America: Two Enduring Stories
1. **Land of Opportunity:**

Work hard, and you can become anything you want to be.
2. Generational Advancement:

Through hard work, each generation of parents can assure a better life — and better education — for their children.
Powerful narratives.

Fast slipping away.
These stories animated hopes and dreams of people here at home

And drew countless immigrants to our shores
Yes, America was often intolerant...

And they knew the “Dream” was a work in progress.
We were:

• The first to provide universal high school;
• The first to build public universities;
• The first to build community colleges;
• The first to broaden access to college, through GI Bill, Pell Grants, ...
Percent of U.S. adults with a high school diploma

1920: 21%
1940: 38%
1960: 61%
1980: 85%
2000: 88%
2012: 90%
Percent of U.S. adults with a B.A. or more

2012

33%
Progress was painfully slow, especially for people of color. But year by year, decade by decade...
Percent of U.S. adults with a high school diploma, by race

2012

- White: 95%
- Black: 89%
- Latino: 75%
Percent of U.S. adults with a B.A. or more, by race

2012

- **White**: 40%
- **Black**: 23%
- **Latino**: 15%
Then, beginning in the eighties, growing economic inequality started eating away at our progress.
In recent years, most income gains have gone to those at the top of the ladder, while those at the bottom have fallen backwards.

Instead of being the most equal, the U.S. has the third highest income inequality among OECD nations.

Note: Gini coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, where 0 indicates total income equality and 1 indicates total income inequality.
There is one road up, and that road runs through our schools and colleges.
So, how are we doing?
First, some good news.

After more than a decade of fairly flat achievement and stagnant or growing gaps in K-12, we appear to be turning the corner.
Since 1999, large gains for all groups of students, especially students of color

9 Year Olds – NAEP Reading

*Denotes previous assessment format
Eighth-Grade Math: Progress for all groups, some gap narrowing

13-Year Olds – NAEP Math

- African American
- Latino
- White

*Denotes previous assessment format
Source: NAEP 2008 Trends in Academic Progress, NCES
12th Grade Math: Progress for all groups, but smaller

Grade 12 – NAEP Math

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP Data Explorer, http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nde/ (Proficient Scale Score = 176; Basic Scale Score = 141)
Also, high school graduation rates are up, reaching an all-time high last year.
In other words, reason to be encouraged—if cautiously so.

Different story in Michigan.
In All-Important Area of Early Literacy, Michigan One of Only Five States with Declining Achievement Since 2003

Average Scale Score Change, NAEP Grade 4 - Reading - All Students (2003-15)

Note: Basic Scale Score = 208; Proficient Scale Score = 238
Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES
In Math, Michigan’s 8th Graders Show Little Improvement Compared with Leading States

Average Scale Score Change, Grade 8 - NAEP Math - All Students (2003-2015)

- Massachusetts
- Tennessee
- Nation
- Michigan

Source: NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 299; Basic Scale Score = 262)
Across racial, ethnic and socio-economic groups, Michigan is in a free fall, with broad evidence of systemic failure.
Reasonably Well Known: Michigan’s African American Students at the Bottom Compared to Peers in Other States

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2015)

- NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 238; Basic Scale Score = 208)
Less Well Known: Michigan’s White Students Perform Below Peers in All But West Virginia

Grade 4 – NAEP Reading (2015)

- NAEP Data Explorer, NCES (Proficient Scale Score = 238; Basic Scale Score = 208)
Michigan NAEP Performance
Relative Rank of All Students 2003-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28th</td>
<td>30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30th</td>
<td>30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34th</td>
<td>35th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>41st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>32nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>32nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>41st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42nd</td>
<td>42nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>29th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>32nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>31st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34th</td>
<td>33rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>36th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>37th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings are among all 50 states
Source: NCES, NAEP Data Explorer
Add these numbers together and compare with other states?

Michigan is generally both low performing and low improving—not a good place to be in a country that is at best only middle-of-the-pack.
And for those who think that the “answer” is fast growth of charters...
Even though Boston’s Traditional Public Schools Perform Much Higher Than those in Detroit, Their Charters Overwhelmingly Have Higher Learning Gains

Stanford University – CREDO (2015):
Comparing Charter School Growth to Local Traditional School Growth within Boston and Detroit in Math

The Majority of Charter Districts (67%) Perform **Worse** than DPS among African American Students in 8th Grade Math

Grade 8 – MEAP Math (2013)
African American Students

**Note:** Data above represents all charter districts statewide reporting African American proficiency rates in grade 8 MEAP math for 2013. Only charter districts where African American students comprise 50% or more of the total enrollment are included.

**Source:** MDE MEAP 2013, CEPI Educational Entity Master (EEM), CEPI Public Head Count
What Can You Do?

Main lessons from fast-improving states.
Join Us

• Over the last year, our organization has launched a new campaign to make Michigan a top ten education state for *all* students, starting with early literacy and math.

• Leading organizations around the state have joined the effort to move on some of the most high-leverage and systemic improvement strategies from leading education states.
Build a Solid Foundation: Ensure Strong Reading Skills for All Michigan Third Graders
4th Grade Reading:
Michigan Low Performing, Low Growth while Florida is High Performing, High Growth

Source: 4th Grade Reading - All Students

The green lines represent national averages: the vertical green line represents the national average improvement, and the horizontal green line represents the average 2013 performance – for the subject, grade and group you chose. The focus state appears in red.
Florida: One of the Nation’s Top Gainers in Reading

• Universal pre-k;
• Investment in high quality professional development for elementary reading teachers, perhaps the best in the country;
• Significant supports for struggling readers.
Recommendations for Michigan:

Michigan needs a multi-year, system-wide plan that includes:

• Investing in re-training our teachers so that they are up-to-date on the best instructional practices in reading;
• Careful evaluation of what is working and what is not, so our course can be corrected along the way;
• Ensuring students who are behind get the extra instruction they need to catch up; and,
• Prioritizing early reading in the state’s new accountability system developed under ESSA.
Support College- and Career-Ready Instruction Across the Grades
Michigan adopted high-quality standards, but didn’t invest in implementing them.

Largely left to districts, including those with little capacity.
8th Grade Math: Michigan Low Performing, Low Growth, while Massachusetts is High Performing, High Growth

The green lines represent national averages: the vertical green line represents the national average improvement, and the horizontal green line represents the average 2013 performance – for the subject, grade and group you chose. The focus state appears in red.

Source:
What led to Massachusetts’ success?

• Major reforms began in 1993 with education grand bargain:
  – High standards and increased accountability, in return for
  – Greater and more equitable funding for schools, with increased dollars sent to schools with more children from low-income families.
College- and Career- Ready Expectations

- National leader in holding all students to rigorous standards, which included a new comprehensive assessment system.
- Developed statewide curriculum frameworks & standards in core academic subjects.

Support for All Teachers

- College- and career-ready training for thousands of educators.
- Expanded learning time.
- Joined other states to create tool to help educators assess quality of their lessons.
Investment in Systems Improvement

- Emphasis on effective teaching and leadership, including teacher performance standards; annual evaluations of teachers and administrators; raised certification requirements; accountability for teacher prep programs; investment in development and retention of top teachers.
Recommendations for Michigan:

• Stick with your existing college- and career-ready standards;

• Provide training and ongoing support (including standards-aligned instructional materials) to teachers and leaders: quality implementation is everything.

• Stay on track with the new assessment: Michigan needs to continue administering a fully aligned, independently reviewed, high-quality assessment like the initial iteration of the M-STEP.
Talent Matters: Develop Strong Leaders and Excellent Teachers
ACCESS TO MULTIPLE EFFECTIVE TEACHERS CAN DRAMATICALLY AFFECT STUDENT LEARNING

CST math proficiency trends for second-graders at 'Below Basic' or 'Far Below Basic' in 2007 who subsequently had three consecutive high or low value-added teachers.
Effective Teaching and School Leadership

• Tennessee has put a laser-like focus on effective teaching and school leadership.
  – All teachers evaluated based on classroom observations and student learning data through the statewide evaluation system.
• Tennessee has trained 5,000 evaluators in the system.
  – One of the nation’s first value-added data systems
  – Multiple observations of classroom practice in final evaluations and individual evaluations private
Career- and College- Ready Expectations for All Students

• Tennessee phased in the Common Core standards over multiple years, starting with math in grades 3-8 and a pilot of English standards in 60 school districts.

• Invested $15 million in Common Core training. Identified more than 700 teachers with strong learning gains and trained them to be Common Core coaches for more than 30,000 educators.

• Developed a pre-K through higher education (P-20) longitudinal student data system and piloted early warning data system so educators could monitor real-time indicators of at-risk student progress.
Recommendations for Michigan:

- Implement the statewide system of educator evaluation effectively so that educators can get timely feedback;
- Invest in capacity-building, for both evaluators and those being evaluated;
- Train principals in techniques for holding on to their top performers; and,
- Evaluate educator pipelines, growing those that produce the most effective teachers and principals, and shrinking those that produce the least effective.
Fix Your Funding Systems
While Michigan’s overall per student spending has declined a bit, it remains above the national average. But....
Michigan’s Funding Gap Between the Highest and Lowest Poverty Districts is 42nd Out of 47 States

Michigan is one of only six states in the analysis that provides substantially less funding to its highest poverty districts than to its lowest poverty districts.

Funding Gaps Between the Highest and Lowest Poverty Districts, By State

Reading this figure: In Ohio, the highest poverty districts receive 22 percent more in state and local funds per student than the lowest poverty districts (not adjusted for additional needs of low-income students). In states shaded in teal, the highest poverty districts receive at least 5 percent more in state and local funds per student than the lowest poverty districts; in states shaded in red, they receive at least 5 percent less. Black shading indicates similar levels of funding for the highest and lowest poverty districts.

Note: Hawaii was excluded from the within-state analysis because it is one district. Alaska and Nevada are also excluded because their student populations are heavily concentrated in certain districts and could be broken into quartiles. Because so many of New York’s students are concentrated in New York City, the analysis sorted that state into two halves, as opposed to four quartiles.

Source: The Education Trust, Funding Gaps Report, 2015
## Funding Gaps *Within Michigan*: Inequities in State and Local Revenue per Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gap</th>
<th>−$664, or 6%, less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest-Poverty vs. Lowest-Poverty Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for Michigan:

• Find resources now for strategic state investments in systems improvement strategies, including training and supports around early literacy; standards implementation for teachers and school leaders, and quality evaluation.

• Begin the process of overhauling the school funding system as necessary to assure fairness across different kinds of districts.
Beyond Funding, Aggressively Address Other Inequities That Contribute to Michigan’s Large Achievement Gaps
While many Americans believe that achievement gaps are mostly about the kids and their parents, research tells us otherwise.
When it comes to poor and minority students, we:

- Expect less from them;
- Educate them disproportionately in watered down courses; and,
- Assign them disproportionately to our least experienced, least well-educated and least effective teachers.
We’re also more likely to suspend them from school, even for exactly the same offenses as more advantaged children.

And Michigan seems to have a particular problem...
Michigan Has 3rd Highest Out-of-School Suspension Rate in the Nation for African American Students at 21%

*Note: Hawaii provided limited data and is excluded from this analysis.
Source: 2011 CRDC
Recommendations for Michigan:

Hold school districts (and schools) accountable for:

- Ensuring fair access to the strongest teachers;
- Ensuring equitable access to the rigorous high school courses that lead to readiness for college and careers; and,
- Using discipline policies fairly, and focusing them on keeping students in school.

Organize vehicles for schools struggling with these issues to get advice and assistance from those that have successfully tackled them.
All of this requires committed and sustained State Leadership.
Recommendations for Michigan:

• State leaders should engage the best experts from inside and outside of the state to help re-engineer the state’s improvement structures to provide better support to schools and districts.

• Better use of data and the creation of fast-cycle feedback loops must be at the heart of the new system, so our efforts support continuous improvement and get smarter over time.

• New resources should be focused on high-leverage, targeted strategies to improve system performance and student achievement, but quality implementation is essential.
Michigan Achieves: Key Priorities Moving Forward

TOP TEN EDUCATION STATE BY 2030

- Strong Reading Skills for All Michigan Third Graders
- Committed and Sustained State Leadership
- College- and Career-Ready Instruction for All Students
- Fair School Funding
- Improved Access and Opportunity for All Students
- Strong Leaders and Excellent Teachers
- Honest and Reliable Data
- Improved Access and Opportunity for All Students
- Strong Leaders and Excellent Teachers
- Honest and Reliable Data
THANK YOU!

Contact:

Amber Arellano, aarellano@edtrustmidwest.org

The Education Trust – Midwest
(734) 619-8008
edtrustmidwest.org
michiganachieves.com