



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

October 25, 2017

The Honorable Brian H. Whiston
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Michigan Department of Education
608 W. Allegan Street
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Superintendent Whiston:

Thank you for submitting a revised version of Michigan's consolidated State plan on September 6, 2017 to implement requirements of covered programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and of the amended McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento Act). On August 4, 2017, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) indicated that the information provided by Michigan in its consolidated State plan that was submitted on May 3, 2017, was insufficient for the Department to adequately review Title I, Part A and did not include substantive information for the Department or peer reviewers to determine if the requirements outlined in the Revised Template for the Consolidated State Plan issued on March 13, 2017 were met. As a result, the Department conducted a peer review for select requirements in Title I, Part A of your most recently submitted State plan. The goal of the peer review was to support State- and local-led innovation by providing objective feedback on the technical, educational, and overall quality of the revised State plan and to advise the Department on the ultimate approval of the plan. I am enclosing a copy of the peer review notes for your consideration.

Based on the Department's review of all programs submitted under Michigan's consolidated State plan, including those programs subject to peer review, the Department is requesting clarifying or additional information to ensure the State's plan has met requisite statutory and regulatory requirements, as detailed in the enclosed table. Each State has flexibility in how it meets the statutory and regulatory requirements. I encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your consolidated State plan.

Department staff are available to support Michigan in submitting a revised consolidated State plan that meets the requirements of Title I, Part A. If you have any immediate questions or need additional information, I encourage you to contact your Program Officer for Title I, Part A.

Please note that the Department only reviewed information provided in Michigan's consolidated State plan that was responsive to the Revised Template for the Consolidated State Plan that was issued on March 13, 2017. Each State is responsible for administering all programs included in its consolidated State plan consistent with all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. Michigan may also propose an amendment to its plan when additional data or information are available consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(6)(B) after approval. The

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

Department cannot approve incomplete details within the State plan until the State provides sufficient information.

Thank you for the important work that you and your staff are doing to support the transition to the ESSA. The Department looks forward to working with you to ensure that all children have the opportunity to reach their full potential.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel
Acting Assistant Secretary

Enclosures

cc: Governor
State Title I Director
State Title II Director
State Title III Director
State Title IV Director
State Title V Director
State 21st Century Community Learning Center Director
State Director for McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program

Items That Require Additional Information or Revision in Michigan’s Consolidated State Plan

Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies	
A.4.iii.a: Academic Achievement	Section 1111(c)(4)(a)(i)(I) of the ESEA requires State-designed long-term goals that show improved academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. Because its long-term goals for academic achievement do not show improved academic achievement for each subgroup of students, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has not met the statutory requirements for the establishment of long-term goals for academic achievement.
A.4.iii.c: English Language Proficiency	The ESEA requires a State to identify and describe its ambitious long-term goal and measurements of interim progress for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency. In its State plan, MDE refers to a proficiency/progress goal for English language proficiency. Therefore, it is unclear if MDE’s long-term goal and measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency are based on the percentage of English learners making progress toward proficiency, as required by the ESEA, as opposed to the percentage of English learners achieving proficiency.
A.4.iv.e: School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In its State plan, MDE identifies five measures for the School Quality or Student Success indicator. The ESEA requires a State to describe in its State plan one or more School Quality or Student Success indicators for all students and separately for each subgroup of students that allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance, and are valid, reliable, comparable for the grade spans to which the indicator applies, and statewide. Because the State’s description indicates each measure is based on long-term targets but does not provide those targets for any of the measures, MDE has not fully described the indicator. • One of the measures MDE proposes to include in its School Quality or Student Success indicator is an Advanced Course measure. As noted above, the ESEA requires that a State describe a School Quality or Student Success indicator that can be measured statewide, is comparable for the grade spans to which the indicator applies, and that will allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance. Because MDE has not described how it will calculate this indicator, including a description of how this includes all students, it is unclear whether MDE meets the statutory requirements.
A.4.v.a: State’s System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation	The ESEA requires a State to establish and describe its system of annual meaningful differentiation, including a description of how the system is based on all indicators, for all students and all subgroups of students. In its State plan, MDE includes “General Participation”

	and “English Learner Participation” as measures in its accountability index but does not describe how these measures are included in the system of annual meaningful differentiation, nor how they are calculated.
A.4.v.c: If Applicable, Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation	The ESEA requires a State to include all public schools in its system of annual meaningful differentiation and to describe that system in its State plan (i.e., a State may not permit schools to opt out of the State’s accountability system). In its State plan, MDE describes plans to pilot a voluntary, parallel system of accountability for eligible schools, but does not describe the different methodology, including how the methodology will be used to identify such schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement or whether the different methodology is limited to schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made. Accordingly, it appears MDE does not meet the statutory requirements.