitoring of all LEAs and regional grant consortia to ensure compliance with program requirements and guidance.

(9)   In collaboration with Michigan's Center for Education Performance Information, collect and analyze valid and reliable data on identification, attendance and educational achievements of homeless children and youth through the MI Student Data System.

(10)   Develop, review and revise policies to remove barriers to the identification, enrollment, retention and success of homeless children and youth in school

2. **Dispute Resolution (722(g)(1)(C) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youth.**

   Response

   (1)   The MDE Office of Field Services (OFS) Special Populations Unit (SPU) has developed, utilized and continues to update as necessary, formal guidance on the resolution of disputes between school districts and parents/youth experiencing homelessness. The Guidance is distributed to district administrators and school leaders, as well as Homeless Education Liaisons via MDE Communications, as well as through regional grant coordinators and the State Coordinator. It is also published on the Homeless Education Program website.

   (2)   The MDE Dispute Resolution Guidance is time-sensitive to minimize any school disruptions to students, and allows for multiple levels of appeal at the local, regional and state levels. District Homeless Education Liaisons are the first to initiate or respond to an appeal from a parent or youth; the MDE-OFS-SPU Manager has the final response, if the dispute is not resolved at other levels.

3. **Support for School Personnel (722(g)(1)(D) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe programs for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including runaway and homeless children and youth.**

   Response

   (1)   MDE's Homeless Education Team will provide or arrange for the provision of professional development and training opportunities for Homeless Education Liaisons and all LEA and school personnel on general homelessness awareness on the eligibility requirements for MV rights and services, as well as the duties of LEA Liaisons to identify and serve homeless children and youth. Training and professional development on specific

provisions of ESSA and the MV Act pertaining to various staff groups (school leaders and administrators, counselors, social workers, residency and truancy personnel, teachers and paraprofessionals, enrollment staff, pupil accounting staff, food service and transportation staff, etc.) will be provided at the state, regional and local levels.

(2) In partnership with a small technology firm in Grand Rapids, MI, MDE has developed an online training and professional development model for the credentialing of Homeless Education Liaisons. The model consists of Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced levels of specific topics, units and lessons. Liaisons and regional grant coordinators who pass assessments for each level's lessons receive a certificate of achievement. When all three levels are completed, the Liaison is presented with a plaque certifying this accomplishment and documents their credential as a Michigan McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Liaison.

(3) Regional meetings are held annually across the state involving multiple grant consortia and including specific technical assistance and training for identified needs in each region. Regional grant coordinators, monitors and the State Coordinator are all involved in these meetings and training sessions.

(4) LEA Liaisons and other school staff are encouraged to participate in the monthly webinars offered by the National Association for Homeless Education, the technical support center through the US Department of Education. Email announcements of dates and times are shared with regional grant coordinators and passed on through the consortia of districts.

(5) The State Coordinator provides training and professional development to professional education organizations and associations related to their specific involvement with homeless children and youth (i.e., MI Pupil Transportation Directors Association, MI Head Start Association, etc.).

(6) Beginning in January 2017, regional grant coordinators and monitors will meet bimonthly with the State Coordinator to assess training needs and update the progress toward the goals in the annual Homeless Education Plan.

(7) The MDE Homeless Education Program website will be continually updated with information and resources for liaisons and school staff, regional grant coordinators, parents and students experiencing homelessness and the general public

(8) The MDE Office of Field Services Special Populations Unit holds an annual conference to provide technical assistance and training for all school staff working with special populations of students, including a track for those working with homeless students.

4. <u>Access to Services</u> **(722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Describe procedures that ensure that:**

     i.   Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;

     ii.   Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and

     iii.   Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.

Response

i. Public Preschool Access:

(1)   The State Coordinator for Homeless Education collaborates and coordinates with the MDE early childhood care and learning programs, as well as other federally and locally funded preschool programs – Great Start Readiness Program, Head Start and Early Head Start, Title I-A preschools, and other contracted community agency preschool programs.

(2)   Training and technical assistance are provided to SEA early childhood program staff and early literacy program staff, as well as to State and Federal Program Directors, preschool program coordinators, teachers, paraprofessionals and child care regional support offices regarding homelessness among families and children and the process for referring families to support services at all federal, state, regional and local levels.

ii. Equal Access to Appropriate Secondary Education and Support Services

(1)   To ensure that homeless youth who are separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access, without barriers to full or partial credit, outreach by LEA Homeless Education Liaisons is a critical element in trainings at the local, regional and state levels. Outreach procedures are included in the monitoring of LEA MV programs.

(2)   Access to online courses, summer school and tutoring through Title I-A has also been developed and enhanced for credit recovery for students

experiencing homelessness through collaboration and coordination with district program administrators and MV Liaisons.

(3)   A goal in the 2017-2020 MV state activities plan is to develop formal guidance and procedures at state levels for granting partial and/or full credit for school work satisfactorily completed in a previous school/district by a youth experiencing homelessness. This guidance would then be approved by the MI State Board of Education. Training on this new guidance will also be provided to MV Liaisons, as well as high school counselors, principals and administrators.

iii. Eligible Children and Youth Do Not Face Barriers

(1)   The State Coordinator and state-contracted monitors provide training and technical assistance to LEA MV Liaisons and staff, in coordination with Regional MV Grant Coordinators, on all provisions of the MV Act, ESSA and the USED MV Guidance, including those specifying that students experiencing homelessness must not face barriers to accessing any academic or extracurricular activities for which they are eligible. The MDE MV team conducts on-site monitoring reviews to LEAs (public schools/public school academies/charter schools) receiving McKinney-Vento funds and a sampling of the few LEAs that do not receive McKinney-Vento funds. Following intensive technical assistance to LEAs, the monitoring includes a review of LEAs policies, practices, procedures and practices to ensure homeless students have access to services/ programs comparable to those received by other students. The MDE MV Monitoring Indicators Self-Assessment specifies that LEAs must coordinate efforts within the LEA and with other agencies (as needed) in order to provide homeless students access to the following services/programs:

- Advanced/dual enrollment and online course offerings;

- Extracurricular activities;

- Vocational/technical education;

- Gifted talented education;

- Extended day/year (summer) programs including 21st Century, and

- Unique admissions programs (e.g., magnet schools, early college).

While credentialing Homeless Education Liaisons across the state during the 2017-18 school year, the MDE's professional development plan will include sample procedures and practices for removing barriers to the services and programs listed above. LEAs who violate procedures for removing such barriers will create a compliance plan with action steps and timelines toward removing barriers providing full access to all academic or

extracurricular activities. MDE will follow up with such LEAs to ensure fidelity of implementation.

(2) To prevent any enrollment delays, Regional MV grant coordinators and LEA MV Liaisons receive training and are provided with state forms and procedures to assist homeless parents or youth in obtaining any necessary enrollment documents.

(3) The State Coordinator has coordinated and collaborated with the MI High School Athletic Association to ensure that they maintain a process for exceptions to their standard policy for students who transfer schools due to homelessness

5. **Strategies to Address Other Problems (722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Provide strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by**

     i.   requirements of immunization and other required health records;

     ii.   residency requirements;

     iii.   lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;

     iv.   guardianship issues; or

     v.   uniform or dress code requirements.

Response

i. Requirements of Immunization and Health Records AND

iii. Lack of Birth Certificates, School Records or Other Documentation AND

iv. Guardianship Issues

(1) Training and technical assistance is provided to all LEAs' MV Liaisons and school staff, as well as to MDE early childhood care and education programs, regarding the removal of any enrollment or participation barriers for children and youth experiencing homelessness who lack required health records, birth certificates or documentation of guardianship or residency.

(2) The Michigan Care Improvement Registry (MCIR) is an Immunization database that tracks the immunizations given to Michiganders throughout life. LEA MV Liaisons and School Nurses collaborate with local offices of the MI Department of Health and Human Services to access the MCIR system to obtain quick documentation for children and youth experiencing homelessness.

(3)   Regional MV grant coordinators and LEA MV Liaisons receive training and are provided with state forms and procedures for obtaining any necessary documentation of such documents.

(4)   Regional MV grant coordinators and LEA MV Liaisons are trained to retrieve school records as quickly as possible by contacting the sending district and requesting information by phone or fax, while official school records are being processed and sent.

ii. Residency Requirements

(1)   The Michigan Revised School Code currently contains multiple provisions to remove barriers to educational access for children and youth experiencing homelessness, including residency requirements. The School Code also includes requirements that LEAs have School Board Policies and Procedures for making exceptions for homeless youth (and foster youth) residing outside the boundaries of their school of origin.

(2)   These policies and procedures are reviewed as part of the LEA MV monitoring process.

(3)   The State Coordinator provides training and technical assistance to LEA MV Liaisons and staff, in coordination with Regional MV Grant Coordinators, on all provisions of the MV Act, ESSA and the USED MV Guidance, including those specifying that students experiencing homelessness must not face barriers to accessing any academic or extracurricular activities for which they are eligible.

v. Uniform and Dress Code Requirements

(1)   The State Coordinator provides training and technical assistance to LEA MV Liaisons and staff, in coordination with Regional MV Grant Coordinators, on all provisions of the MV Act, ESSA and the USED MV Guidance, including dress code and uniform requirements.

(2)   Public schools that require uniforms must provide these items to economically disadvantaged, homeless or foster youth enrolling.

(3)   MV Homeless Education Grant funds and Title I-A Homeless Reservation funds are also used to provide necessary clothing for school dress codes or school activities.

6. **Policies to Remove Barriers (722(g)(1)(I) of the McKinney-Vento Act): Demonstrate that the SEA and LEAs in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences.**

   Response

   (1)   The State Coordinator provides training and technical assistance to LEA MV Liaisons and staff, in coordination with Regional MV Grant Coordinators, on all provisions of the MV Act, ESSA and the USED MV Guidance.

   (2)   The Michigan Revised School Code currently contains multiple provisions to remove barriers to educational access for children and youth experiencing homelessness. MDE will ensure that barriers related to outstanding fees, fines or absences are specifically addressed.

   (3)   The LEA monitoring protocol for Title I-A and MV programs includes requirements that LEAs have School Board Policies and Procedures for making exceptions for homeless youth in any policy area that poses barriers to their enrollment, retention and success.

   (4) The State Coordinator for Homeless Education is currently collaborating with the CCBDG and MDE early childhood programs to initiate licensing regulation revisions to align the State regulations with Federal law in this area, to align with the new ESSA preschool regulations.

7. **Assistance from Counselors (722(g)(1)(K)): A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.**

   Response

   (1)   In addition to providing professional development and technical assistance for school counselors as described in Items 6.2 G.ii (1) and 6.2 G.iv (3), the MDE State Coordinator for Homeless Education:

   a.   serves on the Michigan College Access Alliance,

   b.   provides frequent training for the MI College Access Network (MCAN) Advisers, presents at the annual MCAN Conference, and

   c.   has participated on panels for many MCAN training webinars for school counselors, related to preparing and supporting special populations of students for postsecondary education.

   (2)   The MDE Homeless Education Program is one of 15 states with a McKinney-Vento Higher Education Network, consisting of Single Points of

Contact in the Financial Aid Offices of all public colleges and universities. These contacts are trained to support homeless and foster youth in applying for higher education and seeking financial aid, as well as to support the academic success and college completion of such students. The program is currently reaching out to staff at MI community colleges to join this Network.

(3)   The State Homeless Education Coordinator collaborates closely with the MI Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) Foster Youth in Transition (FYIT) program, and will transition this work to the incoming MDE State Coordinator for the Education of Foster Youth this year, under the ESSA transition of foster youth support to Title I.

   a.   Most college and university contacts supporting FYIT college programs are also in the MV Higher Education Network.

   b.   The Western Michigan University (WMU) Seita Scholars Program and the Center for Fostering Success are nationally known for supporting foster youth and serve as models for the nation's colleges. The Seita Scholars Program provides full tuition scholarships and a campus support model for foster youth in the program.

   c.   Based on that model WMU has also developed a scholarship and campus support program for high need, high achieving youth – including homeless youth – called the WMU Foundation Scholarship Program. The MDE Homeless Education Program works very closely with the program director to refer eligible homeless students and provide referrals for those enrolled.

Appendix A: Measurements of Interim Progress

Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency, set forth in the State's response to Title I, Part A question 4.iii, for all students and separately for each subgroup of students, including those listed in response to question 4.i.a. of this document. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the State's measurements of interim progress must take into account the improvement necessary on such measures to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps.

A. Academic Achievement

ELA Proficiency Interim Targets by Subgroup

Student Group	~~2015-16~~ Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2016-17*~~ 2022-23*	~~2017-18*~~ 2023-24*	~~2018-19*~~ 2024-25*	~~2019-20*~~ 2025-26*	~~2020-21*~~ 2026-27*	~~2021-22*~~ 2027-28*	~~2022-23*~~ 2028-29*	~~2023-24*~~ 2029-30*	2030-31*	~~2024-25~~ Long-term Goal* (2031-32)
All Students	~~49.14%~~ 41.47%	~~50.35%~~ 42.95%	~~51.56%~~ 44.44%	~~52.76%4~~ 45.92%	~~53.97%~~ 47.41%	~~55.17%~~ 48.89%	~~56.38%~~ 50.37%	~~57.59%5~~ 51.86%	~~58.79%~~ 53.34%	54.83%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
American Indian or Alaska Native	~~40.78%~~ 7.69%	~~42.92%~~ 12.55%	~~45.05%~~ 17.41%	~~47.19%2~~ 22.28%	~~49.32%~~ 27.14%	~~51.46%~~ 32.00%	~~53.59%~~ 36.86%	~~55.73%~~ 41.72%	~~57.86%~~ 46.59%	51.45%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
Asian	~~70.34%*~~ 60.71%*	~~70.34%*~~ 60.71%*	~~70.34%*~~ 60.71%*	~~70.34%*~~ 60.71%*	~~70.34%*~~ 60.71%*	~~70.34%*~~ 60.71%*	~~70.34%*~~ 60.71%*	~~70.34%*~~ 60.71%*	~~70.34%*~~ 60.71%*	60.71%	~~60.00%*~~ 56.31%
Black or African American	~~23.26%~~ 20.05%	~~27.34%~~ 23.68%	~~31.42%~~ 27.30%	~~35.50%~~ 30.93%	~~39.59%~~ 34.55%	~~43.67%~~ 38.18%	~~47.75%~~ 41.81%	~~51.83%~~ 45.43%	~~55.92%~~ 49.06%	52.68%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
Hispanic or Latino	~~36.15%~~ 34.09%	~~38.80%~~ 36.31%	~~41.45%~~ 38.53%	~~44.10%~~ 40.76%	~~46.75%~~ 42.98%	~~49.40%~~ 45.20%	~~52.05%~~ 47.42%	~~54.70%~~ 49.64%	~~57.35%~~ 51.87%	54.09%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~53.54%~~ 12.50%	~~54.26%~~ 16.88%	~~54.98%~~ 21.26%	~~55.69%~~ 25.64%	~~56.41%~~ 30.02%	~~57.13%~~ 34.41%	~~57.85%~~ 38.79%	~~58.56%~~ 43.17%	~~59.28%~~ 47.55%	51.93%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
Two or More Races	~~46.76%~~ 38.89%	~~48.23%~~ 40.63%	~~49.70%~~ 42.37%	~~51.17%~~ 44.12%	~~52.64%~~ 45.86%	~~54.12%~~ 47.60%	~~55.59%~~ 49.34%	~~57.06%~~ 51.08%	~~58.53%~~ 52.83%	54.57%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
White	~~56.05%~~ 46.67%	~~56.49%~~ 47.63%	~~56.93%~~ 48.60%	~~57.37%~~ 49.56%	~~57.81%~~ 50.53%	~~58.25%~~ 51.49%	~~58.68%~~ 52.45%	~~59.12%~~ 53.42%	~~59.56%~~ 54.38%	55.35%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
Economically Disadvantaged	~~32.83%~~ 33.33%	~~35.85%~~ 35.63%	~~38.87%~~ 37.93%	~~41.88%~~ 40.22%	~~44.90%~~ 42.52%	~~47.92%~~ 44.82%	~~50.94%~~ 47.12%	~~53.96%~~ 49.42%	~~56.98%~~ 51.71%	54.01%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
English Learners	~~22.25%~~ 15.39%	~~26.44%~~ 19.48%	~~30.64%~~ 23.57%	~~34.83%~~ 27.67%	~~39.03%~~ 31.76%	~~43.22%~~ 35.85%	~~47.42%~~ 39.94%	~~51.61%~~ 44.03%	~~55.81%~~ 48.13%	52.22%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%
Students with Disabilities	~~18.87%~~ 16.13%	~~23.44%~~ 20.15%	~~28.01%~~ 24.17%	~~32.58%~~ 28.18%	~~37.15%~~ 32.20%	~~41.72%~~ 36.22%	~~46.29%~~ 40.24%	~~50.86%~~ 44.26%	~~55.43%~~ 48.27%	52.29%	~~60.00%~~ 56.31%

*Note: Subgroups already meeting the long-term goal must improve current performance, both in interim and long-term goals.

Math Proficiency Interim Targets by Subgroup

Student Group	~~2015-16~~ Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2016-17~~ 2022-23*	~~2017-18~~ 2023-24*	~~2018-19~~ 2024-25*	~~2019-20~~ 2025-26*	~~2020-21~~ 2026-27*	~~2021-22~~ 2027-28*	~~2022-23~~ 2028-29*	~~2023-24~~ 2029-30*	2031-31*	~~2024-25~~ Long-term Goal* (2031-32)
All Students	~~37.55%~~ 28.00%	~~38.66%~~ 29.59%	~~39.77%~~ 31.19%	~~40.88%~~ 32.78%	~~41.99%~~ 34.38%	~~43.11%~~ 35.97%	~~44.22%~~ 37.56%	~~45.33%~~ 39.16%	~~46.44%~~ 40.75%	42.35%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
American Indian or Alaska Native	~~28.50%~~ 3.70%	~~30.62%~~ 7.72%	~~32.73%~~ 11.75%	~~34.85%~~ 15.77%	~~36.97%~~ 19.80%	~~39.08%~~ 23.82%	~~41.20%~~ 27.84%	~~43.32%~~ 31.87%	~~45.44%~~ 35.89%	39.92%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
Asian	~~68.19%*~~ 50.67%*	~~68.19%*~~ 50.67%*	~~68.19%*~~ 50.67%*	~~68.19%*~~ 50.67%*	~~68.19%*~~ 50.67%*	~~68.19%8~~ 50.67%*	~~68.19%*~~ 50.67%*	~~68.19%*~~ 50.67%*	~~68.19%*~~ 50.67%*	50.67%*	~~47.55%*~~ 43.94%*
Black or African American	~~12.43%~~ 5.94%	~~16.33%~~ 9.74%	~~20.24%~~ 13.54%	~~24.14%~~ 17.34%	~~28.04%~~ 21.14%	~~31.94%~~ 24.94%	~~35.85%~~ 28.74%	~~39.75%~~ 32.54%	~~43.65%~~ 36.34%	40.14%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
Hispanic or Latino	~~23.63%~~ 20.21%	~~26.29%~~ 22.58%	~~28.95%~~ 24.96%	~~31.61%~~ 27.33%	~~34.26%~~ 29.70%	~~36.92%~~ 32.08%	~~39.58%~~ 34.45%	~~42.24%~~ 36.82%	~~44.89%~~ 39.19%	41.57%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~41.85%~~ 12.50%	~~42.48%~~ 15.64%	~~43.11%~~ 18.79%	~~43.75%~~ 21.93%	~~44.38%~~ 25.08%	~~45.02%~~ 28.22%	~~45.65%~~ 31.36%	~~46.28%~~ 34.51%	~~46.92%~~ 37.65%	40.80%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
Two or More Races	~~34.42%~~ 22.64%	~~35.88%~~ 24.77%	~~37.34%~~ 26.90%	~~38.80%~~ 29.03%	~~40.26%~~ 31.16%	~~41.72%~~ 33.29%	~~43.17%~~ 35.42%	~~44.63%~~ 37.55%	~~46.09%~~ 39.68%	41.81%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
White	~~43.95%~~ 32.58%	~~44.35%~~ 33.72%	~~44.75%~~ 34.85%	~~45.15%~~ 35.99%	~~45.55%~~ 37.12%	~~45.95%~~ 38.26%	~~46.35%~~ 39.40%	~~46.75%~~ 40.53%	~~47.15%~~ 41.67%	42.80%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
Economically Disadvantaged	~~21.92%~~ 20.16%	~~24.77%~~ 22.54%	~~27.62%~~ 24.92%	~~30.47%~~ 27.29%	~~33.31%~~ 29.67%	~~36.16%~~ 32.05%	~~39.01%~~ 34.43%	~~41.86%~~ 36.81%	~~44.70%~~ 39.18%	41.56	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
English Learners	~~21.04%~~ 7.32%	~~23.98%~~ 10.98%	~~26.93%~~ 14.64%	~~29.87%~~ 18.31%	~~32.82%~~ 21.97%	~~35.77%~~ 25.63%	~~38.71%~~ 29.29%	~~41.66%~~ 32.95%	~~44.61%~~ 36.62%	40.28%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%
Students with Disabilities	~~15.57%~~ 10.62%	~~19.12%~~ 13.95%	~~22.68%~~ 17.28%	~~26.23%~~ 20.62%	~~29.78%~~ 23.95%	~~33.34%~~ 27.28%	~~36.89%~~ 30.61%	~~40.44%~~ 33.94%	~~44.00%~~ 37.28%	40.61%	~~47.55%~~ 43.94%

*Note: Subgroups already meeting the long-term goal must improve current performance, both in interim and long-term goals

B. Growth Goals

English Language Arts Interim Growth Targets by Subgroup

Student Group	~~2015-16~~ Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2016-17*~~ 2022-23*	~~2017-18*~~ 2023-24*	~~2018-19*~~ 2024-25*	~~2019-20*~~ 2025-26*	~~2020-21*~~ 2026-27*	~~2021-22*~~ 2027-28	~~2022-23*~~ 2028-29*	~~2023-24*~~ 2029-30*	2030-31*	~~2024-25~~ Long-term Goal* (2031-32)
All Students	~~49.99%~~ 43.26%	~~50.87%~~ 44.64%	~~51.75%~~ 46.02%	~~52.63%~~ 47.40%	~~53.51%~~ 48.78%	~~54.39%~~ 50.16%	~~55.27%~~ 51.53%	~~56.15%~~ 52.91%	~~57.03%~~ 54.29%	55.67%	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%
American Indian or Alaska Native	~~45.53%~~ 33.34%	~~46.91%~~ 35.71%	~~48.29%~~ 38.08%	~~49.66%~~ 40.45%	~~51.04%~~ 42.82%	~~52.41%~~ 45.20%	~~53.79%~~ 47.57%	~~55.16%~~ 49.94%	~~56.54%~~ 52.31%	54.68%	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%
Asian	~~66.60%*~~ 72.22%*	~~66.60%*~~ 72.22%*	~~66.60%*~~ 72.22%*	~~66.60%*~~ 72.22%*	~~66.60%*~~ 72.22%*	~~66.60%*~~ 72.22%*	~~66.60%*~~ 72.22%*	~~66.60%*~~ 72.22%*	~~66.60%*~~ 72.22%*	72.22%*	~~57.92%*~~ 57.05%*
Black or African American	~~36.89%~~ 26.96%	~~39.22%~~ 29.97%	~~41.56%~~ 32.98%	~~43.90%~~ 35.99%	~~46.23%~~ 39.00%	~~48.57%~~ 42.01%	~~50.91%~~ 45.01%	~~53.24%~~ 48.02%	~~55.58%~~ 51.03%	54.04%	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%
Hispanic or Latino	~~46.09%~~ 40.36%	~~47.41%~~ 42.03%	~~48.72%~~ 43.70%	~~50.03%~~ 45.37%	~~51.35%~~ 47.04%	~~52.66%~~ 48.71%	~~53.97%~~ 50.37%	~~55.29%~~ 52.04%	~~56.60%~~ 53.71%	55.38%	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%

Student Group	~~2015-16~~ Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2016-17*~~ 2022-23*	~~2017-18*~~ 2023-24*	~~2018-19*~~ 2024-25*	~~2019-20*~~ 2025-26	~~2020-21*~~ 2026-27*	~~2021-22*~~ 2027-28*	~~2022-23*~~ 2028-29*	~~2023-24*~~ 2029-30*	2030-31	~~2024-25~~ Long-term Goal* (2031-32)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~52.76%~~ 66.67%*	~~53.33%~~ 66.67%*	~~53.91%~~ 66.67%*	~~54.48%~~ 66.67%*	~~55.05%~~ 66.67%*	~~55.62%~~ 66.67%*	~~56.20%~~ 66.67%*	~~56.77%~~ 66.67%*	~~57.34%~~ 66.67%*	**66.67%***	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%
Two or More Races	~~48.20%~~ 44.45%	~~49.28%~~ 45.71%	~~50.36%~~ 46.97%	~~51.44%~~ 48.23%	~~52.52%~~ 49.49%	~~53.60%~~ 50.75%	~~54.68%~~ 52.01%	~~55.76%~~ 53.27%	~~56.84%~~ 54.53%	**55.79%**	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%
White	~~52.83%~~ 48.13%	~~53.39%~~ 49.02%	~~53.96%~~ 49.91%	~~54.52%~~ 50.81%	~~55.09%~~ 51.70%	~~55.65%~~ 52.59%	~~56.22%~~ 53.48%	~~56.78%~~ 54.37%	~~57.35%~~ 55.27%	56.16%	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%
Economically Disadvantaged	~~42.64%~~ 36.41%	~~44.34%~~ 38.47%	~~46.04%~~ 40.54%	~~47.73%~~ 42.60%	~~49.43%~~ 44.67%	~~51.13%~~ 46.73%	~~52.82%~~ 48.79%	~~54.52%~~ 50.86%	~~56.22%~~ 52.92%	54.99%	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%
English Learners	~~42.46%~~ 22.32%	~~44.18%~~ 25.79%	~~45.90%~~ 29.27%	~~47.61%~~ 32.74%	~~49.33%~~ 36.21%	~~51.05%~~ 39.69%	~~52.76%~~ 43.16%	~~54.48%~~ 46.63%	~~56.20%~~ 50.10%	53.58%	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%
Students with Disabilities	~~39.03%~~ 19.04%	~~41.13%~~ 22.84%	~~43.22%~~ 26.64%	~~45.32%~~ 30.44%	~~47.42%~~ 34.24%	~~49.52%~~ 38.05%	~~51.62%~~ 41.85%	~~53.72%~~ 45.65%	~~55.82%~~ 49.45%	**53.25%**	~~57.92%~~ 57.05%

*Note: Subgroups already meeting the long-term goal must improve current performance, both in interim and long-term goals

Math Growth Interim Targets by Subgroup

Student Group	~~2015-16~~ Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2016-17*~~ 2022-23*	~~2017-18*~~ 2023-24*	~~2018-19*~~ 2024-25*	~~2019-20*~~ 2025-26*	~~2020-21*~~ 2026-27*	~~2021-22*~~ 2027-28*	~~2022-23*~~ 2028-29*	~~2023-24*~~ 2029-30*	2030-31*	~~2024-25~~ Long term Goal (2031-32)*
All Students	~~All Students 21.80%~~	~~43.49%~~ 23.20%	~~44.29%~~ 24.60%	~~45.09%~~ 26.00 %	~~45.89%~~ 27.40%	~~46.70%~~ 28.80%	~~47.50%~~ 30.20%	~~48.30%~~ 31.60%	~~49.10%~~ 33.00%	34.40%	~~49.90%~~ 35.80%
American Indian or Alaska Native	~~American Indian or Alaska Native 7.14%~~	~~40.40%~~ 10.01%	~~41.54%~~ 12.87%	~~42.69%~~ 15.74%	~~43.83%~~ 18.60%	~~44.97%~~ 21.47%	~~46.12%~~ 24.34%	~~47.26%~~ 27.60%	~~48.41%~~ 30.07%	32.93%	~~49.55%~~ 35.80%
Asian	~~Asian~~	~~62.37%*~~ 50.01%*	~~62.37%*~~ 50.01%*	~~62.37%*~~ 50.01%*	~~62.37%*~~ 50.01%*	~~62.37%*~~ 50.01%*	~~62.37%*~~ 50.01%*	~~62.37%*~~ 50.01%*	~~62.37%*~~ 50.01%*	50.01%*	~~62.37%*~~ 35.80%*
Black or African American	~~Black or African American 7.42%~~	~~29.49%~~ 10.26%	~~31.85%~~ 13.10%	~~34.20%~~ 15.93%	~~36.56%~~ 18.77%	~~38.91%~~ 21.61%	~~41.27%~~ 24.45%	~~43.63%~~ 27.29%	~~45.98%~~ 30.12%	32.96%	~~48.34%~~ 35.80%
Hispanic or Latino	~~Hispanic or Latino 17.14%~~	~~37.56%~~ 19.01%	~~39.02%~~ 20.87%	~~40.48%~~ 22.74%	~~41.94%~~ 24.60%	~~43.40%~~ 26.47%	~~44.86%~~ 28.34%	~~46.32%~~ 30.20%	~~47.78%~~ 32.07%	33.93%	~~49.24%~~ 35.80%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander 14.29%~~	~~46.32%~~ 16.44%	~~46.81%~~ 18.59%	~~47.29%~~ 20.74%	~~47.78%~~ 22.89%	~~48.27%~~ 25.05%	~~48.75%~~ 27.20%	~~49.24%~~ 29.35%	~~49.72%~~ 31.50%	33.65%	~~50.21%~~ 35.80%
Two or More Races	~~Two or More Races 18.37%~~	~~41.58%~~ 20.11%	~~42.60%~~ 21.86%	~~43.61%~~ 23.60%	~~44.62%~~ 25.34%	~~45.63%~~ 27.09%	~~46.65%~~ 28.83%	~~47.66%~~ 30.57%	~~48.67%~~ 32.31%	34.06%	~~49.69%~~ 35.80%
White	~~White 25.76%~~	~~46.62%~~ 26.76%	~~47.07%~~ 27.77%	~~47.53%~~ 28.77%	~~47.98%~~ 29.78%	~~48.43%~~ 30.78%	~~48.89%~~ 31.78%	~~49.34%~~ 32.79%	~~49.79%~~ 33.79%	34.80%	~~50.24%~~ 35.80%
Economically Disadvantaged	~~Economically~~ 16.73%	~~35.58%~~ 18.64%	~~37.26%~~ 20.54%	~~38.94%~~ 22.45%	~~40.62%~~ 24.36%	~~42.30%~~ 26.27%	~~43.98%~~ 28.17%	~~45.66%~~ 30.08%	~~47.34%~~ 31.99%	33.89%	~~49.02%~~ 35.80%

Student Group	~~2015-16~~ Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2016-17*~~ 2022-23*	~~2017-18*~~ 2023-24*	~~2018-19*~~ 2024-25*	~~2019-20*~~ 2025-26*	~~2020-21*~~ 2026-27*	~~2021-22*~~ 2027-28*	~~2022-23*~~ 2028-29*	~~2023-24*~~ 2029-30*	2030-31*	~~2024-25~~ Long term Goal (2031-32)*
	~~Disadvantaged~~										
English Learners	~~36.96%~~ 0.40%	~~38.48%~~ 3.94%	~~40.01%~~ 7.48%	~~41.54%~~ 11.02%	~~43.06%~~ 14.56%	~~44.59%~~ 18.10%	~~46.12%~~ 21.64%	~~47.64%~~ 25.18%	~~49.17%~~ 28.72%	32.26%	~~50.70%~~ 35.80%
Students with Disabilities	~~33.38%~~ 9.76%	~~35.30%~~ 12.36%	~~37.23%~~ 14.97%	~~39.15%~~ 17.57%	~~41.08%~~ 20.18%	~~43.00%~~ 22.78%	~~44.92%~~ 25.38%	~~46.85%~~ 27.99%	~~48.77%~~ 30.59%	33.20%	~~50.70%~~ 35.80%

*Note: Subgroups already meeting the long-term goal must improve current performance, both in interim

138

and long-term goals

C. Graduation Rates

Graduation Rate Interim Goals – 4-Year Cohort

Student Group	~~2015-16~~ Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2016-17~~ 2022-23	~~2017-18~~ 2023-24	~~2018-19~~ 2024-25	~~2019-20~~ 2025-26	~~2020-21~~ 2026-27	~~2021-22~~ 2027-28	~~2022-23~~ 2028-29	~~2023-24~~ 2029-30	2030-31	~~2024-25~~ Long-term Goal (2031-32)
All Students	~~79.79%~~ 81.25%	~~81.41%~~ 82.43%	~~83.04%~~ 83.60%	~~84.67%~~ 84.78%	~~86.30%~~ 85.95%	~~87.93%~~ 87.13%	~~89.56%~~ 88.30%	~~91.19%~~ 89.48%	~~92.82%~~ 90.65%	91.83%	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
American Indian or Alaska Native	~~70.88%~~ 100%*	~~73.50%~~ 100%*	~~76.11%~~ 100%*	~~78.73%~~ 100%*	~~81.35%~~ 100%*	~~83.97%~~ 100%*	~~86.59%~~ 100%*	~~89.21%~~ 100%*	~~91.83%~~ 100%*	100%*	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
Asian	~~90.77%~~ 100%*	~~91.18%~~ 100%*	~~91.59%~~ 100%*	~~91.99%~~ 100%*	~~92.40%~~ 100%*	~~92.81%~~ 100%*	~~93.22%~~ 100%*	~~93.63%~~ 100%*	~~94.04%~~ 100%*	100%*	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
Black or African American	~~67.31%~~ 75.68%	~~70.32%~~ 77.41%	~~73.34%~~ 79.14%	~~76.35%~~ 80.88%	~~79.37%~~ 82.61%	~~82.38%~~ 84.34%	~~85.40%~~ 86.07%	~~88.41%~~ 87.80%	~~91.43%~~ 89.54%	91.27%	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
Hispanic or Latino	~~72.07%~~ 82.14%	~~74.55%~~ 83.23%	~~77.04%~~ 84.31%	~~79.53%~~ 85.40%	~~82.01%~~ 86.48%	~~84.50%~~ 87.57%	~~86.99%~~ 88.66%	~~89.47%~~ 89.74%	~~91.96%~~ 90.83%	91.91%	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~76.67%~~ 100%*	~~78.64%~~ 100%*	~~80.62%~~ 100%*	~~82.59%~~ 100%*	~~84.57%~~ 100%*	~~86.54%~~ 100%*	~~88.52%~~ 100%*	~~90.49%~~ 100%*	~~92.47%~~ 100%*	100%*	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
Two or More Races	~~74.74%~~ 86.36%	~~76.93%~~ 87.02%	~~79.12%~~ 87.69%	~~81.31%~~ 88.35%	~~83.50%~~ 89.02%	~~85.69%~~ 89.68%	~~87.88%~~ 90.34%	~~90.07%~~ 91.01%	~~92.26%~~ 91.67%	92.34%	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
White	~~83.48%~~ 82.84%	~~84.70%~~ 83.86%	~~85.92%~~ 84.87%	~~87.14%~~ 85.89%	~~88.35%~~ 86.90%	~~89.57%~~ 87.92%	~~90.79%~~ 88.94%	~~92.01%~~ 89.95%	~~93.23%~~ 90.97%	91.98%	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
Economically Disadvantaged	~~67.48%~~ 74.55%	~~70.48%~~ 76.40%	~~73.47%~~ 78.24%	~~76.47%~~ 80.09%	~~79.46%~~ 81.93%	~~82.46%~~ 83.78%	~~85.46%~~ 85.62%	~~88.45%~~ 87.47%	~~91.45%~~ 89.31%	91.16%	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
English Learners	~~72.14%~~ 80.56%	~~74.62%~~ 81.80%	~~77.09%~~ 83.05%	~~79.57%~~ 84.29%	~~82.05%~~ 85.54%	~~84.53%~~ 86.78%	~~87.01%~~ 88.02%	~~89.49%~~ 89.27%	~~91.97%~~ 90.51%	91.76%	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%
Students with Disabilities	~~57.12%~~ 57.14%	~~61.27%~~ 60.73%	~~65.42%~~ 64.31%	~~69.56%~~ 67.90%	~~73.71%~~ 71.48%	~~77.86%~~ 75.07%	~~82.00%~~ 78.66%	~~86.15%~~ 82.24%	~~90.30%~~ 85.83%	89.41%	~~94.44%~~ 93.00%

Graduation Rate Goals – 5 Year Cohort

Student Group	~~2015-16~~ Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2016-17~~ 2022-23	~~2017-18~~ 2023-24	~~2018-19~~ 2024-25	~~2019-20~~ 2025-26	~~2020-21~~ 2026-27	~~2021-22~~ 2027-28	~~2022-23~~ 2028-29	~~2023-24~~ 2029-30	2030-31	~~2024-25~~ Long-term Goal (2031-32)
All Students	~~81.99%~~ 87.50%	~~83.60%~~ 88.33%	~~85.21%~~ 89.15%	~~86.82%~~ 89.98%	~~88.43%~~ 90.80%	~~90.04%~~ 91.63%	~~91.66%~~ 92.46%	~~93.27%~~ 93.28%	~~94.88%~~ 94.11%	94.93%	~~96.49%~~ 95.76%
American Indian or Alaska Native	~~70.58%~~ 100%*	~~73.46%~~ 100%*	~~76.34%~~ 100%*	~~79.22%~~ 100%*	~~82.10%~~ 100%*	~~84.98%~~ 100%*	~~87.85%~~ 100%*	~~90.73%~~ 100%*	~~93.61%~~ 100%*	100%*	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%
Asian	~~91.81%~~ 100%*	~~92.33%~~ 100%*	~~92.85%~~ 100%*	~~93.37%~~ 100%*	~~93.89%~~ 100%*	~~94.41%~~ 100%*	~~94.93%~~ 100%*	~~95.45%~~ 100%*	~~95.97%~~ 100%*	100%*	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%
Black or African American	~~69.36%~~ 87.50%	~~72.38%~~ 88.33%	~~75.39%~~ 89.15%	~~78.40%~~ 89.98%	~~81.42%~~ 90.80%	~~84.43%~~ 91.63%	~~87.45%~~ 92.46%	~~90.46%~~ 93.28%	~~93.48%~~ 94.11%	94.93%	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%
Hispanic or Latino	~~73.68%~~ 88.24%	~~76.22%~~ 88.99%	~~78.75%~~ 89.74%	~~81.28%~~ 90.50%	~~83.82%~~ 91.25%	~~86.35%~~ 92.00%	~~88.89%~~ 92.75%	~~91.42%~~ 93.50%	~~93.96%~~ 94.26%	95.01%	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	~~76.15%~~ 100%*	~~78.41%~~ 100%*	~~80.67%~~ 100%*	~~82.93%~~ 100%*	~~85.19%~~ 100%*	~~87.45%~~ 100%*	~~89.71%~~ 100%*	~~91.97%~~ 100%*	~~94.23%~~ 100%*	100%*	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%
Two or More Races	~~78.54%~~ 100%*	~~80.53%~~ 100%*	~~82.53%~~ 100%*	~~84.52%~~ 100%*	~~86.52%~~ 100%*	~~88.51%~~ 100%*	~~90.51%~~ 100%	~~92.50%~~ 100%*	~~94.50%~~ 100%*	100%*	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%
White	~~85.75%~~ 88.14%	~~86.95%~~ 88.90%	~~88.14%~~ 89.66%	~~89.33%~~ 90.43%	~~90.52%~~ 91.19%	~~91.72%~~ 91.95%	~~92.91%~~ 92.71%	~~94.10%~~ 93.47%	~~95.30%~~ 94.24%	95.00%	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%
Economically Disadvantaged	~~71.51%~~ 81.58%	~~74.28%~~ 83.00%	~~77.06%~~ 84.42%	~~79.84%~~ 85.83%	~~82.61%~~ 87.25%	~~85.39%~~ 88.67%	~~88.16%~~ 90.09%	~~90.94%~~ 91.51%	~~93.72%~~ 92.92%	94.34%	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%
English Learners	~~76.84%~~ 86.21%	~~79.03%~~ 87.17%	~~81.21%~~ 88.12%	~~83.39%~~ 89.08%	~~85.58%~~ 90.03%	~~87.76%~~ 90.99%	~~89.94%~~ 91.94%	~~92.13%~~ 92.90%	~~94.31%~~ 93.85%	94.81%	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%
Students with Disabilities	~~62.24%~~ 68.18%	~~66.05%~~ 70.94%	~~69.85%~~ 73.70%	~~73.66%~~ 76.45%	~~77.46%~~ 79.21%	~~81.27%~~ 81.97%	~~85.08%~~ 84.73%	~~88.88%~~ 87.49%	~~92.69%~~ 90.24%	93.00%	~~95.76%~~ 96.49%

Graduation Rate Goals – 6-year Cohort

Student Group	2015-16 Baseline Value (2021-22)	2016-17 2022-23	2017-18 2023-24	2018-19 2024-25	2019-20 2025-26	2020-21 2026-27	2021-22 2027-28	2022-23 2028-29	2023-24 2029-30	2030-31	2024-25 Long-term Goal (2031-32)
All Students	81.25% 89.80%	83.00% 90.45%	84.75% 91.11%	86.50% 91.76%	88.25% 92.42%	90.00% 93.07%	91.75% 93.72%	93.50% 94.38%	95.25% 95.03%	95.69%	97.00% 96.34%
American Indian or Alaska Native	68.50% 100%*	71.67% 100%*	74.83% 100%*	78.00% 100%*	81.17% 100%*	84.33% 100%*	87.50% 100%*	90.67% 100%*	93.83% 100%*	100%*	96.34% 97.00%
Asian	90.97% 100%*	91.64% 100%*	92.31% 100%*	92.98% 100%*	93.65% 100%*	94.32% 100%*	94.99% 100%*	95.66% 100%*	96.33% 100%*	100%*	96.34% 97.00%
Black or African American	66.63% 90.27%	70.00% 90.88%	73.38% 91.48%	76.75% 92.09%	80.13% 92.70%	83.50% 93.31%	86.88% 93.91%	90.25% 94.52%	93.63% 95.13%	95.73%	96.34% 97.00%
Hispanic or Latino	73.49% 90.38%	76.10% 90.98%	78.71% 91.57%	81.33% 92.17%	83.94% 92.76%	86.55% 93.36%	89.16% 93.96%	91.78% 94.55%	94.39% 95.15%	95.74%	96.34% 97.00%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	76.92% 100%*	79.15% 100%*	81.38% 100%*	83.61% 100%*	85.84% 100%*	88.08% 100%*	90.31% 100%*	92.54% 100%*	94.77% 100%*	100%*	96.34% 97.00%

Student Group	2015-16 Baseline Value (2021-22)	2016-17 2022-23	2017-18 2023-24	2018-19 2024-25	2019-20 2025-26	2020-21 2026-27	2021-22 2027-28	2022-23 2028-29	2023-24 2029-30	2030-31	2024-25 Long-term Goal (2031-32)
Two or More Races	79.36% 100%*	81.32% 100%*	83.28% 100%*	85.24% 100%*	87.20% 100%*	89.16% 100%*	91.12% 100%*	93.08% 100%*	95.04% 100%*	100%*	97.00% 96.34%
White	85.71% 91.30%	86.96% 91.80%	88.22% 92.31%	89.47% 92.81%	90.73% 93.32%	91.98% 93.82%	93.24% 94.32%	94.49% 94.83%	95.75% 95.33%	95.84%	96.34% 97.00%
Economically Disadvantaged	71.01% 85.11%	73.90% 86.23%	76.79% 87.36%	79.67% 88.48%	82.56% 89.60%	85.45% 90.73%	88.34% 91.85%	91.22% 92.97%	94.11% 94.09%	95.22%	96.34% 97.00%
English Learners	76.14% 89.47%	78.46% 90.16%	80.78% 90.84%	83.09% 91.53%	85.41% 92.22%	87.73% 92.91%	90.05% 93.59%	92.36% 94.28%	94.68% 94.97%	95.65%	96.34% 97.00%
Students with Disabilities	63.41% 73.68%	67.14% 75.95%	70.87% 78.21%	74.61% 80.48%	78.34% 82.74%	82.07% 85.01%	85.80% 87.28%	89.54% 89.54%	93.27% 91.81%	94.07%	96.34% 97.00%

D. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

English Learner Progress Interim Targets

Student Group	~~2015-16~~ Baseline Value (2021-22)	~~2016-17~~ 2022-23	~~2017-18~~ 2023-24	~~2018-19~~ 2024-25	~~2019-20~~ 2025-26	~~2020-21~~ 2026-27	~~2021-22~~ 2027-28	~~2022-23~~ 2028-29	~~2023-24~~ 2029-30	2030-31	~~2024-25~~ Long-term Goal (2031-32)
English Learners	~~46.41%~~ 23.07%	~~47.84%~~ 25.10%	~~49.27%~~ 27.12%	~~50.69%~~ 29.15%	~~52.12%~~ 31.17%	~~53.55%~~ 33.20%	~~54.98%~~ 35.23%	~~56.40%~~ 37.25%	~~57.83%~~ 39.28%	41.30%	~~59.26%~~ 43.33%

Appendix B: School Accountability Report Card Options

The Report Card examples provided with the original plan submission will be revised through a process of stakeholder engagement, involving extensive parent input over the coming months. The examples previously provided are no longer current and have been deleted from the plan..

Appendix C: English Learner Data Sources

Motamedi, J. (2015). Time to reclassification: How long does it take English learner students in Washington Road Map districts to develop English proficiency?, Education Northwest. Available at: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northwest/pdf/REL_2015092.pdf

Thompson, K. (2015). English Learners' Time to Reclassification: An Analysis. Educational Policy, SAGE Publications. Available at: http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/57224/ThompsonKarenEducationEnglishLearnersTimeReclassification.pdf?sequence=1.

Umansky, I. & Reardon, S. (2014). Reclassification Patterns Among Latino English Learner Students in Bilingual, Dual Immersion, and English Immersion Classrooms, American Educational Research Journal, 51, 879-912.

Appendix D: Additional Indicator Data Sources

Chronic Absenteeism Research Sources

Murphy. E. (2016, August 21). Iowa educators tackle chronic absenteeism among young students, Students who fall behind early struggle later. The Gazette (Cedar Rapids, Iowa), p 1-7. Retrieved August 23, 2016 from http://www.thegazette.com/subject/news/education/k-12-education/iowa-educators-tackle-chronic-absenteeism-among-young-students-20160821

Attendance Works. (2016, September). Preventing Missed Opportunity: Taking Collective Action to Confront Chronic Absence. Attendance Works and Everyone Graduates Center.

Balfanz, R., & Byrnes, Vaughan. (2012, May). The Importance of Being in School: A Report on Absenteeism in the Nation's Public Schools. The John Hopkins University, on behalf of the Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Utah Education Policy Center (2012, July). Research Brief: Chronic Absenteeism. Retrieved August 23, 2016 from http://uepc.edu.utah.edu.

Bruner, B., Discher, A., & Chang, H. (2011, November). Chronic Absenteeism: A Problem Hidden in Plain Sight. Attendance Works and Child & Family Policy Center. Retrieved August 23, 2016 from http://www.attendanceworks.org.

Brown, E. (2015). Report: Chronic school absenteeism is contributing to academic gaps. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com.

Heim, J. (2016). American schools have a chronic absent problem. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com.

Coelho, R., Fisher, S., McNight, F., Matteson, S., & Schwartz, T. (2015). The effects of early chronic absenteeism on third-grade academic achievement measures. Presented at the Workshop in Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

School Libraries/School Library Media Specialists Research Sources

Many of these studies are also summarized at Library Research Service: https://www.lrs.org/data-tools/school-libraries/impact-studies

Scholastic. (2016). School Libraries Work! A Compendium of Research Supporting the Effectiveness of School Libraries. Scholastic Library Publishing. (retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-Ra2pklkx7EaGlZMUtyUjR1WEk/view?usp=sharing)

Rodney, M. J., Lance, K. C., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2003). The impact of Michigan school librarians on academic achievement: Kids who have libraries succeed. Retrieved from Reseach Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/239605101_The_Impact_of_Michigan_School_Librarians_on_Academic_Achievement_Kids_Who_Have_Libraries_Succeed

Coker, E. (2015). Certified Teacher-Librarians, Library Quality and Student Achievement in Washington State Public Schools: The Washington State School Library Impact Study. Washington Library Media Association (WLMA). Retrieved from

https://fopsl.files.wordpress.com/2012/01/certified-teacher-librarians-library-quality-and-student-achievement-in-washington-state-public-schools.pdf

Neuman, SB & Celano, D. (2001). Access to Print in Low-Income and Middle-Income Communities: An Ecological Study of Four Neighborhoods. R*eading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No. 1. (Jan.-Feb.-Mar., 2001), pp. 8-26. Retrieved from http://www-personal.umich.edu/~sbneuman/pdf/AccessToPrint.pdf

Kachel, Debra E., $ Lance, K.C. (2013, April). Latest Study: A full-time school librarian makes a critical difference in boosting student achievement. School Libraries Journal. Retrieved from http://www.slj.com/2013/03/research/librarian-required-a-new-study-shows-that-a-full-time-school-librarian-makes-a-critical-difference-in-boosting-student-achievement/#_

Dow, M. J., Lakin, J. M., & Court, S. C. (2012). School librarian staffing levels and student achievement as represented in 2006-2009 Kansas Annual Yearly Progress data. School Library Research, 2012(15), 1-15. Retrieved from ERIC database: http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ994364

Lance, K. C., & Hofschire, L. (2012, January). Change in school librarian staffing linked with change in CSAP reading performance, 2005 to 2011 [Closer Look]. Retrieved from Library Research Service website: http://www.lrs.org/documents/closer_look/CO4_2012_Closer_Look_Report.pdf

Francis, B. H., Lance, K. C., & Lietzau, Z. (2010, November). School librarians continue to help students achieve standards: The third Colorado study [Closer Look]. Retrieved from Library Research Service website: http://www.lrs.org/documents/closer_look/CO3_2010_Closer_Look_Report.pdf

Lance, K. C., Rodney, M. J., & Hamilton-Pennell, C. (2000, April). How school librarians help kids achieve standards: The second Colorado study [Executive summary]. Retrieved from Library Research Service website: http://www.lrs.org/documents/lmcstudies/CO/execsumm.pdf

Dow, M. J., Lakin, J. M., & Court, S. C. (2012). School librarian staffing levels and student achievement as represented in 2006-2009 Kansas Annual Yearly Progress data. School Library Research, 2012(15), 1-15. Retrieved from ERIC database: http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ994364

Barack, L. (2012, March). Full-time school librarians linked to higher student reading scores. School Library Journal. Retrieved from http://www.slj.com/2011/09/industry-news/something-to-shout-about-new-research-shows-that-more-librarians-means-higher-reading-scores/

Haycock, K. (2011). Connecting British Columbia (Canada) school libraries and student achievement: A comparison of higher and lower performing schools with similar overall funding. School Libraries Worldwide, 17(1), 37-50. Retrieved from Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts database. (Accession No. 57626812)

Kachel, D. E., & graduate students of LSC 5530, School Library Advocacy, spring 2011, Mansfield University. (2013). School library research summarized: A graduate class project. Unpublished manuscript, School Library & Information Technologies Department, Mansfield University, Mansfield, PA. Retrieved from Mansfield University website: http://sl-it.mansfield.edu/current-students/school-library-impact-studies-project.cfm

Jones, J. B., & Zambone, A. M. (2008). The power of the media specialist to improve academic achievement and strengthen at-risk students. Columbus, OH: Linworth Books. Retrieved from https://fopsl.files.wordpress.com/2012/01/certified-teacher-librarians-library-quality-and-student-achievement-in-washington-state-public-schools.pdf

Arts Access/Participation Research Sources

ArtsEdSearch, Students-Policy Recommendations. Arts Education Partnership (AEP). http://www.artsedsearch.org/students/policy-implications

Catterall, James S. (2009). *Doing well and doing good by doing art: The effects of education in the visual and performing arts on the achievements and values of young adults.* Los Angeles/London: Imagination Group/I-Group Books.

Catterall, J. S., Dumais, S. A., & Hampden-Thompson, G. (2012). The arts and achievement in at-risk youth: Findings from four longitudinal studies. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.

Craig, D. & Paraiso, J. (2008). Dual Diaspora and barrio art: Art as an avenue for learning English. *Journal for Learning through the Arts*, 4(1).

Eason, B. J. A., & Johnson, C. M. (2013). Prelude: Music Makes Us baseline research report. Nashville, TN: Metro Nashville Public Schools.

Elpus, K. (2013). Arts education and positive youth development: Cognitive, behavioral, and social outcomes of adolescents who study the arts. National Endowment for the Arts.

Nelson, C. A. (2001). The arts and education reform: Lessons from a four-year evaluation of the A+ schools program, 1995-1999. (Executive Summary of the series of seven Policy Reports Summarizing the Four-Year Pilot of A+ Schools in North Carolina). Thomas S. Kenan Institute for the Arts, Winston-Salem, NC.[1]

Respress, T., & Lutfi, G. (2006). Whole brain learning: The fine arts with students at risk. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 15(1), 24-31

Southgate, D.E. & Roscigno, V.J. (2009). The impact of music on childhood and adolescent achievement. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90(1): 4-21.

Thomas. M. K., Singh, P. & Klopfenstein, K. (2015). Arts education and the high school dropout problem. Journal of Cultural Economics, 39 (4): 327-339

"First in the nation: Arts Education included in the Just Released New Jersey School Performance Reports." New Jersey Arts Education Partnership, 2015.

Physical Education Research Sources

Active Education: Physical Education, Physical Activity and Academic Performance. (2009) Research Brief by Active Living Research, a national program of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Retrieved from: http://activelivingresearch.org/files/ALR_Brief_ActiveEducation_Summer2009.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2010). *The association between school based physical activity, including physical education, and academic performance.* Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Kohl III, H.W. & Cook, H.D. Editors. (2013) *Educating the Student Body: Taking Physical Activity and Physical Education to School*.; Committee on Physical Activity and Physical Education in the School Environment; Food and Nutrition Board; Institute of Medicine. Washington D.C.: The National Academies Press, 2013. Available at: http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=18314 . Accessed: March 29, 2017.

Trost, S.G. & van der Mars, H. "Why We Should Not Cut P.E." (2009/2010). Educational Leadership, December 2009/January 2010, Volume 67, Number 4. Health and Learning, Pages 60-65.

SHAPE America. National standards and grade-level outcomes for K-12 physical education. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics. SHAPE America; 2014.

Additional research on academic achievement and physical activity presented by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is available at *www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/ health_and_academics/index.htm*.

Advanced Coursework Research Sources

Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2010). Up to the challenge: The role of career and technical education and 21st Century Skills in college and career readiness. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research, College and Career Readiness and Success Center. Retrieved from http://www.p21.org/storage/documents/CTE_Oct2010.pdf

Aulls, M.W. & Lemay, D. (2013). *Exploring the learning benefits and outcomes of the IB extended essay in preparing students for university studies in Canada (two phases).* Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, McGill University.

Castellano, M., Sundell, M., Overman, L., Richardson, G., & Stone III, J. (2014). Rigorous tests of student outcomes in CTE programs of study: Final Report. Louisville, KY: National Center for Career and Teachnical Educaiton.

College and Career Readiness & Success Center. (2013). How career and technical education can help students be college and career ready: A primer. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from http://www.ccrscenter.org/products-resources/how-career-and-technical-education-can-help-students-be-college-and-career-ready.

Dougherty, C., Mellor, C., & Shuling, J. (2005). The relationship between Advanced Placement and college graduation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 519 365).

Inkelas, K.K., Swan, A., Pretlow, J., & Jones, J. (2013). Exploring the benefits of the International Baccalaureate extended essay for university study at the University of Virginia. Charlottesville, Virginia, USA. Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, University of Virginia.

Mattern, K., Marini, J., & Shaw, E. (2013). Are AP Studdents More Likely to Graduate from College on Time? Research Report 2013-15. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 556 464).

Mattern, K., Shaw, E., & Ewing, M. (2011). Is AP exam participation and performance related to choice of college major? (College Board Research Report No. 2011-4). New York: The College Board.

Morgan, R. & Klaric, J. (2007). AP Students in college: An analysis of five-year academic careers. (College Board Research Report No 2007-4). New York: The College Board.

Murphy, D. & Dodd, B. (2009) A comparison of college performance of matched AP and non-AP student groups. (College Board Research Report No. 2009-6). New York: The College Board.

Postsecondary Enrollment Research Sources

Horn, L., Cataldi, E.F., and Sikora, A. (2005). Waiting to Attend College: Undergraduates Who Delay Their Postsecondary Enrollment (NCES 2005–152). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Carnevale, Anthony P, et al. "*Recovery: Job Growth and Education Requirements Through 2020.*" CEW Georgetown, Georgetown Public Policy Institute, 26 June 2013, cew.georgetown.edu/cew-reports/recovery-job-growth-and-education-requirements-through-2020/.

Ma, Jennifer, et al. "*Education Pays.*" *Education Pays - Trends in Higher Education*, The College Board, Dec. 2016, trends.collegeboard.org/education-pays.

Appendix E: Summary of Stakeholder Engagement Activities in the Development of Michigan's ESSA Plan

Throughout the development of Michigan's Plan for the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has sought the input and participation of stakeholders in the process. This input has taken many forms, both in-person and virtual, and respondents spanned multiple perspectives representing individuals, organizations, and all regions of the state.

Michigan's Journey

Phase 1

Strategic Vision Development
- Top 10 in 10
- Vision committees (accountability, assessment, funding)

Phase 2

Initial Plan Development
- May-December 2016
- Cycles of development and feedback

Phase 3

Finalize and Submit
- December 2016-April 2017
- Public comment
- Interact with federal guidance

Phase 4

Implementation
- Official USED plan submitted Spring 2017;
- Implementation planning beginning now

PHASE 1 – STRATEGIC VISION DEVELOPMENT

The initial visioning for Michigan's ESSA plan began with State Superintendent Brian Whiston's call for input on the state's Top 10 in 10 plan – asking respondents to share key priorities and activities needed in order for Michigan to become a top 10 education state within the next 10 years. This work also included a review of the strategies used by states and countries with leading education systems, including the strategies outlined in the National Institute for School Leadership's *9 Building Blocks for a World Class Education.*

In response to our invitation for ideas, more than 30 education stakeholder organizations presented their ideas to the State Board of Education, with an additional 765 individuals responding to an online public input survey, which generated nearly 4,200 recommendations. State staff pulled this input together to create the Top 10 in 10 guiding goals and principles, approved by the State Board of Education in December 2015. Additional stakeholder input informed the effort to define and refine the strategies recommended to accomplish the goals. Top 10 in 10 information is available at: www.michigan.gov/top10in10.

Additionally, the State Superintendent convened external stakeholders to serve on three vision committees around the topics of Accountability, Assessment, and School Funding.

Having already received this valuable input throughout 2015-16 through the Top 10 in 10 visioning process, MDE opted not to create a duplicative structure when the ESSA law was enacted, but rather build upon the work already underway through the Top 10 in 10 initiative. The recommendations from

each of these efforts formed the starting point for several aspects of the state's ESSA vision and shaped the direction and focus of the ESSA work.

PHASE 2 – INITIAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT

This phase is where much of Michigan's ESSA stakeholder activity has taken place. The MDE adopted a multi-pronged approach, meeting with and presenting to large and small groups and organizations throughout the process. An overview of these activities is described below.

EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN FORMAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW

The MDE created a formal structure to oversee its ESSA plan development process, as illustrated in the chart at right.

In addition to the internal review and development structures shown in this graphic, external stakeholders were represented on the nine Action Teams, led by department staff and including both internal and external topical experts, formed to review the new law and make recommendations for several specific aspects of the state plan.

Those Action Teams were:

- Accountability System – Technical
- Additional Indicator of School Quality and Transparency Dashboard
- Assessment Implementation
- Communications and Outreach
- Fiscal
- Innovative Assessment Pilot
- Teacher and Leader Quality
- Using Data to Inform Instruction and Leadership

Each Action Team's web page includes a link to background information on the Action Team, its initial charge, and a list of internal and external members of the team, as well as any subsequent reports or recommendations from that team.

The Action Teams met frequently (some as often as weekly), reviewing the committee's charge, related sections of the ESSA law, current practices, and input received through visioning committees, as well as conducting research and discussing options for recommendations to the state plan. As the work continued, the teams developed survey questions seeking broader stakeholder input and reviewed the responses received via those surveys.

External stakeholders also served on two larger committees charged with providing input on the combined recommendations of the Action Teams and the overall state plan. They were:

- The Tactical Review Committee, whose members included representatives from local and intermediate school districts, as well as state organizations representing partners in the educational system, such as school nurses, social workers, librarians, and paraprofessionals, other state agencies, and many others whose expertise spanned multiple aspects of the ESSA plan.
- The External Advisory Committee, comprising representatives of education associations, legislative leaders, the Governor's office, representatives of business and higher education, state advocacy organizations, and other state agencies with primary roles in the state's education system.

The Tactical Review and External Advisory Committees met monthly, initially reviewing and providing input on the overall structure of the work, and later looking at specific aspects of the Action Teams' work, often focusing on one or two topic areas in more depth and providing input to MDE staff.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

One of the first stakeholder engagement efforts was the creation of a new ESSA page on the MDE's website (www.michigan.gov/essa), which was used to share Information related to the state's process for developing the plan with the public. Its key sections include: State Plan Development materials, such as draft recommendations, vision documents, Action Team information and work products, and any presentations made to the State Board of Education; ESSA Resources, including links to the law itself and resources and guidance from MDE and the U.S. Department of Education (USED); opportunities to Get Involved in the ESSA plan development process by joining virtual focus groups, participating in online surveys, learning of other feedback opportunities, or signing up to receive ESSA updates; and ESSA Notes, which contains archived versions of all ESSA Notes newsletters.

ESSA Notes newsletters, with an email distribution list of more than 3,400 subscribers, were sent whenever new opportunities for feedback or information on the plan development process was available. As the work progressed, a new edition of the newsletter was produced approximately every two weeks. Articles included information related to both state and federal activities and guidance around plan development, updates on opportunities to provide input, and status reports on Action Team activities.

ROUND ONE STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

As the work progressed and each Action Team developed preliminary recommendations or concepts, broader stakeholder input was sought in the form of an online survey, open for several weeks in August 2016. Notification of its posting was shared via the e-newsletter ESSA Notes, the MDE's weekly communication to schools and districts, the e-newsletter Spotlight on Assessments, and by education partners via notices in their member publications, as well as through staff presentations to the State Board of Education and other organizations. More than 1,100 individuals responded to the survey, which included questions on Accountability, Assessments, Supports for Students and Schools, Teacher and Leader Quality, and Using Data to Inform Instruction related to the ESSA recommendations. Results were analyzed by topic by the Action Team leads, and responses then informed the future direction of the committees' work. Detailed analysis of each survey was made available online:

- [Accountability System-Technical/Additional Indicator of School Quality and Transparency Dashboard (combined results)](#)
- [Assessment Implementation](#)
- [Innovative Assessments](#)
- [Supports](#)
- [Teacher and Leader Quality](#)
- [Using Data to Inform Instruction and Leadership](#)

OUTREACH TO STAKEHOLDERS VIA TARGETED FOCUS GROUPS AND CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Throughout the plan development process, the MDE team was invited to present on ESSA at conferences, association meetings, and other venues. More than 40 presentations to groups ranging from ten people to more than 500 were given. Typically, there was opportunity for attendees to ask questions and provide input to the presenter.

In November, MDE staff led a half-day session with more than 100 members of local school boards to share details of the recommendations and seek input. These responses were shared with the relevant Action Team Lead or staff member for further consideration.

Presentations were made to all of the major education associations, and the State Superintendent provided regular updates and engaged in discussion with association leaders at their monthly Education Alliance meeting.

Several groups with interest in the ESSA plan development approached MDE seeking an opportunity to share input from their members' perspectives. We considered these *targeted focus groups*. These took the form of a meeting with multiple members of the group or organization in attendance, in focused discussion with MDE staff, to learn of their unique interests and concerns and discuss ways in which they might be addressed as part of the ESSA plan. Follow-up meetings with many of the groups will be held during the formal public comment process to outline where/how their input has been incorporated into the final plan or implementation activities. In many cases, additional input during the implementation phase will be sought, to assure continued alignment.

Groups with specific interest in meeting to discuss their feedback on ESSA included school librarians, representatives of Michigan's Math and Science Center Network, arts education associations, student advocacy groups, parents of and organizations representing foster and homeless youth in the state, Michigan's 12 federally recognized tribes, and several civil rights organizations (the latter two described in more detail below).

The MDE has committed to ongoing dialog with representatives of these various groups throughout the implementation phase of the ESSA plan.

TRIBAL CONSULTATION

Federally recognized tribal organizations are listed as one of the groups for whom engagement and consultation is required. This fit well with a developing Indigenous Education Initiative (IEI) that had recently been convened within the Department and the Governor's 2012 executive order requiring each

state agency to identify a liaison to coordinate departmental efforts related to Tribal-State affairs. Members of the ESSA planning team worked with the liaison and the IEI staff to convene several consultation meetings with representatives from Michigan's 12 federally recognized tribes and their education associations, and through this process have created agreement to continue working together to provide guidance to state education agency (SEA) and local education agency (LEA) staff regarding ESSA consultation requirements and service to Native American children and their families.

As a results of these preliminary discussions, MDE has taken the following actions:

- Integrated references to tribal education departments throughout all foundational plan documents, to represent this commitment;
- Committed to quarterly consultation between the SEA and the federally recognized tribes;
- Committed to developing processes to engage in 1:1 consultation between the SEA and each federally recognized tribe individually;
- Adopted as guidance the Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors "Guidance to Michigan Department of Education Regarding Tribal Consultation in the Every Student Succeeds Act," with plans to use this as the core document to motivate consultation work between the SEA and the tribes as well as LEAs and tribes.

W.K. KELLOGG AND STEELCASE FOUNDATION GRANTS TO SUPPORT OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT EFFORTS

In partnership with the Council of Michigan Foundations (CMF), MDE sought grant funds from Michigan-based foundations to support the ESSA plan development process. The W.K. Kellogg Foundation awarded CMF/MDE $175,000 and the Steelcase Foundation provided a $10,000 match to foster stakeholder engagement efforts around ESSA and Michigan's Top 10 in 10 initiative, with a focus on outreach to parents and traditionally underserved communities and groups. Because of the timing of the awards, much of MDE's stakeholder engagement was already underway when the funds were received, so the funds are planned to be used for stakeholder engagement during the implementation phase of the plan, as well as in the later stages of plan development.

The MDE and CMF have contracted with Lansing-based Public Policy Associates to assist in these targeted outreach efforts. Details of these activities are described throughout this report.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND SCHOOL JUSTICE ORGANIZATIONS

Recognizing the importance of engagement with civil rights organizations in the development of the ESSA plan, the MDE used a portion of the grant funds provided through the W.K. Kellogg and Steelcase Foundations to partner with Public Policy Associates to convene a focus group of representatives from multiple civil rights organizations throughout the state. The draft recommendations were shared with the group, and MDE staff engaged in facilitated dialog with attendees to discuss their overall thoughts on improving the state's educational system and feedback on the draft plan. Following the discussion, participants were asked to prioritize areas of focus from the ideas generated during discussion. A key topic of discussion was the importance of increasing student voice and stakeholder participation and

access to decision-making processes, coupled with a strong passion to break down silos within state government entities to coordinate mutual areas of work with students and their families.

At their request, all meeting attendees were added to the ESSA Notes email list, and invited to take part in future opportunities for stakeholder input. In direct response to this discussion, MDE added the collection of student suspension and expulsion data to its proposal for the transparency dashboard recommendation, and will be seeking additional feedback from these groups during the development phase of the transparency dashboard. On a broader scale, MDE leadership has begun outreach to other state agencies to facilitate increased partnership in certain areas of work, including the Partnership District concept.

Civil Rights organizations also provided input through the Michigan Students Succeed Coalition, a coalition of multiple state organizations (including civil rights and student advocacy groups) formed to share collective input on the ESSA plan. MDE staff, including the State Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent, met with representatives of the Coalition during the second phase of stakeholder input to discuss more detailed aspects of the plan recommendations and seek input from group members. A summary of this discussion was shared with MDE leadership and in addition to being considered for ESSA plan development, will be used to guide the department's work going forward, with the goal of continued engagement.

PARENT SURVEY

In partnership with an ongoing Student Voices initiative within MDE's Office of Education Improvement and Innovation, MDE partnered with YouGov to conduct a survey that ran during October-November 2016, aimed at parents of P-12 students, seeking thoughts and input on issues that related to aspects of the ESSA plan. The opportunity to participate was shared via ESSA Notes and the ESSA webpage, as well as directly to those who volunteered for the Parent virtual focus group and shared by stakeholder organizations. Additionally, the opportunity was reported in several media outlets. More than 1,700 Michigan parents of children under 18 responded. Parents were asked for their opinions on what is needed for their student to receive a great education, information deemed important to determine school quality, thoughts on why some schools are underperforming, who is responsible for student academic achievement, equity of distribution for education resources across the state, level of understanding of education terms and concepts, confidence with their own child's school, and opinions and use of results on statewide assessments. An analysis of that survey was provided to the MDE, in which responses were reported both in aggregate, as well as compared across income levels and noting where responses varied across those groups.

This analysis was provided to MDE in December and was shared with Action Team Leads and other MDE staff, including those working on the ESSA plan. One of the findings of the survey was that responding parents supported the concept of MDE placing emphasis on helping teachers and aligning resources to support schools deemed as low-performing, which aligns well with the Partnership District concept. Additionally, respondents listed as most important to school quality: school safety; student achievement as determined by graduation rates, post-secondary enrollment, and the presence of art and music classes. This input, along with that received from other stakeholder groups, led to the addition of *time spent in arts, music, and physical education courses* as one of the components of the school quality and

student success accountability indicator, and the consideration of other factors for inclusion on MDE's proposed Transparency Dashboard.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Throughout the plan development, information has been shared with and input gathered from members of the State Board of Education (SBE) via weekly email updates on ESSA plan development activities and formal presentations at SBE meetings. There will have been six presentations to the SBE, culminating in the presentation that will serve as the start of the official public comment period for Michigan's draft plan. Additionally, the ESSA vision and plan have been discussed at the SBE's Annual Retreat, at an orientation session for newly-elected members, in multiple discussions with individual board members, and during a special meeting convened just prior to the launch of formal public comment. This special meeting on February 6, 2017 provided more detailed information about the proposals to board members, answered their questions about the plan and timeline, and garnered feedback to inform the final draft. The 30-day formal public comment period on the ESSA draft plan launched with the February 14, 2017 presentation of the plan to the SBE. An update on public comment received to-date was presented to the SBE at its March 14, 2017 meeting.

LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BRANCH INVOLVEMENT

State legislative leadership, as well as chairs of the House and Senate education policy committees and education-related appropriations subcommittees, were invited to join the ESSA External Advisory Committee (EAC), which convened monthly to review and provide input on the ESSA plan. Several legislators or their designees participated regularly in these meetings.

Other legislative engagement involved the State Superintendent or Deputy Superintendent (ESSA Lead) providing testimony on various aspects of ESSA or the ESSA components to legislative committees, as well as numerous one-on-one meetings with legislators by the State Superintendent and MDE staff. During the formal public comment period, the State Superintendent and department staff met in one-on-one meetings with members of the state legislature. Testimony was provided at several state House and Senate committees related to the draft ESSA plan.

Throughout the plan process, the State Superintendent met regularly with the Governor and his education advisors, providing updates on aspects of the vision and plan and seeking input and feedback. A member of Governor Rick Snyder's team also served on the External Advisory Committee and provided regular feedback verbally and in writing.

Additionally, the Deputy Superintendent, serving as the ESSA lead, met monthly with the governor's education advisor to discuss the ESSA process and key components of the plan.

Prior to submission of the final plan, the Governor was provided the legally-required 30-day review period.

PHASE 3 – PLAN DEVELOPMENT

This phase included refining of the initial recommendations, based on previous information and input received and the work of the Action Teams. At this point, Action Teams had developed preliminary recommendations for each aspect of the ESSA plan, and sought additional feedback from stakeholders to solidify the recommendations to the MDE leadership and State Superintendent.

FEEDBACK FORUMS

As various aspects of the plan developed, MDE partnered with intermediate school districts (ISDs) across the state to host regional Feedback Forums at six ISD locations. In addition to sharing this information by usual methods, ISDs also issued press releases within their communities, and several media outlets shared the information in their publications. All interested members of the public were invited to attend and more than 400 individuals did so, with additional people viewing the livestream video of one of the events, or watching the archived video at a later date.

At the forums (which ranged from two to six hours long), a detailed overview of the draft recommendations for Accountability, Assessments, Supports, and Educator quality components of the ESSA plan was presented to attendees, who were then invited to ask questions and share feedback with MDE staff. At several sessions, MDE topical experts were on hand for one-on-one discussions or to lead focused discussion with smaller groups.

These comments and questions were compiled and provided to Action Team leads to inform the next phase of recommendations and plans for implementation. The compiled questions became the basis for an online ESSA FAQ document, which MDE plans to update as this work proceeds.

ROUND TWO STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

Following the feedback forums, all stakeholders were invited to provide feedback on the ideas and concepts presented at the forums, which comprised the plan component recommendations to-date. Again, members of the public were notified of these options via the ESSA Notes newsletter, through notices in MDE's various communications to the education community, announcements at State Board of Education meetings, and targeted outreach through partner organizations.

The survey was open December 2016-January 2017. Survey options included: five detailed topical surveys on the topics of Assessment, Accountability, Supports for Students and Schools, Educator Quality, and Supports for Special Populations, aimed at those who had attended a feedback forum or viewed the archived video; a general, less detailed survey for those who had not; and an open-text option for those who wanted to share general input on ESSA outside of the survey structure. Emailed feedback, questions, and comments were also accepted. More than 950 responses were received to the combined surveys. Detailed summaries of those responses can be found via the links below:

- Accountability
- Assessment
- Educator Quality

- Supports
- Supports to Special Populations

VIRTUAL FOCUS GROUPS

Parents, teachers, and paraprofessionals were invited to join virtual focus groups to discuss and provide input on the ESSA plan. These sessions, convened by Public Policy Associates, with support from the W.K. Kellogg and Steelcase Foundation grant funds, provided opportunity for more than 100 individuals to participate in moderated online discussions over several days with fellow parents, teachers, or paraprofessionals, providing input and sharing feedback on multiple aspects of the ESSA recommendations. Questions were targeted to the unique perspectives of each focus group, and discussion in each session varied, based the initial responses of participants. Participants' feedback was used to further refine the ESSA plan recommendations and will inform plan implementation processes.

FORMAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON DRAFT PLAN

The formal public comment period for Michigan's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) draft plan ran from February 14, 2017 through March 16, 2017.

Throughout the public comment period, the draft plan was available for review on Michigan's ESSA website. The key components of the draft plan were shared in a presentation to the State Board of Education at its February 14, 2017 meeting. Supporting documents also posted on the website included an overview of the key components of the plan (which was also provided in Spanish and Arabic translations), high-level and detailed PowerPoint presentations related to specific aspects of the plan, and a summary of the stakeholder engagement process undertaken throughout development of the plan. Stakeholders were invited to submit comments via email to the MDE-ESSA email account or via U.S. mail. Nearly 700 public comments were received, related to the topics indicated below.

Public Comments Received by Topic Area
(note: many comments related to multiple topics)

Topic Area	Comments
Accountability System	560
Transparency Dashboard	136
Supports	224
Teacher and Leader Quality	84
Assessments	80
Plan Submission Timing	298
Other Aspects of ESSA Plan	371
Non-ESSA Specific	38

Summary of Themes
Below is a summary of the themes of the comments received within various category areas:

Accountability
- Comments were received supporting (12) and opposing (16) the inclusion of an A-F accountability system, most of them with strong feelings one way or the other. See summaries of organization/group feedback below for more detail on the positions of major groups/organizations on this topic.
- Multiple comments related to N-size (at least 40 commenters) – the majority (primarily from special education advocates) in favor of decreasing it from the proposed 30. Several commenters recommended increasing it above 30 or not weighting subgroups equally in the accountability system. Several commenters strongly supported the proposed N-size of 10 for English learners.
- There were comments for/against specific aspects of the accountability plan – particularly the various components of the Additional Indicator of School Quality/Student Success – suggesting changes to the weighting of various factors (some calling for more growth/proficiency, others suggesting more of the "other" school quality factors, many suggesting additions to the school quality/student success indicator.
- Multiple comments called for the addition of a "parent accountability" measure.
- Several comments addressed the issue of poverty and suggested that until that is addressed, the accountability system will continue to negatively label schools with high percentages of economically disadvantaged students.
- Several commenters stated that the plan does not adequately address the needs/measurements for gifted/talented students.
- Several comments called for the addition of a district-level grading system, in addition to a building level system.

Transparency Dashboard
- Commenters suggested additional items to add to the Dashboard or Accountability system
  - Foreign language
  - Physical education/outdoor exercise
  - Health-related coursework
  - Access to/time spent with school librarians, and support for indicated willingness to do so
- Supports
  - Support for Blueprint, librarians, gifted and talented students, Big History program, arts instruction
  - One commenter called for increased alignment across multiple MDE initiatives (Blueprint, MTSS, Early Literacy) – all good, but not necessarily coordinated at MDE level, which makes implementation hard for districts/ISDs where they're all in play
  - Support for English Learner recommendations
  - Support for whole child focus and partnership district model (some suggestions for additional partners)
  - Calls for more explicit references to supports for gifted and talented students
  - Calls for more explicit references to health-based curriculum as allowable activity

Teacher and Leader Quality
- Comments include concern raised re: teacher shortages, lack of $$ in challenging districts
- Calls for mention of preparing educators for specific groups of students – both special education and gifted and talented
- Several comments dealt with the intersection between the state assessment and educator evaluations
- See group/organizational letters for specifics on input related to these sections of the plan, as well as the state's proposed use of the statewide Title II, A funds

Assessments
- Concern over changing assessments again
- Several commenters requested that the state pick a system and stick with it, saying that constant change creates confusion at the school/district level
- Multiple commenters don't like any assessments
- Several comments were specific to the administration of the WIDA assessment for English learners
- Several comments encouraged use of existing district-selected assessments (NWEA, etc.) in lieu of state assessments
- Several commenters strongly supported the switch to PSAT in grade 8, several others strongly opposed the change, expressing concerns regarding alignment to state standards

Other Comments
- 297 comments (including those in the 268 letters from the "Stop Common Core" group and the special education advocates mentioned below) support delaying plan submission. One commenter specifically expressed appreciation for the state taking the lead by submitting in April, though several comments indicated support for moving forward with the plan. Several of the groups/organizations requested a delay in submission (see summaries below), to allow for more discussion on specifics of the plan. The remainder did not address timing in their comment.
- Multiple comments did not express support/opposition to specific sections of the plan – just provided input on one/more aspects – including suggestions for implementation and willingness to partner with MDE and schools in the process

Non-ESSA Related
- Multiple comments related to school funding (or lack of)
- Several comments were actually questions related to school choice/vouchers/rumors of federal-level change, or impact of proposed state legislation re accountability and school reform, or provisions of the teacher certification/licensure system

Comments from Groups and Organizations

Several groups/organizations generated "form letter" comments addressing a variety of common topics. Other organizations submitted one letter representing the agreed-upon position of their membership.

Form letters

- o Opposition to Common Core and federal oversight/authority – we received 243 essentially duplicative emails that opposed Common Core, the inclusion of early childhood and social-emotional learning in the plan, collection of student-level data, and submission of the plan in April
- o Recommendation for a lower N-size, particularly for students receiving special education services, calling for a lower N-size, so as not to "mask" those subgroups, many also encouraging delay in submission of the plan to allow for continued discussion (more than 25 form letters, plus additional that expressed similar sentiment)
- o Support and praise for the inclusion of Fine Arts and Music in the Accountability and Transparency Dashboards, with suggestions for and promise to aid in implementation (126)
- o Support among educators in public school academies for the A-F accountability system, the educator quality recommendations, the alternative accountability system (with suggestions for implementation), and making suggestions for changes to the growth measure, the assessment proposal, and some tweaks to the accountability system (per the MAPSA proposal) (37)
- o Parents and educators encouraging adding gifted children as a subgroup and making more explicit reference to gifted and talented students in several sections of the plan (21)
- o Support for the addition of access to and time spent in health education programs as part of the accountability system and transparency dashboard (10)

Comments On Behalf of Associations/Organizations:

EDUCATOR ASSOCIATIONS

- **Michigan Association for Gifted Children (MAGC) —** Despite their working closely with others around ESSA planning and implementation, they express dismay that there is no mention of gifted students in Michigan's draft plan. They contend that often gifted students are underserved and thus they underperform, and that our ESSA plan—like our state's accreditation system—relies heavily on bringing up low performing students to close gaps rather than on ensuring all students reach their potential. They present more than two dozen specific areas (citing page and section numbers) where our ESSA plan could be strengthened for gifted students.
- **Michigan Association for Media in Education (MAME) — Supports:** including media specialists in the School Quality/Student Success indicator.
  Makes the following **recommendations:** Include in accountability plan a metric indicating the FTE of library media teacher in each school; adding specific language about library/media whenever referring to a well-rounded education; list "supporting access to effective school library programs" as an allowable activity for Title IV funds (6.1D); include a document describing library measurement benchmarks (link provided) in the redesigned Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and allow MAME to review CNA when drafted; include "effective

school library programs as an item in the list of evidence-based practices in the grant application "super-highway" (provides link to evidence).

- *Michigan Association of Public School Academies (MAPSA)* — In a memo, referred to Michigan's original accountability plan—before moving away from A-F—a "foundation to build on despite missing some critical requirements to create a meaningful accountability system that reflects student differences." Areas of support: emphasis on supporting excellent educators; grant-making strategy for using 3% Title IIA funds (encourages addition of PSAs as collaborative partners); development of an alternative accountability system in section G. **Areas of Recommendation**: Return to A-F grading; use a growth measure other than student growth percentiles; more robust strategy for identification of schools, clarity in flexibility offered, and assurances about consistent measurement of progress; consistent assessment strategy (at least 5 years) that includes timely data usable at the classroom level; extended exclusion period for recently arrived EL students; changes to the A-F system (chart included) to focus more on outcomes than inputs.
- *Michigan Association of School Administrators/ Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (MASA/MAISA)* – (March 6) Expressed concern with April 3 submission; A-F grading of Michigan schools; and public comment process that "demonstrates a lack of willingness to incorporate feedback in a revised plan or communicate changes made to the field before submission.
- *Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA)* – (March 16) Feel strongly that some input on key issues was ignored, so addressed them in a memo. Key recommendations: Strongly urges delay of submission; oppose assigning a summative letter grade, and since so much of the plan references A-F this is a big reason for delay; weigh subgroups based on their percentage relative to overall population by building; remove teacher/administrator longevity metric, since this information is likely to be taken out of context and does not predict school health; remove (or limit to K-8 schools only and expand to "access" as well as "participation") fine arts/music/physical education metric as it might have unintended consequences; propose a more solid metric for calculating the school quality/student success indicator and resubmit for stakeholder input; delay submission until complete accountability/feedback loop process is developed, including exit criteria; adjust methodology for identifying and serving "comprehensive support schools" to target schools with highest needs; develop a more systemic approach to Title IIA to impact more educators throughout the state and using service providers already in place.
- *Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB)* – recommend delay of submission until September, citing too many unresolved issues on the federal level and pending accountability changes at the state level. They express concern that an application from MDE while the Legislature and Congress are reviewing this very issue will cause confusion among local districts and "cause doubt with MDE's process."
- *Michigan Association of School Nurses (MASN)* — expressed support the plan's focus on the "whole child" and its power to overcome barriers to student success. Identified the comprehensive needs assessment (CAN) as the key to identifying student needs and referenced a sample template that was submitted to MDE to help school systems plan for using school nursing services in the school improvement plan.

- ***Michigan Association of School Social Workers (MASSW)*** **—** Very supportive of the overall content of the draft plan, with emphasis on whole child and importance of school climate/student safety. Urge MDE to provide additional focus to the strategies and supports to address social, emotional and behavioral needs of students. Strongly support the goal of providing access to high quality educational opportunities to all students and to address achievement gaps.
- ***Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)*** **–** In a memo with attachments, express concerns with "significant elements of draft plan for Title A, Part A and Title II, Part A, and urge submission delay of at least these sections. Key recommendations around Title I: Finish development of a dashboard accountability model that does not include summative grades; weight subgroups based on their percentage of overall student population in a building; use a larger n-size of 50 students; abandon the use of teacher/administrator longevity data as a metric; limit the arts/music/P.E. metric to K-5 or K-8 OR change to measure access rather than participation; provide specific information on weighting of school quality/student success metrics; revise methodology to focus on school most in need of support to leverage resources. Key recommendations around Title II (with concerns expressed with each proposed investment in MDE's plan): complete revision to build on models used in other states, such as Battelle for Kids/Tennessee; incorporate wide-scale professional development customized for districts; dedicate funding to evaluation training.
- ***Michigan College Access Network (MCAN)*** **—** **Expressed support for:** the stakeholder engagement process; recommendation to use PSAT in grades 8-10. Expressed concerns/recommendations for: using postsecondary enrollment as a significant metric for determining a high school's A-F grade (as the driving indicator for School Quality/Student Success for high school); CNA should consider postsecondary educational resources available to students and capture baseline data such as college enrollment rate, FAFSA completion rate, and college remediation rate, as well as other metrics named by MCAN; Partnership Model agreements should consider MCAN a ready and willing partner for high schools that have low college-going rates or large gaps between subgroups.
- ***Michigan Council of Charter School Authorizers*** **—** Express extreme concern about the "ever-changing nature of the contents of this plan" with special note of the change to (moving away from) the A-F strategy. They urge return to a single indicator (with more emphasis given to academic indicators) and encourage delay in plan submission until there is greater consensus from the education community, legislature, and executive. They also encourage dropping the time spent in fine arts/PE as it would undermine choice and stifle innovative curricula.
- ***Michigan Education Association (MEA)*** **—** Express satisfaction with many points in the overall plan, especially focus on the whole child. Their memo provides input in four areas:
  - Assessment—**Agrees with** use of benchmark exams to provide immediate feedback; encourages scheduling two exams in Sept and Jan, with optional spring exam for students who did not show growth by Jan. **Area of concern** is that assessment data should not be used for labels but rather to direct assistance.
  - Accountability — **Supports:** proportional credit for participation, inclusion of graduation rates; inclusion of access to arts/PE; inclusion of educator longevity IF we do not continue NCLB model of restructuring. **Does not support** A-F as a single indicator; academic indicators making up more than 50% of rating (overemphasis on test scores); inclusion of

advanced college/career coursework, citing lack of funding in many low-performing schools. Would like to add metric for media center staffed with certified specialists.

- o Supports for districts and schools—Supports Partnership Model; Calls for more flexibility in turn-around time, clarification on "next level of accountability."
- o Educator quality—**Supports:** inclusion of residency-based preparation program focused in Partnership Districts, provided this does not change requirements for certification; teacher evaluations used to inform PD and improvement; inclusion of paraprofessionals in PD plans; development of career pathways. Expresses concerns with: alternative route preparation program proposal. Calls for a complete revision of MDE's proposed plan under Title II, Part A.

- *Michigan Library Cooperative Directors Association (MLCDA)* **–** Thanks to MDE for inclusion in process, encouraging continued support for/inclusion of school libraries in implementation of plan.
- *Michigan Parent Teacher Association (PTA)* **—** The group applauds the plan to put Michigan children at the center of the discussion and to include stakeholder engagement, and encourages continuing that focus throughout implementation, despite USED shift in direction away from stakeholder engagement.
- *Michigan World Language Association (MIWLA)* **—** Encouraged to see language in the plan to provide a well-rounded education. Since language education in US lags far behind other countries, urges additional resources to close this gap and ensure Title IV, Part A grants include support for world language instruction.

ISDS/COUNTYWIDE SUPERINTENDENTS

- *Macomb County Association of School Administrators/Macomb Association of Curriculum Administrators/Macomb County Administrators Association of Special Education* — A memo outlines concerns in several areas:
  - o Accountability—Supports holding targets constant for 10 years. Major concerns around A-F as a single indicator; lack of shared methodology for calculating the weighted index for each indicator; teacher/administrator longevity as an indicator. Would support a dashboard for accountability.
  - o Assessment—Concerns about using state assessment to measure growth ("using tests for purposes other than the ones that they were designed for may lead to invalid results"); additional concerns about using "unproven" methodology in a high-stakes accountability system. Expressed disappointment that MDE did not follow the recommendation of the Assessment Implementation Action Team regarding use of the PSAT in 8th grade.
  - o Partnership Model—requests that ISDs be included with MDE as a full partner. Also express extreme concerns about identification of schools, timeline of improvement, and next level of accountability. Advocate for a minimum of 4 years to show reform, and strongly suggest that MDE outline several options for "next level" accountability that includes local feedback.
  - o Submission deadline—"plea" to delay submission until September.
- *Oakland County Superintendents Association* — **Express gratitude and support for**: pulling back from letter grades and support for the use of a balanced dashboard of indicators, which they offer to help develop using a pilot underway in Oakland County; much of the new

assessment plan, but think benchmark assessments should be optional and administered locally; allowing for pilots of innovative assessments by select districts.

Expressed concerns: that in places, Michigan's plan exceeds what ESSA requires (e.g. listing all schools rather than just Title 1 schools; listing every year vs. every 3 years); desire full alignment of state assessments with state standards; the process by which the plan was developed, citing "many" decisions made without considering stakeholder input; meeting an "arbitrary and unnecessary" April 3 deadline.

- *Washtenaw Superintendents Association* – Encouraging delay in submitting plan to allow for maximum state flexibility (in anticipation of revised regulations from Secretary DeVos)
- *Washtenaw ISD* – Recognized willingness to respond to public input by pulling back from A-F grading system, but urge that you delay submission of the plan "given the shifting landscape in Washington DC and release of the revised Consolidated Plan template.
- *Wayne RESA* — Expressed two primary concerns: 1) Opposition to an A-F summative grade, because it serves as a proxy for measuring poverty; also, growth measure based on medial growth percentile is inadequate to measure true (individual) student growth; 2) concern about adoption of PSAT 8/9 for 8th grade assessment, due to standards misalignment, which will throw local schools into turmoil.

ADVOCATES/COALITIONS/RESEARCHERS

- *Brandeis University, Institute for Child, Youth and Family Policy* — Applaud MDE for a strong, evidence-based approach to integrating early childhood concerns. Encouraged further strengthening it in the implementation phase by issuing guidance around defining and measuring issues of access, quality, and equity in early education and care for the LEA CNA (with specific recommendations).
- *Early Childhood Investment Corporation* — Supports the increased integration of early childhood at the earliest ages, with a focus on transition and alignment with early elementary and K-12 system. Expressed additional support for high early learning standards, leveraging resources to achieve earlier outcomes, focus on the "whole child." Greatest concern: the implementation of early childhood components in communities and urged continued effort to increase awareness and implementation best practices/resources.
- *Ed Trust Midwest* –Supports several positive aspects of the DRAFT plan: Single summative rating IN THE ORIGINAL, using largely academic measures toward college/career readiness; ensuring subgroup performance matters in a school's final rating; clarity around methodology for calculating ratings. Their concerns/recommendations include:
  o *Assessment:* Keep M-STEP
  o *Accountability:* Require a single summative rating; student growth measures must show whether a child is on track to meet grade-level standards; require ambitious and well-defined goals for school improvement, aligned to becoming a top ten state (calling for a higher target than 75%); reward schools for progress against the state's long-term goals; provide greater information on plans for identifying and supporting struggling schools (prior to plan submission); require accountability ratings for *districts* as well as schools.
    A separate white paper provides feedback on ESSA, and their site also has a "submit your ESSA comments" function included.

- o *Teaching Quality and Equity:* Promote equitable access of high-quality educators for most vulnerable students, and support the implementation of Michigan's educator evaluations system;
- **EmpowerK12 —** Their memo expresses appreciation for greater flexibility and focus on improved outcomes and for the stakeholder engagement process. They then present detailed and technical questions and suggestions around all accountability metrics and MDE's long- and short-term goal setting with the goal to "ensure the creation of a more robust accountability system aligned to Michigan's "Top 10 in 10 years" aspirations.
- **Excellence in Education —** To fully realize the benefits of a transparent A-F school grading system, ExcelinEd offers Michigan public comments based on nine evidence-based fundamental principles developed during 18 years of experience across dozens of states. Comments focus on suggestions for improving the calculations for Accountability to more closely align with the nine fundamental principles. Specific comments are provided on the Academic Achievement Indicator, Academic Progress Indicator, weighting of indicators, School Quality/Student Success Indicator, Graduation Rate Indicator, and Grading Scale. Research demonstrating the impact of A-F school ratings are provided at the end of the comments.
- **Great Lakes Education Project (GLEP) —** Expressed belief in a strong accountability system with certain characteristics: uses A-F grades annually; academics (progress & growth) comprise at least 90% of letter grade; early intervention for schools earning "D"; clear/substantive consequences for chronic failure. GLEP urges delay of submission until we have legislative consensus. Encourages MDE to seek assistance/consultation from Foundation for Excellence in Education and attaches their "Intervention Playbook."
- **Healthy Kids, Healthy Michigan** — Recommend inclusion of Physical Education a part of the School Quality/Student success indicator but encourage addition of Health Education as well, since it is included in the definition of a "well-rounded education."
- **Michigan Protection and Advocacy Services (MPAS) —** Proposes eight improvements that will cause the plan will better serve students with disabilities, including reduced n-size, raising long-term goals higher than 75% of schools/subgroups, reconsidering use of student growth percentiles, lowering the percentage of students taking alternative assessments, defining criteria for underperforming schools, address "context-based learning" within the plan.
- **The Arc Michigan —** Identical letter to MPAS (above)
- **Michigan Students Achieve Coalition –** *Members include: Black Family Development, Detroit Branch NAACP, Detroit Regional Chamber, Education Trust-Midwest, Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce, Grand Rapids Urban League, Michigan Alliance for Special Education, Michigan Association of United Ways, Michigan College Access Network, Michigan State Branch NAACP and the Student Advocacy Center of Michigan.* The group presented five principles for meaningful accountability; called for high enough goals to significantly improve quality of education and transparency in reporting; urged including students/families/educators as full partners; and called for prompt action when schools are not meeting rigorous expectations, including those for historically underserved student groups.
- **The Advocacy Institute/National Down Syndrome Congress —** Their document focuses on "issues most critical to subgroup accountability and to students with disabilities. They call for

MDE to: delay submission until September; revise of graduation, long-term academic AND growth goals to comply with ESSA requirements; abandon student growth percentiles; describe how our assessments will use the principles of universal design for learning, list our strategies for not exceeding the 1% cap; clarify indicator metrics for ELL; lower N-size for subgroups; put less weight on growth and no weight on participation; clarify criteria for identification of targeted and comprehensive support schools. They also cite a general lack of information about how ESSA plan coordinates with the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

- *The Mackinac Center* — **Expressed support for**: abandoning Top to Bottom rankings; giving greater weight to academic growth metrics. The bulk of the letter was reserved for **concerns and recommendations:** School Quality/Student Success indicators should include added weight for growth achieved by lowest-performing 25% of students (elementary & middle) and advanced coursework completion (high school); provide *specific and defined* flexibility to high-performing schools; develop a similar ranking system to measure quality of alternative education programs; retain the originally proposed A-F summative rating system (citing 2013 study regarding success of Florida's A-F system).

- *The Student Advocacy Center of Michigan* — **grateful** that the state's plan includes efforts to bring attention to attendance and school discipline, and that suspension data "finally will see the light of day in the transparency dashboard." **They further suggest:** consider moving suspension data to the accountability system and include expulsion data to the School Quality indicator; change the n-size to 10 for all subgroups; develop and publish methodology for identifying low-performing schools prior to plan submission; provide greater clarity and transparency on the school improvement process for both low-performers and schools where subgroups are struggling; provide a meaningful role to parents and students in underserved populations.

- *482 Forward – A citywide education organizing network in Detroit. Members include neighborhood organizations, parents, and youth committed to ensuring that all Detroit children have access to an excellent education, regardless of race or socioeconomic status.* **Supports** focus on equity in plan. Encourages significant weight to growth measures. **Expresses concern** over lack of awareness/participation in plan development process. Calls for stronger future engagement, particularly with parents and their organization. Promises support in future efforts

BUSINESS/COMMUNITY/POLICYMAKERS

- *Detroit Regional Chamber* — Partnered with a broad coalition that includes Ed Trust-Midwest, the Grand Rapids Chamber, and others and fully endorses the coalition's input/feedback. Adds comments on **key areas of concern:** Lack of a single summative rating for schools, which will leave many parents and educators without a clear understanding of school performance; continued use of M-STEP, which they strongly support; need for a more aspirational long-term school improvement goals, which are needed in order to become a Top 10 education state.

- *Hope Starts Here Stewardship Board* — *Co-chaired by: Rip Rapson, President/CEO of the Kresge Foundation and LaJune Montgomery Tabron, President/CEO of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation; comprising business leaders, local policymakers, parents, and practitioners*

working to develop early childhood systems to improve the lives of Detroit children.
Seven identical letters were submitted by the following Hope Starts Here Stewardship Board members: Denise L. Smith, Excellent Schools Detroit; Richard L. DeVore, PNC Financial Services Group; Danielle Atkinson, Mothering Justice; Herman Gray, MD., MBA, United Way for Southeastern Michigan; Leslie Murphy, Murphy Consulting; Eli Savit, Senior Advisor and Counsel to the Detroit Mayor; and Kimberlydawn Wisdom, Senior VP, Community Health & Equity, Henry Ford Health System.

Support for: inclusion of early childhood education throughout the document; the whole-child perspective of the plan; focus on reducing chronic absenteeism; attempt to address the vast inequities in compensation between early childhood educators and teachers in early elementary grades.

Specific recommendations: Strengthen the role and supports for early childhood education (including early elementary grades) throughout the plan; use of the micro-credential for early childhood education; review and approval of the LEA comprehensive needs assessment to ensure assessment of the LEA's early education needs; stronger focus on chronic absenteeism through more robust systems to monitor attendance and identify underlying causes; strong focus on supporting children of color; and clear guidance on how LEAs can address teacher compensation and pay equity for early childhood educators. They would like to review the CNA before release.

- *Lt. Governor Brian Calley* — Writes on behalf of "numerous student and family advocates who are concerned about potential accountability gaps for students in special education." Calls for a lower n-size to allow parents/policymakers/educators better understand not only the performance of students in special education, but also the performance of all students within the accountability system. Also urges delay of plan submission until September.

- *Michigan Realtors Association*– Prior to the formal public comment period, the association sent a letter expressing concern with the proposed A-F system, saying it could negatively impact home values in communities with low-rated schools

- *Senator Arlen Meekhof* — Consultation with stakeholders indicates strong support for a statewide A-F system and the accountability as a whole. Constituents expressed **concerns**: put more emphasis (greater weight) on proficiency and growth, and less emphasis on school quality measurements (no more than 10 percent); for elementary and middle schools, replace graduation rate with academic progress (growth/proficiency); including teacher and administrator longevity as a factor might encourage schools to retain underperforming employees. Senator Meekhof offers to discuss additional detail on the above comments (and other components of the plan).

- *Senator Phil Pavlov* — Expresses grave concerns over an April 3 submission date with so many unresolved issues: no final decision on accountability plan; no methodology for determining indicators; whether intervention in low-performing schools should be a state or local action; lack of specific consequences for a school's failure to improve over certain amount of time. He further requests clarification on specific questions about the above issues.

PHASE 4 - IMPLEMENTATION

PLANS FOR ONGOING STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT THROUGHOUT IMPLEMENTATION

Through the implementation phase of ESSA, MDE plans to continue seeking stakeholder input. Though the Action Teams and Advisory Committees will be phased out with the submission of the final plan, the need for stakeholder feedback will continue. Implementation Teams will be convened around multiple aspects of the plan, to facilitate a smooth transition from NCLB to ESSA throughout the state. External stakeholders will inform and aid in these efforts in multiple ways. Through the connections that were built and strengthened throughout the ESSA plan development process, MDE is well positioned to begin this work, with the support and assistance from our many partners.

In addition to the implementation teams, MDE's work on stakeholder outreach and engagement through the funds provided by the W.K. Kellogg and Steelcase Foundation grants will continue into the implementation of the ESSA plan. Plans to hold regional community forums following submission of the final plan are in the works now. These events, hosted in partnership with local community foundations, will help inform and guide the MDE's ESSA transition and implementation planning efforts and the development of technical assistance materials.

Outreach to parents, particularly those in previously low-performing schools, through targeted focus groups will also take place in the transition and implementation period.

Communication to schools, districts, and other stakeholders regarding policy changes resulting from the transition to ESSA will be regular, and informed by input received throughout the process.

Attachment 1: Involvement of Required Stakeholders in the ESSA Plan Development Process

ESSA requires engagement and consultation with representatives of the following groups. Below is a brief summary of ways in which each has participated or had opportunity to be involved in the plan development process.

All stakeholders: Had the opportunity to respond to multiple online surveys and attend or view one of the seven regional Feedback Forums. During the formal public comment period, stakeholders were invited to submit comments via U.S. mail or to the MDE-ESSA@michigan.gov email address.

State Board members: See State Board of Education section 2.9 above

Principals: School building principals served on several of the ESSA Action Teams. Additionally, leaders of state associations representing elementary, middle, and secondary school principals served on the External Advisory Committee.

Teachers: Teachers served as members of several of the ESSA Action Teams. Additionally, multiple representatives of Michigan's two major education labor unions served on the External Advisory and Tactical Review Committees. Opportunities to participate on Virtual Focus groups were shared via the MEA newsletter.

Service professionals, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel: Several paraprofessionals were included on the Tactical Review Committee and their voice was represented by the major education labor unions on the External Advisory Committee. Paraprofessionals were invited to participate in the paraprofessional virtual focus group sessions.

Representatives of school districts: Schools districts were represented in numerous ways throughout the process. Local education agency (LEA), public school academy (PSA), and intermediate school district (ISD) administrators, educators, board members, and staff participated on Action Teams and the External Advisory and Tactical Review Committees. MDE staff presented to and sought feedback from representatives through conferences, organization board meetings, and other small group meetings throughout the ESSA plan development process.

Private school officials: The Executive Director of the Michigan Association of Non-Public Schools served as a member of the External Advisory Committee, and is a member of the Michigan Education Alliance, which received monthly updates on ESSA from the State Superintendent. Additionally, MDE staff consulted with representatives from non-public schools in the creation of the position description for the private school ombudsman required under ESSA to support students and families being served by non-public schools in the state.

Local elected officials: LEA and ISD board members served on Action Teams and on the External Advisory and Tactical Review Committees. A half-day session for local school board members was part of the Michigan Association of School Boards' conference in November 2016, at which MDE staff shared the ESSA recommendations and sought input.

Parents: Parents served on several Action Teams and were represented through member organizations on the External Advisory Committee. MDE staff met with other parent groups to shape the stakeholder engagement activities. A Parent Virtual Focus group was created and a survey for parents was developed (both described in the main report). MDE staff also shared information with several organizations representing parents of students with disabilities and English learners, and other special populations. See also section 2.8 regarding outreach to parents in partnership with the YouGov survey. Additional focused parent outreach is planned during the implementation phase of our ESSA work.

Secondary students: MDE staff met with or presented to several groups of students during ESSA plan development, including students previously in the foster care system. Students had opportunity to respond to ESSA online surveys and attend Feedback Forums.

Community-based organizations: Representatives of several community-based organizations served on Action Teams and on the Tactical Review Committee. All had opportunity to respond to ESSA online surveys and attend Feedback Forums. Further outreach and discussion is planned in the implementation phase of the Partnership District model.

Civil rights organizations: Please refer to Civil Rights and School Justice Organizations section 2.7 above.

Institutions of higher education: The state organizations representing both public and private colleges and universities, as well as community colleges in the state, served on the External Advisory Committee. Additionally, representatives of institutions of higher education and their educator preparation institutions and a community college board member were represented on the Tactical Review committee.

Tribes: Please refer to Tribal Consultation Section 2.5 above.

Business/Employers: Representatives from of the Michigan Chamber of Commerce and several local Chambers of Commerce, as well as several other state and regional business advocacy groups, were invited to serve on the External Advisory and Tactical Review Committees.

Governor's Office: Please refer to Legislative and Executive Branch section 2.10 above.

State legislators: Please refer to Legislative and Executive Branch section 2.10 above.

General public: Served on Action Teams and the Tactical Review Committee.

Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors
Guidance to Michigan Department of Education Regarding
Tribal Consultation in the Every Student Succeeds Act

Background: The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) is the latest reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Previously known as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), this reauthorization gives more freedom to states to implement standards and accountability. Please visit http://www.ed.gov/essa for more information. Passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015 marks a major change in education of the United States.
Furthermore, there are additions which specifically impact Tribal Nations.

- Approval of the first phase of the Navajo Nation's alternative accountability system, which provides the tribe with the authority to implement uniform standards, aligned assessments, and alternative measurements of student success across its schools in multiple states; and
- A tribal consultation requirement to local education agencies and states; and
- Two new rounds of federal grants totaling nearly $25 million to support native youth and educators.

For several generations, tribal leaders and Native education stakeholders have urged policy makers to work collaboratively with tribes. The Every Student Succeeds Act allows educational stakeholders to enter a new era of education, one that requires timely and meaningful tribal consultation. Meaningful tribal consultation, both in process and the product, is the foundation that will best support Native students. It would be helpful if states and districts approach consultation in the context of developing a mutually respectful relationship among tribes and localities. A key component in working with tribal representatives and supporting Native youth is trust.

Concern: As part of ESSA's new tribal consultation requirements and funding increases, how are Local Education Agencies, State Education Agencies & Higher Education Institutions coordinating with Tribal Nations to implement a successful transition?

Why Consult with Tribes?

Tribes are not merely a homogenous minority group, but as sovereign nations, maintain a unique political status and should be dealt with accordingly. With tribes, the fundamental basis of required consultation is recognition of Tribal sovereignty. Over the years, the federal government has refined the obligation to interact with Tribes on a government-to-government basis in a series of laws, amendments to existing laws, and executive orders, all of which direct agencies to engage in consultation with Tribes. Today, the government-to-government relationship with Tribes has evolved to the point where consultation on a government-to-government basis is not only the law, it is considered sound management policy and the right way for the United States to conduct business.

Following suit, the State of Michigan has institutionalized tribal consultation. There have been two Executive Orders issued pertaining to tribal consultation. These include Governor Granholm' s Executive Directive 2004-05, and Governor Snyder's Executive Directive 2012-02. The Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors' position is that tribal consultation between the Michigan Department of Education is non-negotiable and should always occur whenever Native students are impacted. In addition to inclusion in the State ESSA Implementation Plan to the federal government, the 12 federally recognized tribes would like to collaborate on a 10 year strategic plan for tribal education consultation with the Michigan Department of Education as mandated by Governor Granholm' s Executive Directive 2004-05.

Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors
Guidance to Michigan Department of Education Regarding
Tribal Consultation in the Every Student Succeeds Act

Leverage Tribal Leadership Through Consultation

Through self-determination, Indian tribes have an inherent right to self-governance, which means tribes are provided greater power to manage local governments and local issues that affect tribal citizenship. As sovereign nations, Indian tribes exercise inherent autonomy over education, which includes control in local schools, the development and administration of culture-based curriculum, and the presence of advisory councils. Since federal funding is allocated to states to collaborate with tribes, there must be strict guidance throughout the process to ensure Native voice is included in decision-making.

Similarly, in ESSA, under Section 8538, districts are required to consult with Indian tribes or tribal organizations prior to submitting a plan for a covered program under ESSA. It is critical that meaningful consensus-based decision making is a core component when implementing ESSA as it relates to Native students. However, without a distinct tribal state policy consultation, Native perspectives will be left out of the important process of developing local and state plans. As such, we strongly encourage the state of Michigan and local districts to define meaningful consultation with tribal leaders.

Below are core components of meaningful tribal consultation, many of which ED has outlined in its "Consultation and Coordination with American Indian Alaska Native Tribal Governments" policy:

- Consultation is meaningful when it occurs at the earliest possible stage, prior to the development of a program, initiative, or policy to ensure that tribal views are integrated.
- Tribal Consultation is most effective when it is seen and understood as a process that requires continuous input and discussion.
- True consultation is based on open communication and coordination that actively seeks and considers the views of all participants, and then seeks agreement on how to proceed.
- The process of meaningful consultation is equally as important as the product of consultation. If tribal input is not reflected in how education programs and services are administered to Native students, then we have missed a great opportunity in supporting our nation's most vulnerable youth.
- Establishing a minimum set of requirements and expectations with respect to consultation along with establishing measurable outcomes are necessities for meaningful consultation.

For far too long, education has "happened" to Native people. It is important, especially in the State of Michigan where two Indian boarding schools were in operation, one as recently as 1983, that we move toward educating Native people in Michigan in more just and equitable ways. One step to shifting this relationship between tribes and education is to engage with tribes on government-to-government terms on any and all issues where they will be impacted and move beyond the longstanding history of omitting tribes from decision-making power over their education.

Successful tribal consultation also takes into consideration the timelines that need to be in place in order for tribal representatives engaged in consultation to have time to communicate with our Tribal leaders or Legal departments, if needed. Approaching consultation from an Indigenous understanding of what "consultation" means is of utmost importance. The Indigenous understanding of being in a relationship is predicated upon respect and reciprocity. Therefore, collaboration vs. consultation is of much more value when putting emphasis on the inclusion of all tribes. At the local level, it is important

Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors
Guidance to Michigan Department of Education Regarding
Tribal Consultation in the Every Student Succeeds Act

for LEA's to consider which tribes have a service area that covers their institutions. Many tribes have overlapping service areas and may require LEA's to work with multiple tribes to reach consensus. This may be tribal education directors or tribally elected officials, but should be up to the tribes to choose who represents their voices in the process of consultation. Tribal parents should also be in the consultation & collaboration processes.

Determining the Current Educational Landscape

In order to meaningfully support Native students, the current landscape of ESSA implementation on the state, district, and school levels must be identified. It is vital to determine key contacts to develop and maintain a strong Native voice during the implementation process of the entire law (even if the contacts are not formally on the ESSA workgroup). Under ESSA, the "Indian section" or Title VI is not the only portion of the legislation that affects Native Students. Topics such as accountability, assessments, and interventions affect Native students directly. A great resource for states and districts to reference is ED's Frequently Asked Questions document that provides states and districts basic information on tribal consultation as outlined in ESSA. Considering that Native students are assessed by the same criteria as non-Native students nationally, Native input is vital in addressing state plans, accountability systems, assessments, and interventions of low-performing students and schools. Key questions to think about include:

- Does Michigan have an Indian Education Department or full-time position in Indian education dedicated to facilitating ESSA requirements?
- What is the contact information for Michigan's Tribal Liaisons for each department?
- Do Tribal Liaisons meet regularly with Tribal Leaders?
- Are there professional development trainings for the MDE staff to understand tribal sovereignty and how it may affect job duties?
- Is there an active Indian Education Association in Michigan?
- Are there Native representatives on the ESSA working group?
- How are tribal leaders being informed about ESSA?
- Have you reached out to tribal education departments/ tribal education agencies to understand their ESSA implementation status?
- In what ways have you meaningfully consulted with tribal leaders and tribal organizations regarding key provisions under ESSA, such as the state development plan, accountability systems, assessments, and interventions for low-performing students and schools?

Why is this important?

 Although ESSA is geared towards K-12 students, the impact it will have on Higher Education Institutions could be beneficial. In addition to State Tribal Educational Partnerships (STEP) Grant and Native Youth Community Project (NYCP) college & career readiness grants, the Indian Professional Development Program is

Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors
Guidance to Michigan Department of Education Regarding
Tribal Consultation in the Every Student Succeeds Act

Utilizing Collaborative Agreements such as MOU/MOA's

Collaborative agreements will help entities in several ways, such as determining accredited language revitalization, recruitment, data sharing, providing successful Tri-lateral models, meeting federal reporting mandates and timelines, and ensuring site equality.

Additional topics of interest for formalization and discussion include:

1. How will the department look at issues of districts that may have submitted consolidated applications for funding?
2. How will we increase access and notification to tribal education departments around equitable access to resources and individuals?
3. How will we braid federal Title funding; such as TITLE I, III, and VI?
4. How will we utilize Title I parent and family engagement funding to support schools in training staff regarding engagement strategies?
5. How will we allocate parent and family engagement funding for sub granting to schools to collaborate with community-based organizations that have a track record of improving family engagement and strengthening Native student success?
6. How can we work on restructuring TITLE III language to recognize Native language revitalization, additional tutoring, etc.?
7. How can Tribes coordinate with the SEA and LEA's to implement strategies of incorporating eagle feathers in the graduation of Native American students under Title VI?
8. How will we work to address FERPA issues around sharing student information?
9. How do we structure the collaborative meetings to share data and maximize its use for students?
10. How do we craft professional development services that are not based on ethnicity, but around a tribe's sovereign nation status?
11. How might we incorporate current successful tribal state partnerships? (digital badging, language accreditation, curriculum development)
12. How might we engage the higher education and teacher preparation institutions in meetings and conversations?
13. How do we build on previous agency successes in government-to-government collaborations?

Evaluate Progress

After establishing a clear understanding of an ESSA implementation system among tribal, state, and local entities, strategies must be developed to measure and monitor performance to ensure success. The evaluation strategies should be monitored collectively, encouraging ownership over each step of the consultation process to ensure all stakeholders are striving towards a consensus. Throughout the evaluation process it will be critical to bring stakeholders together again to address challenges and provide technical assistance in order to strengthen and formalize relationships. This consultation process should not be linear or stagnant. Consultation is not a single step process, it must be utilized multiple times to collaborate and monitor progress. Effective and ongoing evaluation is critical as states

Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors
Guidance to Michigan Department of Education Regarding
Tribal Consultation in the Every Student Succeeds Act

and districts work to develop and strengthen processes and policies to facilitate meaningful tribal consultation. If tribal input is not reflected in how educational programs and services are administered to Native students, then we have missed a great opportunity in supporting our nation's most vulnerable youth.

Below are critical components of the evaluation process that states and districts are encouraged to incorporate:

- Establish a minimum set of requirements and expectations with respect to consultation.
- Establish measurable outcomes for meaningful consultation.
- Ensure everyone involved understands the objectives of each meeting and the purpose of consultation.

Questions that should guide evaluation include:
- How was outreach conducted to reach groups or individuals whose views have not traditionally been recognized?
- Was the information provided relevant, produced in plain language, and easy to understand?
- Are all consultations accessible and welcoming?
- Did all participants have the opportunity to add their value to the meeting?
- What kind of follow-up was provided after the meeting?
- Did the consultation meeting change the relationship among participants?

Follow Up and Close the Loop
When a decision about policy issue is reached, it is critical that states and districts make available a written explanation of the outcome of the consultation process. For regulatory actions, the outcomes of the consultation process need to be addressed in the preamble to the regulatory document. The written explanation will include the reasons for accepting or rejecting suggestions from the Native community. The timing of this response may vary, depending on the state law that applies in each case, and will be determined based on the form of the proposed policy. For ongoing issues identified during regular and case-by-case consultation, states and districts will provide the appropriate parties with periodic status reports.

Conclusion
Through the inclusion of the above recommendations and strategies, states and districts will help ensure that ESSA implementation better addresses the needs of Native communities and Native students. Matters of culture, language, cognition, community, and socialization are central to Native learning. The coordination and collaboration between various stakeholders will allow Native students to have the best opportunity to develop their own identities, traditional knowledge, modern skills, and self-worth. These elements will undoubtedly lead to social and academic success.

Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors Guidance to Michigan Department of Education Regarding Tribal Consultation in the Every Student Succeeds Act

The Confederation of Michigan Tribal Education Directors appreciates the Departments full consideration of these suggested guidelines for tribal consultation.

June Smith, Lac Vieux Desert
Yvonne Parsons, Little River Band Ottawa
Jannan Cotto, Chair, Little Traverse Bay Band
Amy St. Arnold, Keweenaw Bay
Anna Larson, Treasurer, Hannahville
Lisa Moran, Sault Ste. Marie Tribe

Jennie Heeren, Gun Lake Band
Melissa Montoya, Secretary, Saginaw Chippewa
Geraldine Parish, Bay Mills
Sam Morseau, Vice-Chair, Pokagon Band
Andrea Rainer, Huron Band
Melissa Alberts, Grand Traverse Band

This guide is a collaborative work from National Indian Education Association, Tribal Education Directors National Assembly, Confederated Michigan Tribal Education Directors, and Michigan Department of Education and should be viewed as a living document.

Patel, D. & Cournoyer, D. (2016) NIEA: Tribal State Consultation Guide

Appendix F – General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) Section 427

The Michigan Department of Education adheres to Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA). In carrying out its educational mission, the Michigan Department of Education will ensure to the fullest extent possible equitable access to, participation in, and appropriate educational opportunities for individuals served. Federally funded activities, programs, and services will be accessible to all teachers, students, and program beneficiaries. The MDE ensures equal access and participation to all persons regardless of their gender, race, color, national origin, age, or disability in its education programs, services, and/or activities.

For state-level activities, as well as all other activities supported by federal assistance through our electronic grant application, MDE will fully enforce all federal and state regulations designed to ensure equitable access to all program beneficiaries and to overcome barriers to equitable participation. The MDE will hold LEAs accountable for assuring equal access and providing reasonable and appropriate accommodations to meet the needs of a diverse group of students, staff, community members, and other participants.

Steps taken to ensure equitable access may include, but are not limited to:

- Michigan's Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act (PA 453 of 1976), Article 4 prohibits discriminatory practices, policies, and customs on the basis of religion, race, color, national origin, age, sex, height, weight, familial status, or marital status by educational institutions within the state
- MDE provides reasonable accommodations for student state assessments based on disability and native language
- MDE assures all state communications, including print and electronic media, are compliant with applicable ADA requirements;
- MDE adheres to the requirement that schools provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to all school aged children who are individuals with disabilities as defined by Section 504 and IDEA or who are English learners.
- As MDE develops, acquires and disseminates curriculum and instructional materials we consider cultural relevance and abilities of the intended audiences to meaningfully understand; reasonable efforts are taken to overcome any barriers.
- School culture and climate, as well as student health and safety issues are included as factors in our comprehensive needs assessments.
- MDE has developed, adopted or identified a plethora of strategies, activities and programs based on evidence based practices that we make available to LEAs and schools for adoption. MDE provides training, coaching and technical assistance to LEAs and schools to assist them in implementing these practices with fidelity.

- In our grant application assurances, MDE requires that LEAs not discriminate against any person on the basis of religion, race, color, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, height, weight, familial status, or marital status.
- In our grant application assurances, MDE requires that no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by such entity.
- The MDE requires LEAs and schools to provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to all school aged children who are individuals with disabilities as defined by Section 504 and IDEA or who are English learners.
- MDE Enforces these requirements by training, technical assistance, monitoring and complaint resolution.