

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**

MICHIGAN



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 ED Facts 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
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: Ryan Starkweather	
Telephone: 517-373-4872	
Fax: 517-373-4872	
e-mail: starkweatherR1@michigan.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Ryan Starkweather	
_____ Signature	_____ Friday, March 8, 2013, 3:01:05 PM

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Michigan adopted the Math and ELA Common Core State standards in June 2010. These standards replace the GLCE and HSCS for Math and Science.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

State assessments are transitioning to the CCSS. Expecting full implementation by 2014-15.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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*.

State has revised or changed	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2014-15	2014-15	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	N/A

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Michigan adopted to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in June 2010 as our state standards for math and ELA. Other content areas are remaining the same based on GLCEs.

Michigan's assessments will remain based on the old standards though we will assure there are not items on the assessments that do not align to the CCSS. Michigan benefits in the fact that there is a lot of overlap between the old standards and the new CCSS.

Starting with the 2014-2015 school year Michigan is planning to move to the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium assessments for math and ELA which will be completely aligned to the CCSS.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	10.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	90.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	S	800,255	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	6,172	98
Asian	S	22,751	>=99
Black or African American	S	145,035	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	48,744	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	666	98
White	S	559,463	>=99
Two or more races	S	17,424	>=99
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	103,952	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	33,907	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	387,452	98
Migratory students	S	1,079	96
Male	S	409,096	>=99
Female	S	391,159	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The errors in Section 1.2 are due to two problems: One, incorrect calculation of the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander subgroup, and two: incorrect application of de-duplication rules when calculating performance level counts. These errors will be addressed and corrected when the CSPR Part I reopens in 2013.

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	40,555	39.01
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	35,896	34.53
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	9,838	9.46
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	17,663	16.99
Total	103,952	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The errors in Section 1.2 are due to two problems: One, incorrect calculation of the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander subgroup, and two: incorrect application of de-duplication rules when calculating performance level counts. These errors will be addressed and corrected when the CSPR Part I reopens in 2013.

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	S	800,879	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	6,185	98
Asian	S	22,273	97
Black or African American	S	145,755	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	48,767	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	657	97
White	S	559,792	>=99
Two or more races	S	17,450	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	104,423	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	32,968	96
Economically disadvantaged students	S	388,145	98
Migratory students	S	1,123	98
Male	S	409,421	>=99
Female	S	391,458	>=99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The errors in Section 1.2 are due to two problems: One, incorrect calculation of the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander subgroup, and two: incorrect application of de-duplication rules when calculating performance level counts. These errors will be addressed and corrected when the CSPR Part I reopens in 2013.

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	1,650
--	-------

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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	53,634	51.33
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	20,506	19.63
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	11,989	11.47
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	18,294	17.51
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	63	0.06
Total	104,486	////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The errors in Section 1.2 are due to two problems: One, incorrect calculation of the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander subgroup, and two: incorrect application of de-duplication rules when calculating performance level counts. These errors will be addressed and corrected when the CSPR Part I reopens in 2013.

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	S	341,762	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,702	97
Asian	S	9,527	>=99
Black or African American	S	59,968	95
Hispanic or Latino	S	19,073	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	278	>= 98
White	S	243,494	>=99
Two or more races	S	6,720	98
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	S	43,357	96
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	11,980	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	156,621	97
Migratory students	S	345	96
Male	S	174,557	98
Female	S	167,205	98

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The errors in Section 1.2 are due to two problems: One, incorrect calculation of the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander subgroup, and two: incorrect application of de-duplication rules when calculating performance level counts. These errors will be addressed and corrected when the CSPR Part I reopens in 2013.

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.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	16,136	37.22
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	19,429	44.81
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,792	17.97
Total	43,357	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The errors in Section 1.2 are due to two problems: One, incorrect calculation of the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander subgroup, and two: incorrect application of de-duplication rules when calculating performance level counts. These errors will be addressed and corrected when the CSPR Part I reopens in 2013.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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

Grade 3	# 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	111,679	S	37
American Indian or Alaska Native	787	S	31
Asian	3,436	S	63
Black or African American	20,574	S	17
Hispanic or Latino	7,777	S	24
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	98	S	41
White	76,142	S	43
Two or more races	2,865	S	35
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,137	S	31
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,095	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	57,858	S	25
Migratory students	209	S	20
Male	57,240	S	39
Female	54,439	S	36

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

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

Grade 3	# 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	111,642	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	788	S	60
Asian	3,332	S	74
Black or African American	20,635	S	39
Hispanic or Latino	7,779	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	97	S	71
White	76,148	S	70
Two or more races	2,863	S	63
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	14,181	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,912	S	36
Economically disadvantaged students	57,871	S	50
Migratory students	219	S	41
Male	57,213	S	59
Female	54,429	S	66

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# 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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Michigan does not assess science for grade 3.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# 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	112,199	S	41
American Indian or Alaska Native	813	S	31
Asian	3,425	S	68
Black or African American	20,593	S	19
Hispanic or Latino	7,605	S	28
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	75	S	53
White	76,964	S	47
Two or more races	2,724	S	39
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,275	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,263	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	57,579	S	27
Migratory students	193	S	27
Male	57,460	S	43
Female	54,739	S	39

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

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

Grade 4	# 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	112,114	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	812	S	61
Asian	3,315	S	81
Black or African American	20,635	S	46
Hispanic or Latino	7,593	S	54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	74	S	76
White	76,956	S	74
Two or more races	2,729	S	66
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,317	S	43
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,050	S	39
Economically disadvantaged students	57,560	S	55
Migratory students	199	S	47
Male	57,437	S	64
Female	54,677	S	71

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# 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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Michigan does not assess science for grade 4.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# 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	115,399	S	41
American Indian or Alaska Native	851	S	28
Asian	3,334	S	71
Black or African American	21,377	S	19
Hispanic or Latino	7,436	S	28
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	102	S	45
White	79,634	S	47
Two or more races	2,665	S	38
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,011	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,440	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	58,165	S	27
Migratory students	150	S	27
Male	59,349	S	43
Female	56,050	S	38

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

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

Grade 5	# 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	115,381	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	854	S	59
Asian	3,251	S	81
Black or African American	21,423	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	7,438	S	57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	101	S	80
White	79,650	S	75
Two or more races	2,664	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	16,082	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,285	S	39
Economically disadvantaged students	58,203	S	57
Migratory students	157	S	44
Male	59,326	S	66
Female	56,055	S	72

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# 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	115,334	S	16
American Indian or Alaska Native	849	S	9
Asian	3,333	S	29
Black or African American	21,342	S	5
Hispanic or Latino	7,439	S	7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	102	S	22
White	79,605	S	20
Two or more races	2,664	S	15
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,962	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,445	S	3
Economically disadvantaged students	58,114	S	8
Migratory students	149	S	3
Male	59,310	S	18
Female	56,024	S	14

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# 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	117,385	S	38
American Indian or Alaska Native	900	S	30
Asian	3,269	S	69
Black or African American	21,913	S	18
Hispanic or Latino	7,394	S	25
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	122	S	54
White	81,158	S	44
Two or more races	2,629	S	34
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,755	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,570	S	19
Economically disadvantaged students	58,278	S	25
Migratory students	188	S	19
Male	59,822	S	39
Female	57,563	S	38

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

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

Grade 6	# 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	117,392	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	899	S	63
Asian	3,219	S	77
Black or African American	21,999	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	7,383	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	118	S	75
White	81,138	S	74
Two or more races	2,636	S	66
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,803	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,439	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	58,318	S	55
Migratory students	197	S	37
Male	59,812	S	64
Female	57,580	S	70

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# 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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Michigan does not assess science for grade 6.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# 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	117,447	S	38
American Indian or Alaska Native	970	S	27
Asian	3,090	S	69
Black or African American	22,041	S	16
Hispanic or Latino	6,924	S	25
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	95	S	52
White	81,840	S	44
Two or more races	2,487	S	35
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,346	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,022	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	57,258	S	24
Migratory students	142	S	19
Male	60,120	S	38
Female	57,327	S	39

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

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

Grade 7	# 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	117,426	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	970	S	50
Asian	3,032	S	76
Black or African American	22,103	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	6,913	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	94	S	77
White	81,824	S	67
Two or more races	2,490	S	59
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,399	S	36
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,872	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	57,284	S	46
Migratory students	144	S	34
Male	60,119	S	57
Female	57,307	S	64

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# 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			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Michigan does not assess science for grade 7.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# 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	118,073	S	31
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,009	S	24
Asian	3,185	S	62
Black or African American	21,765	S	12
Hispanic or Latino	6,784	S	18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	93	S	31
White	82,873	S	36
Two or more races	2,364	S	28
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,312	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,823	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	55,473	S	18
Migratory students	130	S	9
Male	60,762	S	32
Female	57,311	S	29

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

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

Grade 8	# 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	118,074	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,012	S	54
Asian	3,105	S	76
Black or African American	21,834	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	6,788	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	92	S	61
White	82,875	S	67
Two or more races	2,368	S	60
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,361	S	37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,689	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	55,530	S	48
Migratory students	138	S	38
Male	60,758	S	57
Female	57,316	S	66

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# 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	117,995	S	17
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,008	S	13
Asian	3,182	S	34
Black or African American	21,730	S	5
Hispanic or Latino	6,786	S	8
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	93	S	13
White	82,834	S	21
Two or more races	2,362	S	16
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,238	S	13
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,825	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	55,416	S	9
Migratory students	129	S	5
Male	60,703	S	20
Female	57,292	S	15
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.			

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	108,073	S	30
American Indian or Alaska Native	842	S	16
Asian	3,012	S	60
Black or African American	16,772	S	8
Hispanic or Latino	4,824	S	17
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	81	S	30
White	80,852	S	34
Two or more races	1,690	S	26
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,116	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,694	S	10
Economically disadvantaged students	42,841	S	16
Migratory students	67	S	9
Male	54,343	S	33
Female	53,730	S	28

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

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	108,850	S	57
American Indian or Alaska Native	850	S	50
Asian	3,019	S	66
Black or African American	17,126	S	29
Hispanic or Latino	4,873	S	43
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	81	S	64
White	81,201	S	63
Two or more races	1,700	S	56
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,280	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,721	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	43,379	S	42
Migratory students	69	S	29
Male	54,756	S	52
Female	54,094	S	61

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	108,433	S	27
American Indian or Alaska Native	845	S	16
Asian	3,012	S	45
Black or African American	16,896	S	6
Hispanic or Latino	4,848	S	14
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	83	S	23
White	81,055	S	31
Two or more races	1,694	S	24
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,157	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,710	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	43,091	S	14
Migratory students	67	S	7
Male	54,544	S	30
Female	53,889	S	24

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Large decreases in percent proficient across all subgroups and in the all students group are due to the adoption of more stringent Career and College Ready (CCR) cut scores for determining proficiency on standard assessments. The Native Hawaiian group is not included due to an oversight and will be corrected.

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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	3,907	2,669	68.31
Districts	870	501	57.59

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	1,954	1,593	81.53
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,176	891	75.77
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	775	702	90.58

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
765	470	61.44

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	10
Extension of the school year or school day	4
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	4
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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)	20
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	1
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	40
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

--

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.

There were twenty-six districts identified for improvement. Of these, eight were intermediate school districts (ISDs) that run alternative education programs for constituent LEAs under their county-level jurisdiction. Of the remaining eighteen LEAs, the state provides technical assistance to all title schools in these districts through the statewide system of support in partnership with ISDs. Central office staff is an important part of this technical assistance.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented 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 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Michigan had five districts in corrective action in 2011-12. One (Blanche Kelso Bruce Academy) is a strict discipline academy.</p> <p>Detroit public schools had the largest number of individual schools identified for corrective action or restructuring. This district received support and technical assistance from the SEA in coordinating supports to their identified schools through the following: Technical assistance from their local ISD; budgetary guidance from the SEA; academic and leadership support from the SEA and its partners in the statewide system of support. ISDs provided continuous school improvement support teams to each identified school.</p> <p>The remaining three ISDs in corrective action run either special education or alternative education programs.</p> <p>Michigan does not collect data on the corrective action chosen by the district.</p>	

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	77	18
Schools	375	162
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	07/16/12
---	----------

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As required by the USED, all regular and ARRA funds were used for the SIG competition for eligible persistently low achieving schools. The section 1003(g) 5% reservation was used to contract with a third party vendor to perform an evaluation of the implementation and effectiveness of the ARRA SIG. The outside vendor, WestEd, is currently in the second year of the study.

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 2011-12 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.

The state did not have other funding to support these activities.

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.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	57,754
Applied to transfer	552
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	325
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 483,315

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	44

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:
 - o 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
 - o 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
 - o 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.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

³ 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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	38,741
Applied for supplemental educational services	23,549
Received supplemental educational services	19,019
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 29,082,958
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

	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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	216,696	216,130	99.74	566	0.26
All elementary classes	48,552	48,489	99.87	63	0.13
All secondary classes	168,144	167,641	99.70	503	0.30

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.

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.

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
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	97.00
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	3.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the 216,696 classes in Michigan, 63 (0.02%) are taught by non-HQ elementary teachers. Of those 63 classes, 61 are general education and 2 are special education classes

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
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)	76.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	24.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the 216,696 classes in Michigan, 503 (0.23%) are taught by non-HQ secondary teachers. Of those 503 classes, 381 are general education and 122 are special education classes.

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.

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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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	19,469	19,355	99.41
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	15,507	15,499	99.95
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	23,229	23,119	99.53
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	56,965	56,893	99.87

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	73.90	34.50
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. Data has been verified and is accurate.	
Secondary schools	67.90	33.30
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. Data has been verified and is accurate.[2.3	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.
- b. *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.
- c. *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.
- d. *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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Arabic, Mandarin
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish, Arabic, Albanian, Bengali, Chinese, French, Urdu, German, Romanian
No	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Arabic, Spanish
No Response	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
No Response	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
No Response	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
No Response	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
No Response	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
No Response	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	76,953
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	72,256
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	34,653
Arabic	18,916
Bengali	1,981
Albanian	1,701
Chinese	1,396

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 students' 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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	65,770
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	6,174
Total	71,944
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the past years, there were codes in the Michigan student dat system that reflected LEP exit reasons such as proficiency (50), graduation (53), parent refusal (52), left school (51), and joined another program (54). Districts used 51, 52, 54 incorrectly thinking the codes are valid LEP exit reasons. Title III director provided technical assistance to sub grantees regarding the invalidity of these codes and they were removed from MSDS during the second part of 2011/12. However, districts had already used the codes as follows: 1991 exit code 51; 983 for exit 52; 822 for 53 graduation (valid reason); 645 for 54. The rest were Migrant who left MI or students who exited the program (50) prior to the testing window and therefore, did not take the test.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	24,228
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	36.83
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	63,951
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,875
Total	69,826
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the past years, there were codes in the Michigan student dat system that reflected LEP exit reasons such as proficiency (50), graduation (53), parent refusal (52), left school (51), and joined another program (54). Districts used 51, 52, 54 incorrectly thinking the codes are valid LEP exit reasons. Title III director provided technical assistance to sub grantees regarding the invalidity of these codes and they were removed from MSDS during the second part of 2011/12. However, districts had already used the codes as follows: 2163 exit code 51; 799 for exit 52; 798 for 53 graduation (valid reason); 207 for 54. The rest were Migrant who left MI or students who exited the program (50) prior to the testing window and therefore, did not take the test.	

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 and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	13,994

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	37,977	76.02	38,679	79.00
Attained proficiency	23,039	36.03	10,093	16.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The state offers a video tape/audio version of these state tests in Spanish and Arabic for LEP students who are at the basic level of English proficiency and receive bilingual instructions.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Spanish
Arabic
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Only audio and video versions of the Spanish and Arabic math test are available to be used with LEP who are at the basic level of English proficiency.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
None
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
Spanish
Arabic
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Only audio and video tape versions of the Spanish and Arabic science test are available to be used with LEP who are at the basic level of English proficiency.

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 (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- 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
7,829	2,406	10,235

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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 out of language instruction educational programs 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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,347	S	41	S

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,358	S	67	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,527	S	9	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	262
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	75
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	128
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	226
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	116
////////////////////////////////////	
# - 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 2010-11 and 2011-12)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	0

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Consortia members were counted as individual districts for AMA calculations.

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	No Response
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State did not meet AMAO I Statewide. The Statewide percentage of students who showed growth was 77.65%, which is below the State target of 79%. The State met AMAO II Statewide. The percentage of students who attained proficiency is 36.67%, which is above the State target of 16%. The State met AMAO III Statewide. The percentage of LEAs who met AMAO III was 85.61%.	

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 <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
7,910	4,010	32

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.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational 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) v The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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 as a second language.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	457
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	250

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 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 and 1.6.4.)
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.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	////////////////////////////////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	262	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	262	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	250	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	249	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	262	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	73	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	249	4,821
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	262	3,356
PD provided to principals	153	1,283
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	23	162
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	210	1,601
PD provided to community based organization personnel	13	272
Total	910	11,495

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Statewide trainings were provided on the writing process for ELs (Buleprint for Exceptional Writing).

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/10/11	11/2/11	122
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Michigan calculates "preliminary" allocations to subgrantees no later than the middle of August preceding each school year. These allocations are based on actual counts and test data, and generally represent the minimum funding each subgrantee can expect to receive. Final allocations cannot be calculated until agencies have been provided the opportunity to join or form consortia and until the final data from the Michigan Student Database and Bureau of Assessment and Accountability is available in early fall. However, the availability and publication of preliminary allocations enables subgrantees to plan and implement LEP programs at the start of the school year, well in advance of the availability and publication of final allocations.		

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.

Once MDE starts using WIDA assessments the testing window will be conducted earlier in the year which will allow the state to determine the number of eligible LEP and the Title III allocations earlier in the summer.

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	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	102	102
LEAs with subgrants	768	768
Total	870	870

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Over 88% of all LEAs in MI are subgrantees and participated in consortium grants during the 2011-2012 school year (an increase of 6% over 2010-11). Over 92% of the LEAs that reported homeless students are participating as McKinney-Vento subgrantees.

All LEAs report homeless data in the Michigan Student Database System. Only 24 (less than 3%) LEAs of the 870 in MI reported zero (0) homeless students enrolled during the 2011-2012 school year. Agencies that reported zero homeless children were included in the "# LEAs Reporting Data" column in this report.

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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9	692
K	95	4,410
1	91	4,429
2	97	4,184
3	54	2,725
4	62	2,752
5	47	2,522
6	54	2,420
7	51	2,376
8	52	2,307
9	52	2,820
10	82	3,300
11	54	2,845
12	71	4,634
Ungraded	11	120
Total	882	42,536

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. MI has used SEA level data to populate this question in the past. After consulting with CEPI and USED, the current data above is based on LEA level data, as advised.

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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	318	10,413
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	502	29,756
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	24	437
Hotels/Motels	38	1,930
Total	882	42,536

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. MI has used SEA level data to populate this question in the past. After consulting with CEPI and USED, the current data above is based on LEA level data, as advised.

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 Birth Through 2	458
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,522
K	3,338
1	3,267
2	3,112
3	2,802
4	2,745
5	2,613
6	2,515
7	2,502
8	2,429
9	2,638
10	2,624
11	2,659
12	3,792
Ungraded	1,233
Total	40,249

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Over 88% of all LEAs in MI are subgrantees and participated in EHCY regional consortium grants during the 2011-2012 school year (an increase of 6% over 2010-11).

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	4,796
Migratory children/youth	462
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,892
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,709

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. MI does not collect "SERVED" data by subgroup. Rather than reporting "SERVED" data, 1.9.2.2 reflects "ENROLLED" data. MI's M-V Homeless subgrants are all regional consortium grants, with district member services coordinated by a regional grant coordinator. The needs of these populations are so specialized that they are universally served by all MI subgrantees, once identified as homeless. Therefore, in MI, the numbers of subgroup students served would be virtually the same as the numbers enrolled.

All of these subgroups increased substantially in number over the 2010-11 school year.

- > Unaccompanied homeless youth increased by 83%
- > Migratory children/youth increased by 178%
- > Children with disabilities increased by 86%
- > LEP students increased by 134%

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,496	724
4	1,496	755
5	1,365	716
6	1,392	707
7	1,350	553
8	1,350	593
High School	1,422	562

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,487	321
4	1,494	334
5	1,361	312
6	1,389	319
7	1,350	264
8	1,343	176
High School	1,394	177

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	1,362	101
6		
7		
8	1,343	89
High School	1,403	170

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science assessments are only reported in grades 5,8, and High School above.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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:

- a. *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.
- b. *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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,051
K	578
1	517
2	442
3	392
4	373
5	340
6	324
7	323
8	281
9	311
10	248
11	217
12	108
Ungraded	107
Out-of-school	191
Total	5,803
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

No response required.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	631
K	400
1	366
2	278
3	283
4	240
5	218
6	202
7	207
8	156
9	160
10	93
11	104
12	17
Ungraded	54
Out-of-school	24
Total	3,433
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

No response required.

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 2011-2012 Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count. The MEDS is an online web-based custom system. This system has been in place since 2006-2007 and replaces one used by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) 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.

Each local migrant program employs recruiters to survey the area within their school district boundaries, identify and recruit new families. In areas of the state where there are no local migrant programs, the MDE funds two State-Wide identification and Recruitment Centers to survey those areas. In all cases, the recruiter interviews the families to determine eligibility. The data collected consists of family data, child data, qualifying move and work data required by the National COE. If the family is deemed eligible, a paper National Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for that family. The interviewee and the recruiter sign the COE. The local migrant program director, or ID&R director, reviews the COE for accuracy and completeness. The director signs the form if s/he finds the COE to be accurate and the family is eligible. The 2011-2012 MEDS data was collected between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012.

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 (Migrant Education Database System). This electronic version of the COE is sent to the local migrant director. The local migrant director reviews the electronic COE and forwards it to MDE for approval. At the MDE, one of two contracted and trained approvers reviews the electronic COE for accuracy. This is their primary job responsibility. If the electronic COE is incomplete or inaccurate, it is returned to the local migrant program for corrections. Once the electronic COE is deemed complete and accurate, it is approved by the MDE.

Enrollment and attendance data is updated on the MEDS when a student withdraws because of a move before the end of the term, or at the end of the school year. Regular term enrollment/attendance information is obtained from the attendance office at the school where the migrant student is enrolled. Summer term enrollment/attendance information is generated by the summer migrant program. In both instances, staff enters the data into the MEDS.

New and updated family information from the paper COE 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 new COE every 365 days. The new COE includes updated information for the family and a new parent signature. The recruiter signs the new COE. Then, the director reviews and signs it. The updated information includes new grade levels and ages, as well as the names of the children who may have moved to join or moved away. New births are noted and included in the comment box.

The updated COE is stapled to the previous COE and maintained at the local level. All new information is posted in the MEDS incorporating the standard process. The MEDS consolidates data from the individual programs and the Regional ID&R entities. Since the MEDS is web-based, data is entered real-time. 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.

No response provided.

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
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MEDS is a database that stores detailed information about migrant children in Michigan. The Category 1 and 2 child counts are compiled by using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) projects that process data from MEDS and employ the following business rules:

1. Include children who were three years of age or older during the reporting period AND who were 21 years of age or less as of September 1 of the reporting period (LQM dates are part of the student records).
2. Include only children who had a Last Qualifying Move within the past 36 months.
3. Include only children who resided in the state for at least one day (evidenced by an Enrollment Date during the reporting period)
4. Deduplicate records by the unique Student ID to ensure that a student is counted only once at the SEA level. In the LEA level reports, a student may be counted once in each LEA in which the student was enrolled during the reporting period.
5. The Category 2 count business rules require that a student receive a MEP-funded service during the summer term, attend for one or more days, and have a summer enrollment date. Deduplication is processed in the same manner as in the Category 1 counts.

The latest enhancement to the MEDS checks specifically for duplicates. The system does a pair-wise comparison of each student in the system. The system compares the first four 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, the 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 data base. In addition, we have established a process of assigning a Unique Identifier Code (UIC).

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.

It is generated using the same system.

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 local migrant program employs recruiters to survey the area within their school district boundaries to identify and recruit new and returning families. In areas of the state where there are no local migrant programs, the MDE funds two State-Wide Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) projects to survey those areas. In all cases, the recruiter interviews the families to determine eligibility. The data collected consists of the family data, child data, qualifying move data, and work related data required by the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE). If the family is deemed eligible, a paper National COE is completed for that family. The interviewee and the recruiter sign the COE. The local migrant program director, or ID&R director, reviews the COE for accuracy and completeness. The director signs the form if s/he finds that the COE is accurate and the family is eligible. The COE is given to the data entry specialist who inputs the information into the MEDS.

The Michigan Department of Education, Migrant Education Data System (MEDS) maintains a web-based training module for authorized users. Data entry and directors are required to review the training module prior to utilizing the system. The module includes specific examples of the MEDS, including the correct completion of a Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Additional customized training is provided by the MEP state consultant and/or state COE Approvers upon request. The Michigan MEP hosted a recruiter mandatory training session May 16, 2012 and addressed eligibility issues using the state-developed recruiters' manual. Additional trainings will be conducted each school year. Eligibility questions requiring clarification or approval beyond the local MEP directors due to unusual circumstances are first directed to the program's assigned, state contracted COE Approvers who have over ten years' experience in the field of migrant eligibility. If the eligibility of a family remains questionable after the director consults with the COE Approvers, the COE is referred to the state MEP office where a decision is made after consulting with the local director, COE Approvers, and reviewing federal guidelines. OME assistance is requested as needed.

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.

Michigan follows the Technical Assistance Guide to Re-Interviewing provided by the Office of Migrant Education. Michigan MEP utilizes an independent party to perform these re-interview duties for the local migrant programs and ID&R entities each year.

The following process was utilized in the selection of an independent party to perform Michigan's 2011-12 re-interviewing:

- a) A state-wide Request for Proposal was posted on the state's website.
- b) A state-wide webinar on instructions, application process, guidelines, as well as a question and answer session was conducted by the state's Title I, Part C staff members.
- c) All applications were reviewed by a selection committee comprised of several state and local agency representatives.
- d) The selection committee recommended Telamon Corporation as a good candidate to conduct Michigan's re-

interviewing. e) Telamon Corporation was awarded Michigan's Re-Interview grant for 2011-12.

The following process was utilized to conduct Michigan's independent re-interviewing:

- a) Michigan's Migrant Education Consultant provided training, utilizing the Technical Assistance Guide to Re-interviewing, to Telamon's Re-interviewing coordinator and its field representatives on June 13, 2012.
- b) The re-interviewing occurred during the months of June through August 2012, which is one of Michigan's highest migrant family population peaks.
- c) Telamon provided weekly updates to Michigan's MEP Consultant. d) A final re-interview report was provided to Michigan's MEP Office.
- e) A random sampling from twenty-seven programs and ID&R areas were included in the re-interview process. f) A total of 2039 COEs were eligible for re-interview at the time of the re-interview process.
- g) A total of 77, randomly selected, COEs were re-interviewed.

2011-12 Re-Interview Results:

- Of the 77 re-interviews conducted, 4 COEs were found to be ineligible and 8 were unable to be contacted. This yielded a 6% error rate.

- No single program or ID&R center demonstrated an error rate requiring a complete and thorough audit of their COEs.

Ongoing

Efforts:

Michigan MEP provides mandatory annual training and ongoing technical assistance to all recruiters, data entry personnel and directors through several venues including one-on-one meetings, local trainings, regional workshops, and sessions at the annual Special Populations Conference. We will be adding online training and support activities including webinars in 2013.

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.

The MEDS has a report function that districts can generate to compare the data that has been inputted into the system with the paper COE to check for accuracy.

All paper COEs must be reviewed and approved by either the local MEP director or recruiter coordinator prior to entry of the information into MEDS. The local data entry staff member works directly from the paper COE and the recruiter as the information is entered into MEDS, the recruiter is available to answer or pursue clarification of information on the COE if necessary. Directors review the information on the paper COE prior to approving the MEDS COE. Before the state accepts a MEDS entry it is reviewed and approved by the state COE Approvers. When the COE Approvers have concerns regarding the MEDS information they request copies of the paper COE for verification of information and discuss unusual circumstances within Michigan MEP office.

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.

Local districts run reports in MEDS that match up with data requests in the CSPR then match that data with their own local data reports to ensure that all students have been entered into the system correctly and with the correct data required. 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, the local migrant program counts are included in the state counts.

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.

Given the reinterview results and the district's error rate, the SEA will conduct a complete audit of all COEs generated by that district. The SEA will work with the local district personnel to correct the issues as well as provide re-training where necessary. Also, the SEA has posted on its website, FAQs on eligibility are available to all districts and are updated as requirements and NRGs are updated.

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.

No response provided.