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MI Landscape and Policy Changes

• Human Capital
  – Tenure reform
  – New teacher evaluation system development and implementation
  – Statewide value-added model
  – Certification/Preparation
  – Investment in teacher training and professional development

Source:
MI Landscape and Policy Changes

• **Accountability and support**
  – Waiver and new accountability system
  – Public reporting
  – Consequences and interventions

• **Expansion of charter schools**

• **School funding and finance**
  – Performance based funding for districts

• **Low performing schools**

Source:
Before we dive into policy changes and questions of implementation, let’s look at the data and see why change is needed.
How has Michigan performed compared to other states?
## Michigan NAEP Performance

### Relative Rank of All Students 2003-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade Reading</td>
<td>28th</td>
<td>30th</td>
<td>30th</td>
<td>34th</td>
<td>35th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade Math</td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>41st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade Reading</td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>29th</td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade Math</td>
<td>34th</td>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>36th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings are among all 50 states
Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
Michigan NAEP Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>38\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>39\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>36\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>44\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>45\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>37\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>40\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>40\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>43\textsuperscript{rd}</td>
<td>44\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>29\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>33\textsuperscript{rd}</td>
<td>38\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>37\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>34\textsuperscript{th}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>35\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>32\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
<td>39\textsuperscript{th}</td>
<td>42\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
<td>42\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings are among the states that reported data for African-American students.
Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
### Michigan NAEP Performance

Relative Rank of Latino Students 2003-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>38&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings are among the states that reported data for Latino students.
Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
### Michigan NAEP Performance

**Relative Rank of White Students 2003-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>26th</td>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>35th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>37th</td>
<td>41st</td>
<td>45th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>30th</td>
<td>37th</td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>37th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>31st</td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>40th</td>
<td>44th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings are among all 50 states  
Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
# Michigan NAEP Performance

Relative Rank of Low Income Students 2003-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>4th Grade Reading</th>
<th>4th Grade Math</th>
<th>8th Grade Reading</th>
<th>8th Grade Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>34th</td>
<td>31st</td>
<td>34th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>37th</td>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>37th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>40th</td>
<td>41st</td>
<td>42nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>37th</td>
<td>45th</td>
<td>37th</td>
<td>47th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>46th</td>
<td>26th</td>
<td>43rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings are among all 50 states

Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
## Michigan NAEP Performance

Relative Rank of Higher Income Students 2003-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>24th</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>35th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>29th</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>43rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>37th</td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>31st</td>
<td>30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>34th</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>39th</td>
<td>40th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings are among all 50 states
Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
NAEP 2011 Reading and Math Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) Results
Average Scale Scores, by District Students Overall
Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2011)

Note: Basic Scale Score = 208; Proficient Scale Score = 238
Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES
Average Scale Scores, by District African-American Students

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2011)

Note: Basic Scale Score = 208; Proficient Scale Score = 238
Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES
Average Scale Scores, by District Latino Students
Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2011)

Note: Basic Scale Score = 208; Proficient Scale Score = 238
Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES
Fall 2011 MEAP Data
Percentage of African American Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards By District

2011 Grade 4 Reading MEAP

Statewide Average for All Students (68%)

All African American Students in Michigan (45%)

Source: Michigan Department of Education, Fall 2011 MEAP Four Year Comparison (Gap Analysis): http://michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-22709_31168_31530---,00.html

© 2012 THE EDUCATION TRUST—MIDWEST
Percentage of African American Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards By District
2011 Grade 8 Math MEAP

Source: Michigan Department of Education, Fall 2011 MEAP Four Year Comparison (Gap Analysis): http://michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-22709_31168_31530---,00.html

© 2012 THE EDUCATION TRUST—MIDWEST
Percentage of Latino Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards By District
2011 Grade 4 Reading MEAP

Statewide Average for All Students (68%)

All Latino Students in Michigan (54%)

Source: Michigan Department of Education, Fall 2011 MEAP Four Year Comparison (Gap Analysis): http://michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-22709_31168_31530---,00.html
Percentage of Latino Students Meeting or Exceeding Standards By District
2011 Grade 8 Math MEAP

Statewide Average for All Students (29%)
All Latino Students in Michigan (16%)

Source: Michigan Department of Education, Fall 2011 MEAP Four Year Comparison (Gap Analysis): [http://michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-22709_31168_31530---,00.html](http://michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-22709_31168_31530---,00.html)
Charter schools
Fall 2010 Math Proficiency Rates of Low Income Students at Charter and Regular Public Schools

Source: Fall 2010 MEAP Six Year Comparison by School, District and State and Fall 2010 Free/Reduced Price Lunch Counts (Building data; available at: http://www.michigan.gov/cepi/0,4546,7-113-21423_30451_36965---,00.html ).
Percent of Low Income Students Meeting/Exceeding State Standards in Math - Detroit High Poverty Elementary Schools

Source: Fall 2010 MEAP Six Year Comparison by School, District and State. Elementary schools have grade 3-5 enrollments and no grade 7 or grade 8 enrollments.
Percent of Low Income Students Meeting/Exceeding State Standards in Reading - Detroit High Poverty Elementary Schools

Source: Fall 2010 MEAP Six Year Comparison by School, District and State. Elementary schools have grade 3-5 enrollments and no grade 7 or grade 8 enrollments.
Sobering data but there are some hopeful pathways to progress.
State level hope: Florida
Average NAEP 4th Grade Reading Scores, Florida and National Average 1992-2011

- National Average
- Florida
Impact of an A – F School Grading System

• **Excellence v. Complacency**
  – School grading brought a **Command Focus on Learning**.
  – Administrators, educators and parents aren’t satisfied with “C” grades, or even “B” grades. Everyone strives for **Excellence**.

• **Media & Public Attention**
  – Transparency in evaluating school performance attracts more attention to education, from extensive media coverage on the quality of education in individual schools to even realtors and realtor guides highlighting good school grades as a selling point on the housing market.

• **Statewide Competition to be the “Best of the Best”**
  – Based on their grades of their schools, each county district in Florida earns a single letter grade, creating added competition.

• **Community Support**
  – Low performing schools are easily identified and communities rally around them. Florida has witnessed countless stories of communities coming together to improve schools and raise student achievement.

• **School Pride**
  – Grading schools establishes public perception of both high performing and low performing schools, creating more ownership at the local level and added incentive to achieve or maintain excellence.
An End to Social Promotion

• Emphasis on reading as a gateway to learning.
  – 3rd grade: students are learning to read.
  – 4th grade: students are reading to learn.

• An end to social promotion in 3rd grade.
  – Students who score the lowest level (level 1 out of 5) in reading on the 3rd grade FCAT must be retained unless the student meets good cause exemptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hopeful pathways to progress in MI
Baylor-Woodson Elementary School
Inkster, MI

- 556 students in grades 3 – 5
  - 98% African American
- 84% Low Income

Note: Data are for 2010-2011 school year
Source: Michigan Department of Education
Baylor-Woodson Performance Equal to Schools in Portage, West Bloomfield, Grosse Pointe and Oxford

All Students – Grade 5 Math (Fall 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Partially Proficient</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baylor-Woodson</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amberly</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doherty</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerby</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Michigan Department of Education
Baylor-Woodson’s Strategies

• Talent transformation
• Strategic use of resources
• Improved instruction and alignment with state standards
• Taking off the “jacket of poverty”

Source: Baylor-Woodson's Strategies
Focusing on teacher quality in Michigan
The difference between top and lowest-performing teachers is equivalent to more than a year of instruction.

Student Performance on SAT 9 Reading Open-Ended Test

- + 5 months of learning
- -5.8 months of learning

Source: Measures of Effective Teaching Project, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
In districts that use a two-rating teacher performance evaluation system—most commonly “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”—the “unsatisfactory” rating is rarely used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Satisfactory Evaluation Ratings SY03-04 - SY07-08¹</td>
<td>Number of Unsatisfactory Evaluation Ratings SY03-04 - SY07-08²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver³</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>22 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonesboro⁴</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo⁵</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>2 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo⁶</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>3 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data for tenured/non-probationary teachers.

1 Source: District extant data supplied between April 2008 and March 2009
2 Source: District extant data supplied between April 2008 and March 2009
3 Number evaluation ratings assigned between SY 2003-04 to SY 2007-08
4 Number of evaluation ratings assigned between SY 2003-04 to SY 2005-06
5 Number of evaluation ratings assigned between SY 2005-06 to SY 2007-08
6 Number of evaluation ratings assigned between SY 2005-06 to SY 2007-08

Source: © The New Teacher Project 2009
Centrist Teacher Legislation

• The Education Trust Midwest led the development and passage of a transformational teacher quality package (June 2011).
• Tenure in Michigan was awarded simply based upon time served. Michigan teacher tenure now is based on performance.
• **Performance-Based Teacher Lay-Off:** Performance now is the majority factor in determining which teachers in Michigan are laid off, in addition to teachers’ special training and accomplishments and in some cases, teachers’ years of experience.
• Districts must now use four standardized rating categories (ineffective, minimally effective, effective, highly effective) in educator evaluations.
• **State is developing a voluntary default evaluation model.**
Centrist Teacher Legislation

- Developing a Pathway toward Consistent and Fair Educator Evaluation Standards: Presently in Michigan, every school district defines its own student growth measure, meaning parents and students don’t know how their schools and teachers are doing compared to other schools and districts. This practice can lead to inconsistent and unreliable performance evaluation. For example, a teacher in one district might receive an ineffective performance rating while a comparable teacher in another district could receive an effective or even highly effective rating. The present system provides neither parents nor educators any assurance of consistent, honest or reliable information. The legislation creates a Governor’s Council on Educator Effectiveness to address these and other outstanding issues.
Creation of the Governor’s Council on Educator Effectiveness

• The Governor’s Council on Educator Effectiveness has been formed to iron out details a state voluntary default evaluation system to recommend to the legislature. The Governor’s Council will be chaired by renowned scholar and Dean of the University of Michigan School of Education Dr. Deborah Ball.

• The Council will be comprised of 5 members and the Superintendent of Public Instruction or his designee as a nonvoting member.

• Among the recommendations the Governor’s Council is charged with developing:
  – Student growth and assessment tool that is a value added model.
  – A state default evaluation system for teachers.
  – A state evaluation system for school administrators.
  – Recommended definitions for effectiveness rating categories.
  – A process for evaluating and approving local evaluation systems.

Source:
Why was reform needed?

• Research shows that the most important in-school factor for students is the classroom teacher.

• Michigan’s antiquated tenure system awarded tenure simply by clocking time.

• The decision to grant tenure needed to become a performance-based, deliberate process—only allowing teachers with proven track record to earn the privilege of tenure. Currently, MI districts have a wide variety of teacher evaluation systems—some that do a decent job, and others that do a terrible job at giving teachers feedback.

• Parents and districts need honest, comparable information about the quality of their teachers and schools’ student learning.

• Teachers need better information about their practice to improve their practice.

• Consistency in at least some components of teacher evaluation is critical to ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers statewide.

Source:
Challenges of implementation
Potential challenges in Michigan

• Implementation of new common core standards
• Communicating and sharing changes with the field
• Ensuring high-quality evaluator training, including for master teachers
• District and state capacity
• Continual feedback and improvement of evaluation system
Challenges in other states

• Questions of commitment to change in field
  – Some educators don’t believe teacher quality matters or in the process

• Usefulness to the field
  – Vehicle for strong professional development
  – Improving teacher practice

Source:
Challenges in other states

• Logistical challenges
  – Widely variant ratings between districts statewide
  – Challenges in getting evaluations completed

• Establishments pushback
  – Fear and discomfort
  – Ease of use

• Release of individual teacher value-added scores in NYC
  – Feeds the fear
  – MI: model for a different pathway

Source:
Why must we struggle our way through change?
Because our kids need and deserve it.
Questions?
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