

STATE PLAN  
PEER REVIEW CRITERIA  
Peer Review Panel Notes Template

---

STATE: Michigan



**U.S. Department of Education**  
April 5, 2017

## SECTION A: TITLE I, PART A: IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LEAS

### A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

Note: State Plan template item A.1 is submitted as part of the separate assessment peer review process consistent with ESEA section 1111(b) and 34 CFR § 200.2(d), and thus has no applicable peer review criteria in this document.

### A.2: Eighth Grade Math Exception (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

Note: State Plan template items A.2.i and A.2.ii require binary yes/no responses from SEAs, and thus have no applicable peer review criteria.

#### A.2.iii: Strategies (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C); 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

- If applicable,<sup>1</sup> does the SEA describe, regarding the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school (e.g., appropriate data and evidence that the strategies are likely to provide all students in the State that opportunity)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A Michigan does not intend to use the 8 <sup>th</sup> grade math exception; no review is required.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

<sup>1</sup> In order for an SEA to exempt an 8<sup>th</sup> grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 8<sup>th</sup> grade under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa), it must ensure that: a. the student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); b. the student's performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E); and c. in high school: (1) the student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers for 8<sup>th</sup> graders under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); (2) the State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and (3) the student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E).

<i>fully meet this requirement</i>	
------------------------------------	--

### A.3: Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4))

#### A.3.i: Definition

- Does the SEA provide its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population”?
- Does the SEA identify the specific languages that meet that definition?
- Does the SEA’s definition include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population?
- In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans?
- In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs, as well as languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Three peers felt the Michigan State Plan addresses all requirements and meets the criteria for this section. Michigan meets the requirements by providing a definition of languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population but fails to discuss the possibility of other language assessment needs of the English language learner. Michigan identifies two languages accounting for 70 percent. Thirty percent of other language speakers are not identified; as the definition is 10 percent, this raises questions.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan State Plan provides a clear definition of languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, and provides detailed information about the two most populous languages. Michigan specifies Spanish and Arabic are the most populous languages other than English. In addition, Michigan shares the formula used to determine the most populous languages other than English.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Michigan does not discuss the other languages that comprise the additional 30% of languages other than English, Spanish and Arabic or suggest if there are concentrations of other languages in particular areas in the State or across other grade levels beyond the tested grades of 3-8 and 11. It is not stated clearly whether there is another language or languages which accounts for the 10% threshold (of the remaining 30% of English learners), and no additional information is provided about the specific languages besides the most populous.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers)

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan needs to clearly identify what languages are represented in the 30 percent of English learners who do not speak Spanish or Arabic and provide clarity if the other languages represent 10 percent or more of English learners.

### A.3.ii: Existing Assessments in Languages other than English

- Does the SEA identify any existing assessments that it makes available in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan Plan addresses all requirements and meets the criteria for this section. The plan indicates the following: Michigan provides state assessments in the following languages and content areas: Spanish, Arabic – social studies (5, 8, 11) and science (4, 7, 11) Spanish –mathematics (grades 3-8). Michigan clearly stated the availability of existing Assessments in Languages other than English.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan Plan clearly states assessment languages, grades, and content areas.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

- Does the SEA indicate the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan, for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The Michigan Plan specifies math assessment not available in language identified in the previous indicator, A.3.i. While the plan indicates that Michigan does not offer an assessment in mathematics in one of the identified languages, the plan indicates that stakeholder feedback deemed this unnecessary.</p> <p>Michigan addresses and provides support for the reasons assessments are not available in the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Michigan Department of Education details why there is not a math assessment in Arabic and shares the accommodation available if needed through providing on-the-spot Arabic translations. The plan describes methods of stakeholder feedback justifying the decision not to offer "written" Arabic math assessment, and explains how on-the-spot Arabic translation meets the needs of students. The plan shares the on-going process to address the need of the Arabic student by explaining the majority of the English Learners in Michigan have oral language proficiency in their native language, but are not literate in that language. In addition, Michigan shares their process of assessing the needs of the Arabic student through discussions with the Accessibility Advisory Committee, direct contact with an LEA with a significant number of English learners whose native language is Arabic, and through surveys of LEAs' communities.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The Michigan State Plan discussion of availability of the 11th grade math assessments in Arabic is insufficient. No discussion of whether academic assessments are or might be needed in any other language besides the two listed in A.3.i.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

- Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include the State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include a description of the process the State used to:
  - 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
  - 2) collect and respond to public comment; and
  - 3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate, and other stakeholders?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include an explanation of the reasons (*e.g.*, legal barriers) the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan Plan does not address how it will develop assessments in other languages. The plan describes efforts used to question whether a mathematics test in Arabic is necessary, but not efforts to develop such assessment. While the plan indicates the test is not needed due to the availability of oral translations, there is no indication of collection of data regarding the use of or effectiveness of these oral translations. The Michigan Plan provides justification for the development of languages other than English.
<i>Strengths</i>	Michigan provides students needing assistance with the ability to have an on-the-spot interpreter for math assessment and has published guidance on how to provide on-the-spot Arabic translations for students taking math assessments online and/or paper/pencil version. The Michigan Department of Education describes how it has made attempts to address the question regarding providing assessment for mathematics in Arabic. The State received input regarding the need for assessment in languages other than English.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Insufficient information is provided about how existing language assessments are developed and/or how new ones might be developed if determined to be needed in the future. A more detailed description is needed of methods used to acquire stakeholder feedback contributing to the decision not to offer "written" Arabic math assessment. Michigan does not specify how it will make assessments available in all languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population. The plan does not articulate how it will receive and respond to public comment.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	Michigan needs to provide additional information regarding why stakeholders determined an Arabic math assessment was not necessary. The stakeholder group needs to ensure all entities are providing input. Michigan

<i>clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	needs to specify how it will make assessments available in all languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population. In addition, the State must share how it will receive and respond to public comment.
--	--

**A.4: Statewide Accountability Systems & School Support and Improvement (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))**

**A.4.i: Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(b)(3), 1111(c)(2))**

**A.4.i.a: Major Racial and Ethnic Subgroups of Students (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B))**

➤ Does the SEA list each major racial and ethnic group that the SEA includes as a subgroup of students in its accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan State Plan provides specific information regarding the major racial and ethnic group that the State includes as a subgroup of students in its accountability system. The plan includes all required subgroups and lists each major racial and ethnic group: American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; Two or More Races; White; Economically Disadvantaged; English Learners; and Students with Disabilities.
<i>Strengths</i>	Michigan documents the major racial and ethnic group that the State includes as a subgroup of students in its accountability system. For example, these include American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	None noted
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.4.i.b: Additional Subgroups at SEA Discretion**

➤ If applicable, does the SEA describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) included in its

statewide accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A Michigan does not describe any additional subgroups in its statewide accountability system.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.i.c: Previously Identified English Learners

*Note: State Plan template item A.4.i.c requires a binary yes/no response from SEAs, and thus has no applicable peer review criteria.*

A.4.i.d: If Applicable, Exception for Recently Arrived English Learners

*Note: This peer review criterion applies only if a State selects the third option in item A.4.i.d in the consolidated State plan template for recently arrived English learners under which the State applies the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) to a recently arrived English learner.*

- Does the SEA describe how it will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner (e.g., a statewide procedure that considers English language proficiency level in determining which, if any, exception applies)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Michigan presents three different Accountability System options and has several scenarios for reporting depending on which is chosen. The plan does not include the results of former English learners with the results of current English learners in any indicator calculations for accountability purposes. This appears true of all three options.</p> <p>Michigan justifies the exception it will apply to the recently arrived English learner based on whichever option is chosen to report accountability. The plan designates a four-year exemption timeline for implementation of testing</p>

	and accountability.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan describes realistic recently arrived English learner exception that applies to all 3 options and clearly outlines how it will implement it. The plan is responsive to the needs and realities of the students, and includes a progression of how the student will eventually be fully included.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Michigan is applying Exception 3, however the plan appears to be inconsistent with the statute. The State intends to apply Exception 1 and 2 to all students, rather than developing and describing a process determining which exception will be used with which students.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan needs to justify how it will chose the exception and specify within the context of Exception 3 clarify how the exception will be used according to statute.

#### A.4.ii: Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))

##### A.4.ii.a: Minimum N-Size for Accountability (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

- Does the SEA provide the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes, including annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools?
- Is the minimum number of students the same State-determined number for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) for accountability purposes?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan Plan states the n-size for accountability is 30 for all indicators except for English Learner Progress, where the n-size is 10. While Michigan offers a sound argument for lowering the n-size for English learners, it is possible other groups might benefit from a lower n-size. Michigan provided the minimum number of students that the State determined is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes. Where there is a

	different n sized used, the plan outlines the state’s reason why a different n size is used. n-sizes can differ by indicator, but not between different subgroups of students.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan Plan justifies the smaller n-size is utilized due to the loss of transparency and accountability by including this indicator in a building level accountability system instead of at a district level system. The State proposes the n-size for accountability is 30 for all indicators except for English learner progress, where the n-size is 10. The State shares that this corresponds with Michigan’s AMAO system of an n-size of 10 at a district level.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	For accountability purposes, the minimum number of students must be the same for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan needs to ensure that the n-size is the same minimum number of students must be the same for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State.

A.4.ii.b: Statistical Soundness of Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

➤ Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?<sup>2</sup>

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Statistical data or evidence is not included to demonstrate reliability of n-size of 30, and the English Language Proficiency n-size of 10 is not addressed although Michigan offers a reasonable, sound argument for their n-size of 30. Although Michigan does not provide supporting data, using the minimum number of students as stated is statically sound based on standard practice.
<i>Strengths</i>	Michigan uses sound judgment for determining n-size, and references those in the appendices; thirty is a typical, widely accepted n-size.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan does not include evidence beyond citations supporting the proposed n-size of 10, for English language

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute of Education Sciences report [“Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information”](#) to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

	learners.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii.c: How the SEA Determined Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(ii))

- Does the SEA describe how it determined the minimum number of students?
- Does the description include how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	While the Michigan plan indicates that feedback was solicited, they do not indicate who the stakeholders were. Inadequate information was provided regarding how the State collaborated with specific stakeholders including teachers, principals, other school leaders, and parents on this issue. Based on Michigan’s information provided, it was unclear how the analysis determined the need to lower the n-size. It is unclear how analysis of students and student subgroups was conducted.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan Plan describes the analysis of student and all student subgroups, and provided a rationale to lower the n-size to include students within subgroups and subgroups within schools throughout the accountability system, thereby increasing transparency. Stakeholders use a variety of methods to solicit feedback through electronic surveys, conferences, and ESSA-specific feedback sessions.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Michigan plan provided limited information about specific stakeholder feedback. The plan lacks clarity about how specific groups were engaged in this decision and what specific feedback was provided by each group. The Michigan State Plan gave no evidence regarding the analysis process used to determine the statistical data to lower the n-size. The State did not specifically share who was involved in the collaboration effort to seek feedback. The State does not specifically describe how feedback is solicited from stakeholder groups including community and parents.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan must provide additional details to document how specific stakeholder collaboration with teachers, principals, other school leaders, and parents helped determine the minimum number of students for n-size.
--	--

A.4.ii.d: Minimum N-Size and Ensuring Student Privacy (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(iii))

➤ Does the SEA describe how it ensures that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students?<sup>3</sup>

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan’s Plan provides a description of how the minimum n-size will protect the privacy of individual students. Plan addresses this requirement and meets the criteria for this section. Michigan outlined the use of suppression for data elements not reaching the threshold as well as top and bottom coding for values less than 5% and greater than 95% will protect the privacy of individual students.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan State Plan demonstrates the use of suppression for data elements not reaching the threshold to protect the privacy of individual students. The State shared the A documented that the collection and dissemination of information is consistent with section 444 of the of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

.4.ii.e: If Applicable, Minimum N-Size for Reporting

➤ If the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability

<sup>3</sup> See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

- purposes, does the SEA provide the minimum number of students for purposes of reporting?
- Is the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting consistent with the requirements in ESEA section 1111(i), including with respect to privacy and statistical reliability?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan addresses all requirements and meets the criteria for this section. Michigan’s n-size is 10 and the plan provides a description of how this minimum n-size will protect the privacy of individual students in reporting.
<i>Strengths</i>	Michigan assured the protection of any student group below 10 students by masking publicly reported accountability data. The plan utilizes suppression for data elements not reaching the threshold to protect the privacy of individual students, and documents that the collection and dissemination of information is consistent with section 444 of the of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

#### A.4.iii: Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))

##### A.4.iii.a: Academic Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))

##### A.4.iii.a.1: Long-term goals

- Does the SEA identify (*i.e.*, by providing a numeric measure) and describe the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (which must apply the same academic achievement standards to all public school students in the State, except those with the most significant cognitive disabilities)?
- Does the SEA identify and describe long-term goals for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?

- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Long-term goals and timeline for meeting them (2024-25) are provided. No discussion of subgroups. Bulk of response is a non-answer. Due to Michigan’s legislation regarding their accountability, the State was unable to respond to each criteria. The plan offers a general statement about 75% of schools and 75% of student subgroups meeting the 2016-17 proficiency rates at the 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile. However, how this gets determined will depend upon the methodology chosen (Option 1, 2, or 3). The plan is ambitious long-term group goals for all students but not for subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan had insufficient detail to describe long-term goals differentiated for each subgroup. The plan does not address the uniqueness of each subgroup and plan for helping them meet the long term state goal While it is very ambitious to assert that every subgroup will meet the long-term goals. Michigan does not provide adequate detail to determine if this intention is realistic or achievable nor does it adequately provide baseline data; data are only available for a single year. Option 3 requires the State to explain how performance will be contextualized; this requirement is not sufficiently addressed in the plan.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The Michigan State Plan must address the criteria required and should create simulations based on 2015 – 2016 data for each of the options under consideration. The State must provide sufficient detail regarding the impact of each option. In addition, the identification of the same long term goals for every subgroup, is not an adequate response to the second criterion. Michigan needs to provide baseline data. The State needs to detail how Option 3 will address all the items of this requirement.

#### A.4.iii.a.2: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for all students?
- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	No subgroup interim progress measurements are provided. Although the charts were helpful to display the data, the interim progress goals were not specified.
<i>Strengths</i>	

<i>Weaknesses</i>	Data in Appendix A is not detailed for each subgroup of students. The Michigan State plan did not include measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for each subgroup of students. For example, Michigan shared it will increase the number of schools/subgroups meeting these values from 25% in 2016-17 to 75% in 2024-25 but did not state interim progress measures.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan must address measurements of interim progress for each subgroup of students (e.g., incremental progress projected/predicted for each subgroup over the years).

A.4.iii.a.3: Improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps

- Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps, such that the State's long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower achieving?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Goals will apply across all subgroups. No interim measurements of progress are provided. No strategies are discussed for increasing the achievement of subgroups requiring greater rates of improvement. Very little information provided except to say historical statewide growth rates will be used. The Michigan Plan did not provide for subpopulation are struggling students other than to say it would identify struggling areas and allocate resources to support access to quality educational opportunities for all students.
<i>Strengths</i>	It is ambitious to set the same goal for every subgroup.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Michigan Plan did not provide planning for student subgroups other than to say it would identify areas and allocate resources to support access to quality educational opportunities for all students. The State did not address closing the proficiency gap for subgroups as goals were not differentiated for the different subgroups. The State consistently asserts that all subgroups will be treated the same, that all will meet the same long-term goals.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	Michigan needs to provide more information and planning to address the long-term goals necessary to close the state proficiency gap for subgroups. The plan needs to provide evidence that measures of interim progress take into

<i>clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	account the improvement necessary for all subgroups of students to meet the long-term goals.
--	--

A.4.iii.b: Graduation Rate (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))

A.4.iii.b.1: Long-term goals for four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan Plan presents long-term goals and the timeline for meeting them (2024-25). Michigan did not discuss how subgroups of students will be assisted to reach goals based on their specific needs. The State provides a rationale for determining the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students but a peer reviewer questions whether the 75% of schools and 75% of student subgroups meet the 2016-17 statewide four-year graduation rate at the 75th percentile is an appropriate measure. The response is unclear to the reader. It appears the term baseline may be used in place of target or goal. A baseline year is listed but specific data is missing.
<i>Strengths</i>	Plan is ambitious and sets a long-term goal for all students and all subgroups based on the top 10 educational state in 10 years State Board of Education-approved initiative.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Insufficient detail is provided to describe long-term goals differentiated for each subgroup. There is no differentiation for subpopulations for students and it is a one size plan fits all. The Michigan Plan does not include actual baseline data or projected targets for each year to determine if goals are realistic. The Appendix presents data by cohort rather than subgroup. The Appendix presents these data by cohort rather than subgroup. A timeline is included, and is the same for all groups of students. It is not possible to determine how quickly various student subgroups will meet the long-term goals and thus, how ambitious the goals are for different subgroups of students. The relative ambition of the long-term goals differs greatly between student subgroups.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)

<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	<p>Michigan needs to provide clearly stated long-term goals. In addition, the plan needs to include the baseline data for student subgroups. As the State develops baseline data and interim progress goals for each subgroup, the plan needs to determine if the different groups may need to meet the long-term goal at different rates.</p>
---	--

A.4.iii.b.2: If applicable, long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?
- Are the long-term goals more rigorous than the long-term goals set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Long-term goals and timeline for meeting them (2024-25) are provided. The use of charts helped outline the graduation goals for subgroups and all students. Not all components are clearly included in the Michigan Plan.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan Plan demonstrates the long term goals are rigorous for four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The State outlined the plan for the four-year graduation rate target to be 94.4% and the five- and six-year graduation rate targets to be 96.49% and 97% respectively. The State specified the long term goal to have 75% of schools/subgroups meeting these targets by 2024-2025. The plan includes baseline data for all students and subpopulations as well as a description explaining how the extended graduation rate will be calculated.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Michigan Plan did not document any differentiation and the timeline is the same for all students and for each subgroup of students.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	Michigan needs to address baseline data and multi-year length of time. The State needs to provide evidence that goals are ambitious or realistic.

*fully meet this requirement*

A.4.iii.b.3: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan provides interim progress for all students, but interim progress by subgroups is not provided. Appendix A charts the measurement of projected interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
<i>Strengths</i>	Interim progress percentages needed (by year) for all students are presented in Appendix A. The State documented measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students including subgroups.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan shows baseline years but does not include baseline data for subgroups. The charts provided are not clear, particularly regarding how to interpret the “schools/subgroups.”
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan needs to provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for subgroups and all students.

A.4.iii.b.4: Improvement necessary to close statewide graduation rate gaps

- Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps, such that the State’s long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that graduate from high school at lower rates?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
--	----------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Goals will apply across all subgroups. No interim measurements of progress are provided. No strategies are discussed for increasing the achievement of subgroups requiring greater rates of improvement. Subgroups and the closing of the achievement gap are not discussed except to say Michigan has the same expectations for all students. Michigan clearly states there are the same expectations of all students, regardless of student subgroups. The long-term goals and measurements of interim progress reflect these expectations.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan State Plan defines its clear position regarding having the same expectations of all students, regardless of student subgroups. The long-term goals and measurements of interim progress reflect these expectations. The goal is ambitious and set high expectations for all students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Michigan State Plan does not take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps. The goal is not responsive to the needs to specific sub-groups of students
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan needs to address the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for subgroups of students to determine how these measurements of interim progress will help to make significant progress to close statewide graduation rate gaps.

A.4.iii.c: English Language Proficiency (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))

A.4.iii.c.1: Long-term goals

- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data?
- Does the SEA’s description include the State-determined timeline for English learners to achieve English language proficiency?
- Is the long-term goal ambitious?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Progress is described as showing satisfactory levels of growth or achieved proficiency, but no specific long term goals or baseline data are included. This appears to be a work-in-progress. Waiting an empirical policy study to occur. Also, dependent upon legislative decisions regarding Options 1,2, and 3. The information provided does not include data or measurable goals to indicate the percentage of English learners making progress. This section

	outlines the process for how students are assessed but does not address a long term goal.
<i>Strengths</i>	Procedure for identification of English language learners (Entrance Protocol) is clearly described. The Michigan Plan clearly states the timeline will be limited to no more than 7 years to align English Language Proficiency with the overall accountability timeline. The plan clarifies the eligibility requirements and the use of standardized testing with protocols that help define levels of proficiency. The process for how students are assessed is clearly explained.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Michigan plan fails to present specific long term goals or baseline data. The plan does not identify or describe the long term goal in measurable terms. The plan states making growth and achieving proficiency is expected but does not discuss in terms of actual data. Baseline data (the percentage of schools meeting the 45.7% goal) is provided but lacks clarity.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan needs to clearly identify the timeline as it states it has yet to be determined, and will be no more than 7 years. The goal should address the percentage of English language learners making targets toward proficiency, not the percentage of English language learners that meet proficiency. The chart on page 25 needs more clarity to determine if it addresses proficiency, percentage making progress toward goal, or other data. The State needs to clearly define the goal in terms of proficiency and/or progress. The plan needs to specify what the 45.7% represents in the baseline data (i.e., students making progress—which would need to be defined, or students meeting proficiency). The goal needs to be sufficiently defined to ascertain whether it is ambitious.

A.4.iii.c.2: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan provides interim progress percentages and research based timeline limited to no more than 7 years. Appendix A provides measurements of interim progress. The plan states that English Language Learners should be in the program no more than seven years but does not discuss interim progress in measurable terms.
<i>Strengths</i>	Interim progress percentages needed (by year) are presented in Appendix A.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	No specific information is provided defining how "growth" (interim progress) will be measured. The Michigan Plan qualifies that English Language Learners should be in the program no more than seven years but does not discuss interim progress in measurable terms.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)

<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	
---	--

**A.4.iv: Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B), 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii))**

*Note: A single indicator may consist of multiple components or measures. Peers must review each such component or measure for compliance with all of the required elements.*

**A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement**

- Does the SEA describe the Academic Achievement indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator for all schools in all LEAs across the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator, including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2) a description of the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement; 3) if the State uses one, a description of the performance index; 4) if, at the high school level, the indicator includes a measure of student growth, a description of the growth measure (*e.g.*, a growth model); and 5) if the State averages data, a description of how it averages data across years and/or grades (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?
- Is the indicator measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments?
- Does the indicator measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	While the response describes Michigan’s system, the response could be altered depending on legislative action. Additionally, when the response is referring to as “special populations” it was unclear who the subgroup was. The explanation provided does not discuss issues of validity or reliability. The explanation of the 100 point index helps outline the Academic Achievement indicator and the impact it has on all schools and students..
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan Plan discusses the Academic Progress Indicator using a 100-point index; calculated by subject area including English language arts, math, science, and social studies; for all schools and all students and disaggregated by subgroups in grades 3-8 & 11. The plan describes the Academic Achievement indicator and the 100-point index system used for each tested content area and shares it is used for all schools with the exception of schools devoted

	to special subgroups. The calculations are also consistent for the content areas of English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies and the indicator is used to measure the performance of at least 95% of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Special schools are not included in the calculation the same way as all other schools and the plan does not go into detail about what this looks like. No specific discussion of validity and reliability based on past/prior use of this indicator. The Michigan Plan does not provide evidence regarding the reliability and the validity of the indicator. The plan states it uses the student growth percentile as its growth measure but does not share statistical data to support it. Reviewers expressed confusion about the indicator/performance index/student growth percentile. Discussion of these various items should be clarified. Each item should be clearly defined and differentiated in the plan. Given the inclusion of the additional subjects, it is not clear whether or to what extent the indicator is measured by proficiency on the annual assessments of reading/language arts and mathematics. The composition of the 100-point index is not clearly defined, and is not clearly linked to proficiency.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan needs to exclude the discussion of the use of the Academic Achievement indicator for subjects beyond English language arts and mathematics. The plan needs to provide a clear description of the weighting of the specific content areas. The State needs to clearly indicate and describe whether it will use a performance index or the 100 point scale and provide evidence it is linked to proficiency.

A.4.iv.b: Other Academic Indicator for Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools

*Note: If the SEA uses a different Other Academic indicator for each grade span, peer reviewers must separately review each indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one Other Academic indicator for elementary schools and a different Other Academic indicator for middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator.*

- Does the SEA describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including that the SEA uses the same indicator and calculates it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the indicator may vary by each grade span?
- Does the SEA describe, if applicable, how it averages data across years and/or grades (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?

- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, is the indicator another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan Plan uses only the Academic Progress Indicator already mentioned, and specifies that it uses the student growth percentile as its growth measure for all schools across the state (except for schools with special populations).
<i>Strengths</i>	The Academic Progress Indicator uses a 100-point index; calculated by subject area including English language arts, math, science, and social studies; for all schools, all students, disaggregated by subgroups in grades 3-8 and 11. The Michigan Plan specifies it uses the student growth percentile as its growth measure for all schools across the state except schools with special populations.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The State Plan does not adequately explain how the student growth percentile is used as a growth measure. Michigan needs to explain how special populations are included. The State provides no differentiation to accommodate different grade spans or different subgroups. The plan lacks detail about how data will be averaged across years.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan must adequately explain that the academic progress indicator will be used as growth measure . The State needs to explain how special populations are included. Michigan needs to clarify whether the indicator allows for differentiation among grade levels and and for different subgroups.

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

- Does the SEA describe the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2), if applicable, whether the SEA chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data; and 3) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (e.g., consistent with the provisions in ESEA section 8101(23) and (25), which permit averaging graduation rate data over three years for very small schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?

- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Is the indicator based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?
- If the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, does the description include how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description include how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25)?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Insufficient information is provided to determine whether or not this indicator addresses all the requirements. The Plan provides alternative explanations depending on Option 1,2, or 3. The information describing the graduation rate was not detailed enough to determine whether it was sufficient to address the stated requirements.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Graduation Rate indicator proposed uses a 100-point index, calculated for all students and subgroups using the adjusted cohort methodology. The Michigan State Plan documents the Graduation Rate indicator uses a 4, 5 and 6-year adjusted cohort method to calculate the graduation rate. It is standard across the state for both all students and subgroups.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan lacks information explaining what the Graduation Rate indicator actually is, how it is calculated, and how it relates to long term goals, as well as its validity and reliability. The State lacks examples of the adjusted cohort method for the graduation rate needed to help clarify the differences between the different options presented. If the State determines to include students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the graduation rate indicator, this must be described.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan needs to clearly describe the graduate rate indicator, how it is calculated, and whether it is reliable and valid. It also needs to explain how the 100-point index relates to the 4-, 5- and 6-year graduation rate, or whether the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The State must clarify if the weighting discussed presented is relevant to this indicator. The State needs to address whether the indicator is based on long-term goals. Since Michigan proposes multiple options and the State shares the indicator will be “handled differently” based on the option chosen, the State needs to describe the potential impact of these differences. The State must clearly describe how the indicator is calculated, including how the State chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data.

A.4.iv.d: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator

- Does the SEA describe the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator aligned with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1?
- Does the indicator consistently measure statewide the progress of all English learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12?
- Does the SEA’s description include the State’s definition of English language proficiency, based on the State English language proficiency assessment?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan used Student Growth Percentile or proficiency levels. Insufficient information is provided to determine whether or not this indicator addresses all the requirements. The State shares they are dependent upon legislative selection of Options discussed. The State provides a single plan to address the English language proficiency of students across the state and across all grade levels. The plan contains some requirements but not all.
<i>Strengths</i>	The English Language Proficiency Indicator proposes using a 100-point index, calculated for all students currently defined as English language learners.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Although references to research is cited in Appendix C, the Michigan State Plan lacks adequate evidence of validity and reliability. The plan does not provide clarity to determine how the measure is used and if is it consistent across the state.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The State needs to explain how the two proposed pathways work in concert with each other and how progress and proficiency are incorporated in the 100-point index. The State must provide additional details to determine whether this indicator is aligned with the timeline. The State must provide more detail to support the validity and reliability of the indicator. The Michigan State Plan does not directly include the State’s definition of English language proficiency, based on the State English language proficiency assessment and this needs to be shared.

A.4.iv.e: School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)

*Note: Peer reviewers must separately review each School Quality or Student Success indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA*

submits one School Quality or Student Success indicator for high schools and a different School Quality or Student Success indicator for elementary and middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the SEA’s description must include the grade spans to which it does apply. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(v))

- Does the SEA describe each School Quality or Student Success indicator used in its statewide accountability system for all public schools in the State?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
- Does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Is the indicator valid, reliable, comparable, used statewide in all schools (for the grade span to which it applies), and calculated in a consistent way?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Four indicator components are defined, but insufficient information is provided about validity and reliability, and how they will work together. Michigan’s plan uses a K-12 measure, a K-8, and high school measure around course completion and postsecondary enrollment. There are four indicators outlined in the plan but it is unclear how these will apply to different grade levels. Two are specific to high school, one to k-8, and one k-12
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan State Plan proposes a 4 point additional indicator component, 2 high school specific, one K-8, and one K-12. K-8 component (time spent in Fine Arts, Music, Physical Education, and Access to a Library Media Specialist) as developed in direct response to stakeholder feedback. The plan provides a good explanation of methodology, however it is dependent upon actions of legislature. The State clearly qualifies their four-part additional indicator component to address factors they have determined are a part of their plan. It further explains the calculations for each with utilizing the 100-point index. The indicators are responsive to the unique environments of elementary and high schools. Chronic absenteeism is clearly defined. The indicator related time spent in arts, music, and physical education was developed in response to stakeholder feedback.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Michigan State plan lacks specific evidence of validity and reliability failing to provide cited documentation regarding the validity and reliability of the indicator although it provides a bibliography of resources utilized. The indicator plan does not allow for differentiation in school performance as it is utilized across the grade levels. It is unclear how the State will determine which indicator to apply to a specific environment. The composition of each 100-point index and the way in which each is calculated, is not clearly described. The State does not address whether the indicators can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students. The proposed School Quality report cards do not clearly align with the proposed indicators; the process by which these indicators are incorporated in School Quality grades is not described. The State does not address whether the indicators can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The State needs to include a more in depth description of the four School Quality/Student Success indicators. Michigan needs to articulate the composition of each 100-point index and the way in which each is calculated. The State also needs to provide justification that the evidence provided reflects validity and reliability.

#### A.4.v: Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))

##### A.4.v.a: State's System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation

- Does the SEA describe its system of meaningfully differentiating, on an annual basis, all public schools in the State?
- Is the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation based on all indicators in the State's accountability system?
- Does the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation include the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State's accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan outlines their determination of the State's System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation utilizing the three different accountability system options they have presented. The plan describes the three options the state is considering, and specifies the outcome based upon performance for each option.
<i>Strengths</i>	The system of meaningful differentiation to be used in Options 1 and 2 are described and meet review criteria.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While the Michigan State clearly describes the methodology for Option 1 and 2, the system to be used under Options 3 is unclear, in large part due to a lack of detail in the description of Option 3. The methods by which the differentiating indicator is determined (e.g., A, B or meets/does not meet) is not clearly described for any of the options. The final selection of Michigan's system of meaningful differentiation is dependent upon a decision by the legislature.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<i>Options 1 and 2</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)  <i>Option 3:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)

<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	<p>If Option 3 is selected, Michigan must describe how it will differentiate all public schools and provide a description of how annual meaningful differentiation based on all indicators and includes all students and subgroups in the State’s accountability system.</p>
---	--

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

- Does the SEA describe the weighting of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (*e.g.*, for the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator)?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan provides the weights of each indicator addressing the categories of Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, English Learner Progress, School Quality/Student Success, General Participation, and English Learner Participation.
<i>Strengths</i>	Three reviewers agreed that Option 1 meets the statutory requirements, citing that for Option 1, the plan fully describes an appropriate weighting system, details the weights of each indicator, and describes how weights would be adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The plan lacks a description of how the initial weights were determined for each indicator for Option 1.</p> <p>One reviewer felt that, relative to student success and school quality, Option 1 does not assign substantial weight to the graduation rate and ELP progress indicators, citing that in the aggregate, academic achievement indicators, graduation rate and ELP progress indicators receive much greater weight than the school quality or student success indicator.</p> <p>The weighting of indicators is not described for Options 2 and 3, and it is unclear how the plan would address the requirement. One reviewer suggested that Option 2 would not necessarily include a weighting system, since no summative grade is provided, and that a system would need to be developed to determine the weight in Option 2.</p>

	Subgroup performance is included within each indicator and does not allow for differentiation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><i>Option 1:</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)</p> <p><i>Options 2 and 3:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>One reviewer indicated that, relative to the student success indicator, Option 1 does not assign sufficient weight to the graduation rate and ELP progress indicators individually, but that in the aggregate, academic achievement indicators, graduation rate and ELP progress indicators receive much greater weight than the school success indicator.</p> <p>The State must clarify for Option 1, substantial weight is assigned to the graduation rate and ELP progress indicators, citing that in the aggregate, academic achievement indicators, graduation rate and ELP progress indicators receive much greater weight than the school quality or student success indicator.</p> <p>For Option 2 &amp; 3, the State must describe the weight of indicators, how the state plan would address the requirement, and how they were determined.</p>

A.4.v.c: If Applicable, Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation

- If the SEA uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a of the State’s plan for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (*e.g.*, P-2 schools), does it describe the different methodology or methodologies, including how the methodology or methodologies will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Does the SEA’s description of a different methodology indicate the type(s) of schools to which it applies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan State Plan outlines a voluntary, parallel system of accountability for alternative education programs based on an application and relevant demographics.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan very clearly describes how this applies to small schools that may not have large enough n sizes.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	Michigan is in the process of determining the components of this alternative accountability system. The plan did not define what the relevant demographics would be for allowing an alternate education program to request utilizing a different methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan must describe the methodology for how annual meaningful differentiation will be applied to schools not included in their accountability system.

**A.4.vi: Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))**

**A.4.vi.a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Lowest Performing**

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement including, if applicable, how it averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>While Supplemental Information was provided, the Plan does not fully respond to this section. Several methodologies are offered based on the 3 accountability plan options.</p> <p>Designations are not required until 2018-19 school year and Michigan states that they will revise the application to include methodologies by fall of 2017, and that the process to align methodologies with the accountability system will include additional stakeholder feedback.</p>

<i>Strengths</i>	The plan outlines the methodologies for identifying the lowest performing 5 percent of schools for Option 1 and 2.  Each option will identify no less than five percent of schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><i>Option 1:</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)  <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><i>Option 2:</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)  <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><i>Option 3:</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	If Option 3 is selected, Michigan will need to describe how all indicators will be used in the identification of the lowest performing five percent of schools.

A.4.vi.b: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Low Graduation Rates

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including: 1) a description of whether the SEA uses one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates in addition to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement?

- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Michigan proposes multiple options; the SEA states that the indicator will be “handled differently” based on the option chosen, but does not describe the potential impact of these differences. The plan does not describe its methodology to identify schools failing to graduate one-third or more of their students, and does not address whether it will use one or more extended year adjusted cohort graduation rates in this methodology. It is not clear that the methodology will result in the identification of all schools failing to graduate one-third of their students. The State includes extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, and does discuss how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate.</p> <p>The SEA does not clearly describe how the 100-point index relates to the 4-, 5- and 6-year graduation rate, or whether the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The SEA does not clearly describe the graduate rate indicator, how it is calculated, and whether it is reliable and valid. The indicator can be disaggregated. Michigan proposes multiple options; the SEA states that the indicator will be “handled differently” based on the option chosen, but does not describe the potential impact of these differences. The plan does not describe its methodology to identify schools failing to graduate one-third or more of their students, and does not address whether it will use one or more extended year adjusted cohort graduation rates in this methodology. It is not clear that the methodology will result in the identification of all schools failing to graduate one-third of their students. The State includes extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, and does discuss how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate.</p> <p>The SEA does not clearly describe how the 100-point index relates to the 4-, 5- and 6-year graduation rate, or whether the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. The SEA does not clearly describe the graduate rate indicator, how it is calculated, and whether it is reliable and valid. The indicator can be disaggregated.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan indicates that Michigan will identify Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools using data from the 2018-19 school year.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan will need to describe its methodology for identifying all public high schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement. The State must clearly describe how the indicator is calculated, including how the State chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data, if applicable. MI must provide sufficient data to determine if the indicator is valid and reliable. The State must clarify if the weighting discussed regarding the 4, 5, and 6-year graduation rate is relevant to this indicator.
--	---

A.4.vi.c: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support Not Exiting Such Status

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (*i.e.*, based on identification as a school in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification as one of the lowest-performing five percent) that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan describes a methodology to identify schools receiving Title 1 Part A funds for Option 1 and 2. The plan does not describe a methodology to identify schools receiving Title 1 Part A funds for Option 3. The plan includes the year in which it will first identify these schools for all Options.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Plan indicates Michigan will use the subgroup component of its overall accountability system.  Options 1 and 2 are rooted in a valid methodology.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

<p><i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i></p>	<p><i>Options 1 and 2</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)  <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><i>Option 3:</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	<p>Michigan does not describe a methodology to identify schools receiving Title 1 Part A funds for Option 3; if Option 3 is selected, the State must describe how this methodology will identify such schools.</p>

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification?
- Does the SEA’s timeline result in identification of these schools at least once every three years?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	MI indicate it will identify all types of Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools at least once every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	MI’s plan does not provide any detail.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)

*If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement*

A.4.vi.e: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—“Consistently Underperforming” Subgroups

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, including its definition of “consistently underperforming”?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students?
- Is the methodology based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation?
- Does the SEA identify these schools annually?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<i>The SEA describes its methodology for identifying these schools, and defines “consistently underperforming” subgroups for all options. Michigan will base the decision on the performance of each subgroup over the previous three years with an annual identification. The methodologies described for Options 1 and 2 will result in the identification of these schools. Option 3 does not use all indicators in its identification methodology so will not necessarily result in the accurate identification of schools.</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	The methodologies described in Options 1 and 2 will result in the identification of these schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	Options 1 and 2: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)  Option 3: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	If Option 3 is selected, MI will need to describe how all indicators will be used in its methodology used to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students.
--	--

A.4.vi.f: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D) (*i.e.*, the methodology described above in A.4.vi.a), including: 1) whether the methodology identifies these schools from among all public schools in the State or from among only the schools identified as schools with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which the State will first identify such schools (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?
- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify such schools after the first year of identification?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA describes the methodology to identify these schools for Options 1 and 2; the methodology for identifying these schools in Option 3 is not clearly described. The SEA does not plan to use all indicators in Option 3; it is not clear this methodology will result in the identification of all schools. The SEA identifies the year these schools will first be identified and the frequency with which they will be identified for all options.
<i>Strengths</i>	For all options, the plan details the year these schools will first be identified and the frequency with which they will be identified.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The distinction between targeted support and improvement schools and comprehensive support and improvement schools is not clear.

<p><i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 &amp;2</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)  <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><i>Option 3</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	<p>If Option 3 is selected, MI will need to describe how all indicators will be used in its methodology to identify such schools.</p>

A.4.vi.g: If Applicable, Additional Statewide Categories of Schools

- If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, does the SEA describe those categories?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan intends to continue the Reward School designation but does not provide a description of what this category means.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan does not define or describe the Reward School designation or the methodology for making that designation.

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	MI will need to define and describe the Reward School designation and specify the methodology for making that designation.

A.4.vii: Annual Measure of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system?
- If applicable, does the SEA describe how the SEA differentiates its approach based on such factors as the number of subgroups in the school missing the participation rate requirement, the length of time over which the school has missed the requirement, or the degree to which the school missed the requirement (e.g., 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation)?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan Plan addresses all requirements and meets the criteria for this section. The Plan describes how it clearly factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan Plan includes description and calculations. The State explains the formula to be used to determine the participation rate of all students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments and includes the English Language Learner progress component.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Additional explanation may need to be clarified why only students with a full academic year are included. and there is a need for a rationale for limiting this measure to students with a full academic year. It is not clear how in Option 3, the activity of reporting the rate will be factored into the accountability system.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vi: Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

A.4.vi.a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Lowest Performing

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement including, if applicable, how it averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>While Supplemental Information was provided, the Plan does not fully respond to this section. Several methodologies are offered based on the 3 accountability plan options.</p> <p>Designations are not required until 2018-19 school year and Michigan states that they will revise the application to include methodologies by fall of 2017, and that the process to align methodologies with the accountability system will include additional stakeholder feedback on this issue alone.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The plan outlines the methodologies for identifying the lowest performing 5 percent of schools for Option 1 and 2.</p> <p>Each option will identify no less than five percent of schools.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

<p><i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1:</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)  <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><i>Option 2:</i>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)  <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><i>Option 3:</i>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	<p>In Option 3, the plan proposes to use two indicators to identify the lowest performing 5 percent, however the criteria requires the use of <b>all</b> indicators.</p>

A.4.vi.b: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Low Graduation Rates

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including: 1) a description of whether the SEA uses one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates in addition to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<p><i>Peer Response</i></p>
--	-----------------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan does not describe its methodology to identify schools failing to graduate one-third or more of their students, and does not address whether it will use one or more extended year adjusted cohort graduation rates in this methodology. It is not clear that the methodology will result in the identification of all schools failing to graduate one-third of their students.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan does indicate the year in which it will first identify schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	MI will need to describe its methodology for identifying all public high schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement. The State must clearly describe how the indicator is calculated, including how the State chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data, if applicable. MI must provide sufficient data to determine if the indicator is valid and reliable. The State must clarify if the weighting discussed regarding the 4, 5, and 6-year graduation rate is relevant to this indicator.

A.4.vi.c: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support Not Exiting Such Status

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (*i.e.*, based on identification as a school in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification as one of the lowest-performing five percent) that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
--	----------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>For Option 1 and 2, the plan clearly describes a valid methodology to identify schools receiving Title 1 Part A funds</p> <p>This section is part of supplemental materials. The materials do include an overview of how the methodology would be used in the three different options they SEA is considering but it is not clear how it will lead to identification of schools</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The Plan indicates Michigan will use the subgroup component of its overall accountability system.</p> <p>Options 1 and 2 are rooted in a valid methodology</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>SEA responded that they are not submitting methodologies for these at this time.</p> <p>The statement is not clear on how it will lead to specific identification</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><i>Options 1 and 2</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><i>Option 3:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA does not describe a methodology to identify schools receiving Title 1 Part A funds for Option 3; if Option 3 is selected, the State must describe how this methodology will identify such schools.</p>

➤ Does the SEA’s description of a different methodology indicate the type(s) of schools to which it applies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
--	----------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan State Plan outlines a voluntary, parallel system of accountability for alternative education programs (i.e. small schools with less than the total number of students necessary for an indicator), based on an application and relevant demographics.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan very clearly describes how this applies to small schools that may not have large enough n sizes.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Michigan is still seeking clarity in the development how the plan will address alternative education programs. The plan did not define what the relevant demographics would be for allowing an alternate education program to request utilizing a different methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Describe in detail the different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation that will be applied to small schools.

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification?
- Does the SEA’s timeline result in identification of these schools at least once every three years?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan provides for the State to identify once every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan does not differentiate types of schools.

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vi.e: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—“Consistently Underperforming” Subgroups

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, including its definition of “consistently underperforming”?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students?
- Is the methodology based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation?
- Does the SEA identify these schools annually?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan will base the decision on the performance of each subgroup over the previous three years with an annual identification.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The plan describes its methodology for identifying these schools, and defines “consistently underperforming” subgroups for all 3 options.</p> <p>The methodologies described in Options 1 and 2 will result in the identification of these schools.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p>Option 1 and 2:</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers) <p>Option 3:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))

<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	<p>The methodology must be based on all indicators and Option 3 does not use all indicators. In Option 3, describe in detail how all indicators will be used in the methodology used to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students.</p>
---	---

A.4.vi.f: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D) (*i.e.*, the methodology described above in A.4.vi.a), including: 1) whether the methodology identifies these schools from among all public schools in the State or from among only the schools identified as schools with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which the State will first identify such schools (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?
- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify such schools after the first year of identification?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan clearly describes the methodology to identify these schools for Options 1 and 2.
<i>Strengths</i>	For all Options, the plan details the year these schools will first be identified and the frequency with which they will be identified for all options.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The distinction between targeted support and improvement schools and comprehensive support and improvement schools is not clear.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><i>Option</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><i>Option</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The methodology must be based on all indicators. Michigan does not plan to use all indicators in Option 3. In Option 3, describe in detail how all indicators will be used in the methodology to identify such schools.
--	--

A.4.vi.g: If Applicable, Additional Statewide Categories of Schools

- If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, does the SEA describe those categories?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan intends to continue the Reward School designation but does not provide a description of what this category means.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan does not define or describe the Reward School designation or the methodology for making that designation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Define and describe the Reward School designation and specify the methodology for making that designation.

A.4.viii: Continued Support for School and Local Educational Agency Improvement (ESEA Section 1111(d)(3)(A))

A.4.viii.a: Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, which may include how the exit criteria are aligned with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Is the number of years no more than four years?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit

criteria improve student outcomes and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan responded that they are not submitting exit criteria at this time. Peer Analysis determines answer provided is a non-answer. The State did not provide the statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement.
<i>Strengths</i>	Designations are not required until 2018-19 school year. The Michigan Plan process to align methodologies with the accountability system will include additional stakeholder feedback on this issue.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	State has state law governing the lowest performing schools and that law is under review.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Michigan must describe its statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, which may include how the exit criteria are aligned with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress. .

A.4.viii.b: Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(II))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), which may include how the exit criteria align with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit criteria improve student outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups that led to the school’s identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan responded in their plan they are not submitting exit criteria at this time. Answer provided is a non-answer.
<i>Strengths</i>	Michigan states their intent is to include additional stakeholder feedback in their process to align methodologies with the accountability system. The State is not submitting exit criteria at this time but does specify schools are expected to meet such criteria in four years.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Michigan State Plan discusses that state law governs the lowest performing schools and that law is under review.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The State must describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support and may include how the exit criteria align with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gap. The State must also confirm the exit criteria ensures continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State including improving outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups that led to the school’s identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified.

A.4.viii.c: More Rigorous Interventions (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe the more rigorous State-determined action required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the SEA’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years, which may include interventions that address school-level operations, such as changes in school staffing and budgeting or the school day and year?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan Plan describes a Partnership Program agreement between the State and LEA for schools needing more interventions with specific timelines and interventions included. Michigan will be implementing a program that includes a designation of a State partnership school district. The State shares the state partnership agreement which will be required to implement a comprehensive support and improvement program.
<i>Strengths</i>	Michigan presents a well-articulated tiered plan that provides not only intervention, but support mechanisms to improve. The State shares the timeline for implementation of the state partnership agreement which will be implemented district wide to hold schools accountable. The Michigan Plan describes the timeline and the benchmark requirement required to implement a comprehensive support and improvement program. Included in the plan is the required outcome of the comprehensive support and improvement plan to meet the state determined exit criteria at the end of three years. The State also says the intervention will be required of the district not specific to only schools not meeting the criteria. The plan seems aggressive and has specific timelines and interventions attached.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The State does not detail what the interventions may include with the plan structure or describe the consequences or outcomes for the breach of plan agreement that will be in place for schools implementing a comprehensive support and improvement plan and are designated a state partnership school district failing to meet exit criteria.
<i>Did the SEA meet all</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)

<i>requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.d: Resource Allocation Review (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii))

- Does the SEA describe how it will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan Plan addresses LEAs serving a significant number or percentage of identified schools. The Michigan Plan describes a periodic resource and systems review process as an “adjunct to the comprehensive needs assessment process” to ensure a comprehensive approach to determining needs and planning appropriately and effectively to meet those needs for LEAs with a significant number or percentage of identified schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan Plan specifies a periodic resource and systems review process to support school improvement in LEAs with a significant number or percentage of identified schools. The plan involves a number of teams designated to assist in the school improvement process. The State found a correlation between having one or more schools in the bottom academic 5% and funding deficit status.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While the plan describes the integration of a resource and systems review, it is not clear how these procedures are deliberately connected to supporting school improvement. The plan describes the technical assistance provided, but there seems to be a disconnect between finance (business) and programmatic educational services. The plan could further clarify how this will specifically address the schools receiving this additional support. The plan does not provide sufficient detail regarding the periodic review and the frequency it should occur.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.e: Technical Assistance (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe the technical assistance that it will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Is the technical assistance likely to improve student outcomes by, for example, 1) identifying State-approved evidence-based interventions; 2) supporting LEAs and schools in the development and implementation of support and improvement plans; and 3) differentiating the technical assistance?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan provides a detailed technical assistance plan. Michigan has described a technical assistance model that recognizes the strengths and limitations of both the State and LEAs. Emphasis seems to be on building the capacity of LEAs – teaching process. The State provided a detailed technical assistance plan to provide support to each LEA serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.
<i>Strengths</i>	The State discussed a detailed technical assistance plan to provide support to each LEA serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. For example, the technical assistance team will provide a list of State-approved evidence-based interventions and will focus on training LEAs to learn a process for evidence-based selection. In addition, an SEA approved Implementation Facilitator will be assigned to Districts with Title I Comprehensive Support Schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear who the approved Implementation Facilitators are – are they State employees; are they external paid facilitators? Clarification should be outlined..
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.f: If Applicable, Additional Optional Action

- If applicable, does the SEA describe the action that it will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that it consistently identifies for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting the State’s exit criteria or

in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A - Michigan has elected to not initiate additional improvement actions.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.5: Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B))**

- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that low-income children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?
- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?
- Does the SEA describe the measures (e.g., data used to calculate the disproportionate rates) that it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?<sup>4</sup>

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan provides a table that displays disproportionate rates for ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. The plan provides a detailed analysis of the elements contributing to this problem.

<sup>4</sup> Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan State Plan includes a detailed description of the challenges the state faces. The State indicates measures to be used to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The State does not indicate whether the student groups are enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A. The SEA does not provide the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. The plan is not specific about how the SEA will address the needs moving forward.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

#### **A.6: School Conditions (ESEA Section 1111(g)(1)(C))**

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Michigan shared that it will redevelop the comprehensive needs assessment process and provide a series of current evidence based practices but did not include how actual support will take place. The State response is limited to a discussion of how it conceptualizes addressing the issue. Michigan is redeveloping its comprehensive needs assessment process. As such, the response is not complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan Plan stated it will redevelop the comprehensive needs assessment process and include a data-based review of all the conditions that relate to student learning, including school safety, discipline, bullying/harassment and student health. Use of Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) approach was discussed.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Michigan State Plan lacks specific information describing exactly how these issues will be addressed. The State shares a comprehensive needs assessment takes place focusing on the whole child, LEAs will be supported with a series of current evidence based practices, including 1) positive behavior intervention supports, 2)

	the implementation of Michigan's anti-bullying policy and practices, 3) school health; but it fails to discuss how this will be utilized to improve school conditions and reduce incidents of bullying and harassment, reduce the overuse of discipline practices remove students from the classroom, and how the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety will be reduced. Providing a list of evidence based practices does not describe sole support. General technical assistance will be provided but it is not specifically tied to outcomes related to the issues raised in this criteria.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The State must discuss how their plan will be utilized to improve school conditions and reduce incidents of bullying and harassment, reduce the overuse of discipline practices remove students from the classroom, and how the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety will be reduced. The State must provide description of specific supports beyond providing a list of evidence based practices.

#### **A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 1111(g)(1)(D))**

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school)?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will work with LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The State discussed the school based opportunities and the Educational Development Plan. The Michigan Plan envisions a well-articulated set of transition supports to build upon the Michigan Merit Curriculum and career and college ready standards. The vision is for each student to create an Educational Development Plan (EDP) to be provided with “individualized assistance in planning coursework to support progress toward educational and career goals.” Plan addresses all requirements and meets the criteria for this section. Requirements present but the plan could provide more detail about the middle and high school transition.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan is comprehensive and detailed and addresses the needs of students from pre-K through college/career readiness, including parent and family engagement. The Michigan Plan outlines a comprehensive system to address the needs of students at all levels of schooling from early childhood to career and college level. The State shared the Educational Development Plan (EDP), would be developed no later than 8th grade and will be updated annually, to support individual planning for continuing education and a career by describing the pathway the student will follow to meet challenging State academic standards and career and technical standards.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Michigan State Plan does not clearly articulate the transition supports at the various transition points and would benefit from some further explanation. For example, the focus on elementary to middle and high school transitions could be addressed more as well as the dropout concern.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

## SECTION E: TITLE III, PART A, SUBPART 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND ENHANCEMENT

### E.1: Entrance and Exit Procedures (ESEA section 3113(b)(2))

- Does the SEA describe how it will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners, including a description of how, if applicable, a State will ensure that local input included in the exit procedures, such as teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide?
- Does the SEA’s description include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan State Plan provides a detailed description of the entrance and exit procedures, pre-k through grade 12. The plan describes the entrance and exit procedures and a description of the consultation and provides an assurance that all students who may be English Learners are assessed within thirty days of enrollment.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Michigan Plan provides a comprehensive Entrance and Exit Protocol developed in consultation and partnership with stakeholders (LEAs, schools, parents and higher education institutions across the State). Michigan qualifies the use of the standardized Entrance and Exit Protocol (EEP) that is used annually to monitor and track students until exit level. The Michigan Plan stated the WIDA Screener, a valid and reliable English Language Proficiency assessment, is administered, within 30 days of student’s enrollment, to those students that identify a language other than English in the Home Language Survey. The section includes very detailed information about the process and metrics used for determining entrance and exit.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Michigan does not address training procedures or review the established protocols with the exception of addressing assessments that are valid and reliable for students with severe cognitive, hearing or visual impairments. The State

	Plan does not address how local input such as the use of teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

## E.2: SEA Support for English Learner Progress (ESEA section 3113(b)(6))

- Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in meeting the State-designed long-term goal for English language proficiency established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goal, based on the State’s English language proficiency assessment under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G)?
- Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan plan provides a detailed list of procedures and expectations conveyed to local programs to ensure English learners meet the proposed long-term goal and make interim progress. Michigan articulates a strong set of supports, practices and resources in meeting the long-term goals for English learners and provides a comprehensive list of opportunities and strategies designed to meet the State-designed long-term goal for English language proficiency. This section includes great detail about what Michigan will convey in this area but lacks clarity about how they will accomplish this and measure success.
<i>Strengths</i>	Michigan states that students identified as English learners would be assessed annually. A list of ten expectations is included to ensure support for the English learner is delivered through strategies that include: English language development and literacy supports in the early years; research-based instructional practices to English learners that develop their academic language and literacy skills while infusing language and content objectives in lesson preparation and delivery; support for newly arrived adolescent English learners by providing flexible course scheduling; teachers skilled and regularly trained in English language and immigrant-related supports; access to Title I and other state /federal supplemental funds and services including literacy instruction; extended learning time during the school year and summer; coordination of parent engagement plans; outreach and family literacy activities; connection with family and social services; and supports to help students transition to college, careers, and practical life after high school. Michigan provides evidence of professional development support and opportunities for teachers.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	Michigan should more clearly describe how assistance will be given to eligible LEAs to make use of the strategies and resources. The LEAs did not provide assurances that they will make use of the strategies and resources provided.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### E.3: Monitoring and Technical Assistance (ESEA section 3113(b)(8))

- Does the SEA describe how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English language proficiency?
- Does the SEA describe the steps it will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as by providing technical assistance and support on how to modify such strategies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The Michigan State plan details the monitoring, intervention, and technical assistance process for entities receiving a Title III, Part A sub grant to help English learners achieve English language proficiency and assist the LEAs not making progress.
<i>Strengths</i>	Michigan presents a plan based on monitoring, best practices, technical assistance and reviewing assessment data. For example: Michigan will support LEAs as they monitor performance of former English-learners for four years to determine whether they are performing academically on par with their newer-English learner peers or whether gaps in achievement remain. Michigan qualifies the plan for breaking into additional subgroups and includes detailed explanations of how they support LEAs.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

*fully meet this  
requirement*