

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:**

**Parts I and II**

**for**

**STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS**

**under the**

**ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT**

**As amended by the**

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on

**School Year 2008-09**

**MICHIGAN**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009**

**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

### PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

### TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2008-09 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:  
Michigan Department of Education

Address:  
PO Box 30008  
Lansing MI 48909

Person to contact about this report:

Name: MaryAlice Galloway

Telephone: 517-241-3147

Fax: 517-241-2540

e-mail: GallowayM@michigan.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):  
MaryAlice Galloway

Friday, March 12, 2010, 4:09:44 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2008-09**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009  
5PM EST**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

### STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

#### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Michigan is one of the 48 states participating in the Common Core State Standards which will result in changes in both Math and ELA standards by August 2010.

Changes were made to the mathematics content expectations specific to Algebra II in December 2009.

Expect to start implementing the Common Core State Standards in Math and ELA in 2011.

No revisions or changes to Science content standards.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)

(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There will be changes regarding the writing portion of the ELA assessments. Beginning in the Fall of 2010, writing will only be assessed on the MEAP in grades 4 and 7. Beginning in the Spring of 2011, writing will only be assessed on the MME in grade 11.

Michigan is also working with a consortium of states to explore the development of common ELA and Math assessments.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

In the Fall of 2010 the MEAP test will assess the new Science Grade Level Expectations for the first time.
--

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with ESEA. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

*The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.*

*The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.*

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	830,250		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,629		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	22,189		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	159,191		>97%
Hispanic	39,108		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	593,151		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	111,914		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	27,874		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	340,641		>97%
Migratory students	1,528		>97%
Male	424,253		>97%
Female	405,997		>97%
<b>Comments: The percentage of students participating is 100% because the data was disaggregated by FULLYR and NOTFULLYR, so we could not determine those data from the headcount. Therefore, the counts for "not tested" were not loaded into the EDEN file.</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	45,071	40.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	46,177	41.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	20,666	18.5
Total	111,914	
<b>Comments: The data submitted are correct.</b>		

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	826,621		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,594		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	21,689		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	158,077		>97%
Hispanic	38,560		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	591,758		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	111,376		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	26,469		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	338,055		>97%
Migratory students	1,420		>97%
Male	422,127		>97%
Female	404,494		>97%
<b>Comments: The percentage of students participating is 100% because the data was disaggregated by FULLYR and NOTFULLYR, so we could not determine those data from the headcount. Therefore, the counts for "not tested" were not loaded into the EDEN file.</b>			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

#### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	57,398	51.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,831	28.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	22,147	19.9
Total	111,376	
<b>Comments: The data submitted are correct.</b>		

#### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	354,737		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,283		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,117		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	65,758		>97%
Hispanic	15,283		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	257,917		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	46,375		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,075		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	134,799		>97%
Migratory students	469		>97%
Male	180,979		>97%
Female	173,758		>97%
<b>Comments: The percentage of students participating is 100% because the data was disaggregated by FULLYR and NOTFULLYR, so we could not determine those data from the headcount. Therefore, the counts for "not tested" were not loaded into the EDEN file.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,493	37.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	20,365	43.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,517	18.4
Total	46,375	
<b>Comments: The data submitted are correct.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

##### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	118,087	107,464	91.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,019	939	92.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,570	3,416	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,486	18,494	78.7
Hispanic	6,472	5,612	86.7
White, non-Hispanic	82,000	77,588	94.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,396	12,258	79.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,760	4,904	85.1
Economically disadvantaged students	53,088	45,383	85.5
Migratory students	300	240	80.0
Male	60,320	55,083	91.3
Female	57,767	52,381	90.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

##### 1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	117,270	97,451	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,002	802	80.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,455	3,173	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	23,218	16,118	69.4
Hispanic	6,367	4,714	74.0
White, non-Hispanic	81,694	71,388	87.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,312	9,257	60.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,475	3,783	69.1
Economically disadvantaged students	52,555	39,071	74.3
Migratory students	283	183	64.7
Male	59,888	48,355	80.7
Female	57,382	49,096	85.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments: Michigan only tests grades 5, 8 and 11 for Science</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	117,074	102,790	87.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,076	941	87.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,221	3,063	95.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,082	17,095	74.1
Hispanic	6,064	4,917	81.1
White, non-Hispanic	82,142	75,479	91.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,733	11,854	70.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,823	3,661	75.9
Economically disadvantaged students	52,141	42,054	80.6
Migratory students	264	218	82.6
Male	59,876	52,565	87.8
Female	57,198	50,225	87.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	116,505	89,389	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,075	797	74.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,131	2,749	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	22,869	12,939	56.6
Hispanic	5,986	3,833	64.0
White, non-Hispanic	81,963	67,931	82.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,656	8,494	51.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,587	2,333	50.9
Economically disadvantaged students	51,726	33,568	64.9
Migratory students	249	132	53.0
Male	59,558	44,239	74.3
Female	56,947	45,150	79.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments: Michigan only tests grades 5, 8 and 11 for Science</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

### 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	118,041	90,590	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,095	792	72.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,317	3,049	91.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,170	12,893	55.6
Hispanic	5,983	3,965	66.3
White, non-Hispanic	83,076	68,821	82.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,077	8,833	51.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,216	2,567	60.9
Economically disadvantaged students	51,301	33,247	64.8
Migratory students	235	148	63.0
Male	60,785	47,244	77.7
Female	57,256	43,346	75.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	117,419	91,878	78.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,090	838	76.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,213	2,841	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,010	13,509	58.7
Hispanic	5,872	3,909	66.6
White, non-Hispanic	82,838	69,673	84.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,008	8,376	49.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,951	1,991	50.4
Economically disadvantaged students	50,908	33,765	66.3
Migratory students	221	119	53.8
Male	60,419	45,783	75.8
Female	57,000	46,095	80.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	117,877	97,419	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,092	909	83.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,309	2,990	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,120	14,223	61.5
Hispanic	5,928	4,300	72.5
White, non-Hispanic	83,027	73,823	88.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,979	10,769	63.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,185	2,463	58.8
Economically disadvantaged students	51,154	36,854	72.0
Migratory students	212	132	62.3
Male	60,701	49,991	82.4
Female	57,176	47,428	83.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

### 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	119,242	95,300	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,121	864	77.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,237	3,007	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,381	14,422	61.7
Hispanic	5,652	4,036	71.4
White, non-Hispanic	84,518	71,918	85.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,725	8,650	51.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,642	2,281	62.6
Economically disadvantaged students	50,670	35,174	69.4
Migratory students	216	157	72.7
Male	61,063	48,249	79.0
Female	58,179	47,051	80.9
<b>Comments: Data was validated and is correct.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	118,564	94,463	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,115	862	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,178	2,829	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	23,159	14,367	62.0
Hispanic	5,563	3,782	68.0
White, non-Hispanic	84,221	71,586	85.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,632	8,229	49.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,436	1,736	50.5
Economically disadvantaged students	50,167	34,228	68.2
Migratory students	197	115	58.4
Male	60,676	46,658	76.9
Female	57,888	47,805	82.6
<b>Comments: Data was validated and is correct.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments: Michigan only tests grades 5, 8 and 11 for Science</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

### 1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	120,959	99,605	82.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,127	886	78.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,031	2,833	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic	23,479	14,907	63.5
Hispanic	5,536	4,174	75.4
White, non-Hispanic	86,540	75,815	87.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,482	8,368	50.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,526	2,330	66.1
Economically disadvantaged students	49,733	35,792	72.0
Migratory students	227	164	72.2
Male	61,900	50,052	80.9
Female	59,059	49,553	83.9
<b>Comments: Data was validated and is correct.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	120,190	96,382	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,120	865	77.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,964	2,683	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	23,165	14,602	63.0
Hispanic	5,442	3,881	71.3
White, non-Hispanic	86,262	73,366	85.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,377	8,078	49.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,328	1,819	54.7
Economically disadvantaged students	49,193	34,111	69.3
Migratory students	209	134	64.1
Male	61,418	46,899	76.4
Female	58,772	49,483	84.2
<b>Comments: Data was validated and is correct.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments: Michigan only tests grades 5, 8 and 11 for Science</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

### 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	123,198	92,003	74.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,155	839	72.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,029	2,702	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,814	12,528	52.6
Hispanic	5,640	3,656	64.8
White, non-Hispanic	88,427	71,477	80.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,695	7,766	46.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,731	2,144	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	48,930	30,533	62.4
Migratory students	218	140	64.2
Male	63,392	47,546	75.0
Female	59,806	44,457	74.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	122,321	94,170	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,148	851	74.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,967	2,602	87.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,486	13,947	59.4
Hispanic	5,543	3,722	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	88,057	72,199	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,555	7,303	44.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,511	1,721	49.0
Economically disadvantaged students	48,344	31,391	64.9
Migratory students	191	109	57.1
Male	62,893	46,061	73.2
Female	59,428	48,109	81.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	122,741	92,985	75.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,152	853	74.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,016	2,621	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,626	11,822	50.0
Hispanic	5,576	3,535	63.4
White, non-Hispanic	88,238	73,318	83.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,535	7,322	44.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,693	1,775	48.1
Economically disadvantaged students	48,623	29,893	61.5
Migratory students	188	103	54.8
Male	63,130	47,254	74.8
Female	59,611	45,731	76.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	113,649	56,639	49.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,036	392	37.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,784	2,008	72.1
Black, non-Hispanic	18,779	3,441	18.3
Hispanic	3,761	1,249	33.2
White, non-Hispanic	86,448	49,144	56.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,806	2,952	23.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,176	452	20.8
Economically disadvantaged students	34,778	10,682	30.7
Migratory students	68	22	32.4
Male	56,917	29,697	52.2
Female	56,732	26,942	47.5
<b>Comments: Data was validated and is correct.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	114,352	60,422	52.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,044	420	40.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,781	1,778	63.9
Black, non-Hispanic	19,170	5,014	26.2
Hispanic	3,787	1,348	35.6
White, non-Hispanic	86,723	51,411	59.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,836	3,732	29.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,181	291	13.3
Economically disadvantaged students	35,162	12,094	34.4
Migratory students	70	19	27.1
Male	57,275	27,535	48.1
Female	57,077	32,887	57.6
<b>Comments: Data was validated and is correct.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	114,119	63,771	55.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,039	482	46.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,792	1,991	71.3
Black, non-Hispanic	19,012	4,535	23.8
Hispanic	3,779	1,482	39.2
White, non-Hispanic	86,652	54,821	63.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,861	3,431	26.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,197	417	19.0
Economically disadvantaged students	35,022	12,889	36.8
Migratory students	69	20	29.0
Male	57,148	32,785	57.4
Female	56,971	30,986	54.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	3,623	3,289	90.8
Districts	845	538	63.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	1,922	1,854	96.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	903	864	95.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,019	990	97.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
759	512	67.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement <sup>1</sup> Year 1, School Improvement <sup>1</sup> Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	6
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	11
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	13
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	41
<b>Comments: Data for the "Extension of the school year day" was submitted, however the total was zero.</b>	

#### 1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	44
<b>Comments: Data for the "Replacement of all or most of the school staff", "Reopening the school as a public charter school", "Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school", and "Take over the school by the State" were submitted, however the totals were zero.</b>	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Closed the school and re-opened it as a magnet school within district governance Used an external research-based reform model Appointed a new principal
---

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action )
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state has three LEAs identified for district improvement. The state is implementing a statewide system of support for high priority schools. This system increases focus on needs of schools within each LEA identified for district improvement. The state uses this data from the system of support to work with LEAs to identify critical factors for change in the course of the years program and services. The state then requires the district to implement this change.

### 1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments: The state does not have any districts identified for corrective action.</b>	

#### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	43	31
Schools	964	512
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	08/01/09
---	----------

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2008-09.

#### 1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

*Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
  - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

*States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	32,088	33,566
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	14,302	9,431
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	44.6	28.1
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	31,702	33,049
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	14,049	10,247
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	44.3	31.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

<b>Category</b>	<b># of Schools</b>
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	125
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	15
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	21
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1	Schools not making AYP for reasons of proficiency must participate in the Title I Statewide System of Support. This includes mentors, coaches, academies, data study, professional development, and partnerships. Additionally, schools not making AYP for reasons of proficiency in corrective action and above are allocated a subgrant to address the reasons the school did not make AYP. Strategies 1,2,3,4,and 5 are applied.	89			D	It is not possible to isolate one variable from a multiple of variables used for school improvement. We are unable to determine an exact number directly related to one strategy
<b>Comments:</b>						

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have used the following media to share:

- 1 Our Regional Service Areas who have Title I schools not making AYP meet quarterly to share issues and successes
- 2 All schools have access to effective strategies through our school improvement website, which links to North Central Association/AdvancED research. this information is available online.
- 3 Schools are invited to State School Improvement Conferences, where effective strategies are shared. Schools that have come "off the list" are recognized, and some have been asked to present the practices they used to other conference goers.
- 4 Field Services consultants are assigned to all Title I schools. During onsite visits, they share how other schools are implementing best practices
- 5 Schools not making AYP for proficiency in Phases 1 and above are assigned a mentor team to assist with implementing the school improvement plan. Mentors assist a school in choosing and implementing best practices that relate to the reasons not making AYP
- 6 All schools have access to the Michigan School Improvement Framework, which lists best practices in the areas of leadership, data and information management, teaching for learning, personnel and professional learning, and school and community relations. This document can be accessed online.
- 7 All schools have access to a comprehensive needs assessment, which provides a rubric where a school can measure its efforts against the best practices described in the Michigan School Improvement Framework (see description above, number 6). This document can be accessed online
- 8 MDE staff presents at statewide and regional conferences to share best practices. Target audiences have included local superintendents, principals, teachers, and boards of education
- 9 MDE is partnering with a variety of professional organizations within the state to develop local capacity. One example is working with Calhoun Intermediate School District, which developed a program of professional development around the interpretation of student data. We are offering this program statewide to districts using their expertise.
- 10 Schools in AYP Phase 3 or above for reasons of proficiency receive a leadership coach. The role of the coach is to assist the building leadership team in dealing with building issues that impede the implementation of the building school improvement plan. Strategies shared are reflected in the School Improvement Framework.
- 11 Schools in Phase 3 or above receiving a leadership coach also have the principal, coach and leadership attend an academy that focuses on aligning resources and systems in the building so the school improvement plan might be implemented. Best practices of instructional leadership are emphasized.
- 12 Schools not making AYP for proficiency in Phases 1 and 2 have access to in-depth data training, assistance in selecting research based strategies, and if requested, instructional coaches.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

##### 1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

##### 1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

##### 1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003 (g) (8) funds in the amount of \$4.2 Million. An accountability grant was established to assist Title I schools in the Statewide System of Support. Schools not making AYP for proficiency and assigned the status of School Improvement were given the opportunity to examine student data in teacher teams. Based on the results of the data examination, schools requested data coaches to assist with ongoing evaluation of student achievement. Schools in this stage also were given technical assistance in selecting research based interventions, and were assigned instructional coaches as appropriate. Funding was used to plan for implementation of scale-up for SY 09-10, where the technical assistance would expand to schools in Corrective Action and Restructuring. A particular focus addressed high schools as well as any school with a targeted need for English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All schools have access to effective strategies through our school improvement website, which links to North Central Association/AdvancED research. this information is available online.

Schools are invited to State School Improvement Conferences, where effective strategies are shared. Schools that have come "off the list" are recognized, and some have been asked to present the practices they used to other conference goers.

Field Services consultants are assigned to all Title I schools. During onsite visits, they share how other schools are implementing best practices

All schools have access to the Michigan School Improvement Framework, which lists best practices in the areas of leadership, data and information management, teaching for learning, personnel and professional learning, and school and community relations. This document can be accessed online

All schools have access to a comprehensive needs assessment, which provides a rubric where a school can measure its efforts against the best practices described in the Michigan School Improvement Framework (see description above, number 6). This document can be accessed online

MDE staff presents at statewide and regional conferences to share best practices. Target audiences have included local superintendents, principals, teachers, and boards of education

MDE is partnering with a variety of professional organizations within the state to develop local capacity. One example is working with Calhoun Intermediate School District, which developed a program of professional development around the interpretation of student data. We are offering this program statewide to districts using their expertise.

MDE has curriculum standards for the core areas that all schools can access. Conferences to support and explain these standards are held throughout the state.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

##### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	84,503
Applied to transfer	633
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	357

##### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 390,695

##### 1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	37

## FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.
- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.
- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	53,333
Applied for supplemental educational services	16,065
Received supplemental educational services	13,134
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 20,314,814
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

### 1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	238,663	236,725	99.2	1,938	0.8
All elementary classes	62,564	62,447	99.8	117	0.2
All secondary classes	176,099	174,278	99.0	1,821	1.0

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Michigan counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom counts as ONE CLASS.

## FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

### 1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.**

	Percentage
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	55.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	45.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the 238,663 classes in Michigan, 64 (0.1%) are taught by non-HQ general elementary teachers and 53 (1.1%) non-HQ special education teachers. While the numbers in the chart above indicate a higher percentage of general education teachers unable to demonstrate HQ, it is important to note that the total number of special education classes (4,776) is significantly lower than general education (57,788).

	Percentage
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	15.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	75.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the 238,663 classes in Michigan, 370 (0.2%) are taught by non-HQ general secondary teachers and 1,451 (12.5%) non-HQ special education. It is significantly more difficult to staff secondary special education classrooms with HQ teachers and the complexity by which HQ status is determined for special education teachers continues to cause confusion. We continue to assist LEAs and special education teachers in understanding the HQ requirements.

\*Of the 84,152 TEACHERS in Michigan, 75,561 are general education teachers and 8,591 are special education teachers. Of the 8,591 special education classes, 601 (7%) are being taught by teachers who have not yet demonstrated HQ status. That is compared to the 0.2% of general education non-HQTs.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

**NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).**

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	18,843	18,778	99.7
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	18,682	18,663	99.9
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	26,815	26,119	97.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	58,601	58,318	99.5

**1.5.4** In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	67.0	26.5
Poverty metric used	The percent of students eligible for free and reduced-priced meals at each school was calculated as the poverty rate. Elementary schools were then ranked among all the elementary schools in the state based on poverty rates to determine the poverty quartiles. If a poverty rate for a school was not available then the rate for the district was used.	
Secondary schools	58.6	24.4
Poverty metric used	The percent of students eligible for free and reduced-priced meals at each school was calculated as the poverty rate. Secondary schools were then ranked among all the secondary schools in the state based on poverty rates to determine the poverty quartiles. If a poverty rate for a school was not available then the rate for the district was used.	

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that

*exclusively serve  
children in grades 6 and higher.*

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

#### **Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf)**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish; Finnish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish; Arabic; Chaldean
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish; Vietnamese; German; Russian; Arabic; Chaldean; Portuguese; Albanian; Chinese; Hmong
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish; Arabic; Ojibwe
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	74,995
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	47,941
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	31,796
Arabic	14,042
Syriac	2,999
Uncoded languages	2,663
Albanian	1,878

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	55,667
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	17,676
Total	73,343
<b>Comments: The LEP population in Michigan has decreased over last year's count.</b>	

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	17,278
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	31.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	36,139
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	9,905
Total	46,044
<b>Comments: Test numbers for title III students are lower this year than last year, for an unknown reason. We will be surveying districts to resolve this discrepancy.</b>	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	8,024

1.6.3.2.2

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	20,325	55.6	27,104	75.00
ELP attainment	11,401	31.2	3,614	10.00
<b>Comments:</b>				



### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

#### 1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1,547	838	2,385
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,019	879	86.3	140
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,020	884	86.7	136
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
346	273	78.9	73
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

**Note:** Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# -Total number of subgrantees for the year	323
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	27
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	251
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	246
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	37
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	4
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	4
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

**Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

#### **Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under**

Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
14,442	14,442	72

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note: Section 3301(8) - The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.**

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	273
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	28

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

### 1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

#### **Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **#Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	43	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	46	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	33	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	23	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	19	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	38	2,752
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	43	483
PD provided to principals	33	417
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	27	460
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	31	731
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	332
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>5,175</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

#### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/08	3/16/09	255
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Michigan Department of Education determined that for the 2009-2010 school year, grantees receiving funds from the 2008-2009 school year would be given a preliminary allocation of 85% of the 2008-2009 school year allocation in order to plan for the 2009-2010 school year and to be able to make use of up to 50% of the 85% until final allocation numbers could be determined.

### 1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
<b>Comments: Data for "Persistently Dangerous Schools was submitted, however, the total was zero.</b>	

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	66.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.7
Black, non-Hispanic	56.3
Hispanic	60.3
White, non-Hispanic	81.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	58.0
Limited English proficient	67.1
Economically disadvantaged	60.5
Migratory students	47.1
Male	71.2
Female	80.0
<b>Comments: Based on 4-yr cohort.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:*
  - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
  - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
  - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	5.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.1
Black, non-Hispanic	11.3
Hispanic	9.3
White, non-Hispanic	3.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7.6
Limited English proficient	7.5
Economically disadvantaged	8.2
Migratory students	7.3
Male	6.4
Female	4.7
<b>Comments: Preliminary rates.</b>	

### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.*

## 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	333	143
LEAs with subgrants	499	440
Total	832	583
<b>Comments: Fifteen (15) of Michigan's 31 subgrantees for 2008-2009 were Intermediate School Districts (ISDs), representing multiple LEAs. Other subgrantees also included smaller consortia of LEAs. The total number of LEAs represented within MI subgrants in 2008-2009 was 499.</b>		

### 1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	35	224
K	299	1,039
1	277	1,066
2	275	1,051
3	242	1,016
4	242	928
5	210	887
6	240	862
7	208	816
8	254	810
9	228	1,010
10	272	883
11	302	945
12	515	1,429
Ungraded		2,141
Total	3,599	15,107
<b>Comments: The UNGRADED category for LEAs without subgrants was left blank because the 2008-2009 Michigan student data system was not able to collect this information. These totals do not represent all of the homeless students enrolled in LEAs in Michigan. Ninety-six (96) LEAs with subgrants reported total numbers of students, but did not provide the grade-level breakdown in time for this report. The number is students from these 96 LEAs totalled 2,141 and is shown in the UNGRADED cell for LEAs with subgrants.</b>		

### 1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	902	3,918
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,263	7,183
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	339	1,207
Hotels/Motels	95	658
Total	3,599	12,966
<b>Comments: The data above DOES NOT include the 2,141 students from LEAs with subgrants that were listed in the UNGRADED category above. The majority of non-subgrantee districts did not report Primary Nighttime Residence of all enrolled homeless children/youth. Based on the discrepancies in counts between LEAs with and without subgrants, additional technical assistance and training will continue to be provided to non-subgrantees on eligibility, identification and reporting of homeless students. Grade-level data do not match the Nighttime Residence count totals or achievement totals due to inadequacies of the student data system used in MI during the 2008-2009 school year. A new data system was implemented at the beginning of the 2009-2010 school year, and should lead to improved accuracy in reporting for future years.</b>		

### 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,317
K	1,302
1	1,307
2	1,245
3	1,291
4	1,149
5	1,130
6	1,156
7	976
8	965
9	1,177
10	1,017
11	991
12	1,397
Ungraded	553
Total	16,973
<b>Comments: At the time of this report, 5 subgrantee fiscal agents had not filed complete data reports, with subpopulation details. Due to inadequacies in the datasystem used in MI during the 2008-2009 school year, ONLY LEAs WITH SUBGRANTS REPORT COUNTS OF STUDENTS SERVED.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	3,114
Migratory children/youth	88
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,608
Limited English proficient students	249
<b>Comments: At the time of this report, 5 subgrantee fiscal agents had not filed complete data reports, with subpopulation details.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	367
Expedited evaluations	254
Staff professional development and awareness	499
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	499
Transportation	499
Early childhood programs	152
Assistance with participation in school programs	480
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	397
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	383
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	468
Coordination between schools and agencies	259
Counseling	308
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	371
Clothing to meet a school requirement	427
School supplies	474
Referral to other programs and services	477
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	350
Other (optional – in comment box below)	323
Other (optional – in comment box below)	285
Other (optional – in comment box below)	44

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

OTHER counts listed above represent: Credit recovery support-323; Personal hygiene items-285; Housing-44. Additional services offered by grantees: Food & food referrals-35 Graduation caps & gowns-35 Parent Support Group-1

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	163
School Selection	251
Transportation	499
School records	172
Immunizations	59
Other medical records	35
Other Barriers – in comment box below	371

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

OTHER barriers faced by subgrantees: ABOVE COUNT represents lack of affordable housing and waiting lists for public housing -371

OTHER BARRIERS: Identification very difficult in rural areas -251

Limited shelter space-94, Children in shelters being truant-32, Serving students with ADHD and behavioral problems due to suspensions & expulsions-21, Incomplete student data provided by LEAs-7, Fees for athletic participation/extracurricular activities-272, Assistance with court fees-1, Length of time dealing with Social Security System (for cards)-1.

The majority of subgrantees reported transportation to be the most significant barrier to the educational access and success of homeless children/youth, followed by eligibility issues, and school selection issues with LEAs.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State ESEA reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	479	346
4	443	270
5	420	243
6	446	267
7	387	266
8	388	222
High School	561	182
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State ESEA mathematics assessment.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient</b>
3	482	412
4	448	355
5	430	245
6	454	285
7	400	277
8	400	205
High School	554	158
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

**Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.**

### FAQs on Child Count:

*How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.*

*How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)*

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,287
K	603
1	581
2	487
3	531
4	434
5	398
6	441
7	374
8	392
9	345
10	276
11	212
12	144
Ungraded	292
Out-of-school	1,264
Total	8,061
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Decline in student counts can be attributed to:

- \* Migrant families settling out of the migrant stream
- \* Decreasing number of farms that employ migrant labor
- \* Farmers hiring single men and not families
- \* Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raids
- \* Unavailability of migrant housing
- \* Farmers switching to crops that do not require manual labor
- \* Migrants finding better paying jobs away from agriculture
- \* Infestations and weather affecting crops
- \* Farms converting to "Pick Your Own"
- \* Less migrants working longer hours
- \* Secondary students staying at home base to maintain credits
- \* Smaller migrant families

Michigan had an increase in the number of migrant families coming to Michigan compared to the previous year in large part due to the decrease in the cost of gas.

### 1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	754
K	453
1	436
2	359
3	372
4	309
5	259
6	245
7	197
8	189
9	111
10	91
11	68
12	18
Ungraded	162
Out-of-school	46
Total	4,069
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Decline in student counts can be attributed to:

- \* Migrant families settling out of the migrant stream
- \* Decreasing number of farms that employ migrant labor
- \* Farmers hiring single men and not families
- \* Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raids
- \* Unavailability of migrant housing
- \* Farmers switching to crops that do not require manual labor
- \* Migrants finding better paying jobs away from agriculture
- \* Infestations and weather affecting crops
- \* Farms converting to "Pick Your Own"
- \* Less migrants working longer hours
- \* Secondary students staying at home base to maintain credits
- \* Smaller migrant families

Michigan had an increase in the number of migrant families coming to Michigan compared to the previous year in large part due to the decrease in the cost of gas.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Michigan used the Migrant Education Database System (MEDS) to generate the 2008-09 Category 1 child count and the Category 2 child count. The MEDS is an online custom web-based system. This system has been in place since 2005-06 and replaces the manual system used by the Michigan Department of Education in earlier years.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) uses the same system described in 1.10.3.1 to collect the Category 1 and Category 2 data.

Each local migrant program employs recruiters to survey the area within their school district boundaries to identify and recruit new families. In areas of the state where there is no local migrant program, the MDE funds four state-wide identification and recruitment (ID&R) projects to survey those areas. In all cases, the recruiter interviews the families to determine eligibility. If the family is deemed eligible, a paper Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for that family. The data collected on the COE aligns with the minimum data elements (MDEs) suggested by the OME, including name, birth date, birth location, grade, sex, and birth verification. The interviewee and the recruiter sign the COE. The local migrant program director, or state-wide director, review the COE for accuracy and completeness. The director then signs the form if s/he finds that the COE is accurate and the family is eligible.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Once eligibility is verified, data entry personnel enter the data from the paper COE into the MEDS. This electronic version of the COE is sent to the local migrant director who reviews it and forwards it to the MDE for final approval. At the MDE, one of two contracted staff review the COE for accuracy and eligibility. This is their primary job responsibility. If the COE is incomplete or inaccurate, it is returned to the local migrant program for corrections. Once the COE is deemed complete and accurate, it is approved by the MDE.

Enrollment and attendance data is updated on the MEDS if a student moves before the end of the term or school year. Typically, the regular term enrollment/attendance information is obtained through the attendance office at the school where the migrant student attends. Summer term enrollment/attendance is generated by the summer migrant program. In both instances, migrant staff enters the data into the MEDS. New COE information is entered into the MEDS every time a family makes a new qualifying move.

For families that did not move during the year, recruiters visit the family and complete a COE every 365 days. The new COE includes updated information for the family and a new parent signature. The updated information includes students' new grade levels, as well as notation of children that have moved away. Any new students that have moved in with the family generate a separate COE. Both the updated COE and the new COE for any new students are stapled to the original family COE. The 2008-09 MEDS data was collected between September 1, 2008 and August 31, 2009. The MEDS consolidates the data from the individual programs to determine counts. The data are now collected on a real time basis. Data is organized in a relational database.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for the State's category 2 count was not collected or maintained differently from the category 1 count.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MEDS includes reporting functions that are programmed to count only those children who meet eligibility criteria. For 2008-09, only those children who:

- \* had an enrollment/identified date between 9/1/2008 and 8/31/2009
- \* had a birth date at least three years before their withdrawal/moved date
- \* had a birth date less than 22 years before their enrollment/identified date
- \* had not yet graduated or received a GED, and \* had a qualifying move within 36 months of their enrollment/identified date

were included in Category 1 child counts. Documentation of a qualifying activity is a prerequisite for the completion of a COE. The family's eligibility is verified by the recruiter and the local migrant director. On 8/31/2008, all previously identified migrant children were withdrawn and had to be identified as residing in Michigan between 9/1/2008 and 8/31/2009 in order to be included on any 2008-09 reports.

The Category 2 child count is programmed to count only those children who, in addition to the five criteria listed above, were enrolled in a migrant summer program between 6/16/2008 and 8/31/2009 and had at least one day of attendance. Both Category 1 and Category 2 MEDS child counts are unduplicated reports run with state-wide data.

The latest enhancement to the MEDS checks specifically for duplicates. The system does a pair-wise comparison on each student in the system. The system compares the first three letters of the last name and the first three letters of the first name. This generates a source student that is compared against all possible matches. If additional examination is required to eliminate possible duplications, the names of parents, birth date, the birth place, and the names of siblings are also compared. The MEDS also assigns a unique student identification number to every student in the database. In addition, we have established a process whereby students in the MEDS are matched to students in the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) for the purpose of assigning a Unique Identifier Code (UIC).

Category 2 dates are 6/16/2009 -8/31/2009

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The states category 2 count was not generated using a different system from the category 1 count.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each of the reports run for Category 1 and Category 2 contain enrollment dates and QAD parameters to insure accurate and unduplicated student counts. These reports run for each migrant program. As a final step to insure accuracy, the reports are sent to each local migrant program for verification of student counts. If there are differences between the local migrant count and the state count, these differences are resolved on a program by program basis. Once the differences are resolved, MDE requests a statement from each local program that the local counts and the state counts match. At this point, the local migrant program counts are included in the state counts.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Re-Interview process for 2008-09 is a continuation and an improvement of the re-interview process begun in 2003-04. The training for the re-interviewers has been on-going and more focused. An analysis was done of the COEs recommended for disqualification during the 2003-2007 school years. The most common reasons for disqualification were qualifying moves older than 36 months, and performance of work that did not qualify; specifically landscaping as opposed to nursery work. The training of recruiters focused on these areas and the re-interviewers report a decrease in these recruitment areas. The defect rate for Michigan for 2003-04 was 7.91%. The defect rate for 2004-05 was 2.77% and for 2005-06, it was 3.16%. The defect rate for 2006-07 was 2.66%. For 2007-08, the defect rate was 1.87% and the defect rate for 2008-09 is 2.77%. This defect rate may change due to COEs still being reviewed.

The training for re-interviews has also been given to recruiters, data entry personnel, secretaries, and migrant directors.

The training curriculum is based on:

- \* an on-line assessment conducted by ESCORT in spring 2006
- \* training conducted by ESCORT in summer of 2006
- \* Draft Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual and Appendices developed by the Office of Migrant Education (OME)
- \* Information from the National ID&R forums (2007 and 2008)
- \* Input from Michigan state-wide ID&R Directors

All specifically tailored for Michigan by the Michigan Migrant Education program staff.

Training sessions were held on March 9 and 10, 2009. The training in March 2009 was provided by staff from the Migrant Education Resource Center (MERC) in conjunction with Michigan Migrant Program staff.

The Michigan Migrant Program will continue to strive for a 0.0% defect rate. Our defect rate is declining and we will continue to focus training on areas that have been unclear to our ID&R staff.

Michigan re-interviewed 180 families of which 176 were found to be eligible

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In addition to our two contracted employees who check and approve COEs, each district is responsible for running an all over report that gives all necessary data on each student. This allows districts to see at a glance any data that may have been mis-entered or is missing.

We have continued to refine our MEDS in preparation for the MSIX interface. We are now transmitting live data to MSIX. Michigan was the eighth state to go live with MSIX and the first state with a custom application.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each of the reports run for Category 1 and Category 2 contain enrollment dates and QAD parameters to insure accurate and unduplicated student counts. These reports run for each migrant program. As a final step to insure accuracy, the reports are sent to each local migrant. In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The re-interviewing results indicate that there are no problems with any sub-grantees except one. In that case, the MEP staff is working with the LEA to correct recruiting issues.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or underlying eligibility determinations. In order to continue the high accuracy level in Michigan recruiters, program directors, and data entry experts will be trained around the latest recruiting issues.