

In September 2011, the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) offered each state education agency (SEA) the opportunity to request flexibility from the one-size-fits-all requirements of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)*, on behalf of itself, its local education agencies (LEAs), and schools. SEAs wishing to qualify for *ESEA* flexibility were required to provide the Department with rigorous and comprehensive state-developed plans designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve instructional quality.


In order to receive *ESEA* flexibility, each SEA developed and implemented a system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support that considered student achievement, graduation rates, and school performance and progress over time for the “all students” group, individual *ESEA* student subgroups, and any combined subgroup. A key element of the accountability systems was the identification of a state’s lowest-achieving schools and schools with the lowest graduation rates as priority schools and schools with the most significant achievement or graduation rate gaps as focus schools. Each SEA identified a number of schools equal to at least 5 percent of its Title I participating schools as priority schools and equal to at least 10 percent of its Title I participating schools as focus schools. Each SEA is ensuring that schools and students receive interventions and supports based on this comprehensive system of identification.

SEAs approved to begin implementation of *ESEA* flexibility in the 2012–13 school year (Windows 1 and 2 states) used 2010–11 data, 2011–12 data, or multiple years of data including 2011–12 data to identify schools under their systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support. Similarly, SEAs approved to begin implementation of *ESEA* flexibility in the 2013–14 school year (Windows 3 and 4 states) used 2011–12 data, 2012–13 data, or multiple years of data including 2012–13 data to identify schools under their accountability systems. The Department analyzed aggregate student data reported by SEAs to determine the extent to which each SEA’s identification of schools captured low subgroup achievement, low subgroup graduation rates, large subgroup achievement and graduation rate gaps, and subgroups meeting annual measurable objectives (AMOs), the 95-percent participation rate, and graduation rate targets. The data analysis that follows is a profile developed specifically for each state based on SEA-provided data for Title I participating schools. Each Window 1 and Window 2 state will have a Year 1 analysis (based on 2011–12 data) and a Year 2 analysis (based on 2012–13 data). Each Window 3 and Window 4 state will have only a Year 1 analysis (based on 2012–13 data). Please note that the analyses were impacted by varying levels of school data quality as indicated in the footnote for each exhibit and as noted in Appendix A-1 (Technical notes) and Appendix A-2 (Excluded and modified state profile analyses). Additionally, under *ESEA* flexibility, a state may have identified Title I eligible, but not Title I participating schools as priority schools. Such schools would not be included in the following analysis, which includes only Title I participating schools.

These profiles are provided to states as tools to facilitate continuous improvement of each SEA’s system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support and to support conversations between individual SEAs and the Department. The Department intends to continue to generate data analyses of *ESEA* flexibility going forward. The current profiles are not designed to provide information on the effectiveness of individual state systems or the impact of *ESEA* flexibility on student achievement or other educational outcomes.

### Section I: Overview of Accountability Under *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility*

**Exhibit 1. What percentage of Title I participating elementary, middle, high, and non-standard schools were identified as priority, focus, or other?**



**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating elementary schools, 5 percent (62 schools) were identified as priority, 11 percent (136 schools) were identified as focus, and 84 percent (1,045 schools) were among all other Title I participating schools for 2012–13.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 18: Grades offered; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 1,734 Title I participating schools)

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

**Exhibit 3. At the time of identification, what were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?**

Characteristics	Schools Identified as Priority or Focus for 2012–13	All Other Title I Participating Schools
<b>School Level (Percentage of Schools)</b>		
Elementary	73.3%	71.4%
Middle	15.6%	15.2%
High	7.4%	6.8%
Non-standard <sup>a</sup>	3.7%	6.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>School Type (Percentage of Schools)</b>		
Regular	96.3%	96.4%
Alternative	<1%	2.0%
Special education	3.0%	1.5%
Vocational	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Charter School Status (Percentage of Schools)</b>	11.5%	14.8%
<b>Urbanicity (Percentage of Schools)</b>		
Large or middle-sized city	42.6%	26.8%
Urban fringe and large town	39.6%	42.6%
Small town and rural area	17.8%	30.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Percentage of Students by Race/Ethnicity</b>		
American Indian	<1%	<1%
Asian	5.2%	1.7%
Black	34.5%	23.7%
Hispanic	5.7%	8.2%
White	51.0%	63.1%
<b>Total<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>97.2%</b>	<b>97.5%</b>
<b>Percentage of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch</b>	56.8%	60.6%
<b>Percentage of Students With Disabilities</b>	12.2%	11.8%
<b>Percentage of Limited English Proficient Students<sup>c</sup></b>		
<b>Average Total School Enrollment</b>	473	401

**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, 73 percent of Title I participating schools identified as priority or focus for 2012–13 were elementary schools, compared to 71 percent of all other Title I participating schools.


Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 18: Grades offered, DG 21: School type, DG 27: Charter status, DG 39: Membership, DG 74: Children with disabilities (IDEA) school age, DG 123: LEP students in LEP program, DG 565: Free or reduced-price lunch; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ( $n = 1,734$  Title I participating schools [270 Title I participating schools identified as priority or focus and 1,464 all other Title I participating schools])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

### Section II: Performance of Title I Schools on Proficiency Rates and Graduation Rates

**Exhibit 4. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in reading?**




**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating schools, 19 percent of priority schools (16 schools), 1 percent of focus schools (1 school), and 2 percent of all other Title I participating schools (21 schools) scored in the bottom 5th percentile statewide in terms of the performance of the “all students” group in reading in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 584: Academic achievement in reading; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ( $n = 1,626$  Title I participating schools [83 priority, 184 focus, and 1,359 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

**Exhibit 5. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in mathematics?**




**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating schools, 22 percent of priority schools (18 schools), 1 percent of focus schools (1 school), and 2 percent of all other Title I participating schools (26 schools) scored in the bottom 5th percentile statewide in terms of the performance of the “all students” group in mathematics in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 583: Academic achievement in mathematics; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 1,626 Title I participating schools [83 priority, 184 focus, and 1,359 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

**Exhibit 6. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroup gaps that exceeded statewide subgroup gaps by one or more standard deviations?**



**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating schools, 0 percent of priority schools (0 schools), 4 percent of focus schools (2 schools), and 1 percent of all other Title I participating schools (2 schools) had a performance gap between Black and nonBlack students exceeding the state-level gap by one or more standard deviations in reading in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*FACTS*, Data Group (DG) 583: Academic achievement in mathematics, DG 584: Academic achievement in reading; 2012–13 ED*FACTS*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ( $n = 1,303$  Title I participating schools [41 priority, 160 focus, and 1,102 all other Title I participating])

Note: States had flexibility regarding which subgroups and subgroup gaps they would target in identifying focus schools.

Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

**Exhibit 7. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rates below 60 percent?**




**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating high schools, 16 percent of priority schools (3 schools), 11 percent of focus schools (1 school), and 24 percent of all other Title I participating schools (36 schools) had a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate below 60 percent for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 695: Adjusted four-year cohort graduation rates; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 181 Title I participating high schools [19 priority, 9 focus, and 153 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

**Exhibit 8. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rate subgroup gaps that exceeded statewide subgroup gaps by one or more standard deviations?**



**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating high schools, 0 percent of priority schools (0 schools), 0 percent of focus schools (0 schools), and 3 percent of all other Title I participating schools (1 school) had a graduation rate gap between Black and nonBlack students exceeding the state-level gap by one or more standard deviations in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 695: Adjusted four-year cohort graduation rates; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 120 Title I participating high schools [15 priority, 6 focus, and 99 all other Title I participating])

Note: States had flexibility regarding which subgroups and subgroup gaps they would target in identifying focus schools.

Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

03/31/15

### Section III: Performance of Title I Schools on ESEA Accountability Targets

**Exhibit 9. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the state-defined annual measurable objective (AMO) targets in reading?**




**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating schools, 97 percent of priority schools (83 schools), 100 percent of focus schools (184 schools), and 100 percent of all other Title I participating schools (1,425 schools) met the state-defined reading AMO target for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 552: AMO reading/ELA status; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school ( $n = 1,701$  Title I participating schools [86 priority, 184 focus, and 1,431 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

**Exhibit 10. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in reading?**




**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating schools, 90 percent of priority schools (77 schools), 99 percent of focus schools (182 schools), and 98 percent of all other Title I participating schools (1,376 schools) met the reading 95 percent participation rate requirement for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 553: Reading/ELA participation status; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (n = 1,669 Title I participating schools [86 priority, 184 focus, and 1,399 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

**Exhibit 11. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the state-defined annual measurable objective (AMO) targets in mathematics?**




**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating schools, 92 percent of priority schools (79 schools), 100 percent of focus schools (184 schools), and 98 percent of all other Title I participating schools (1,406 schools) met the state-defined mathematics AMO target for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*FACTS*, Data Group (DG) 554: AMO mathematics status; 2012–13 ED*FACTS*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 1,701 Title I participating schools [86 priority, 184 focus, and 1,431 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

**Exhibit 12. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in mathematics?**



**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating schools, 90 percent of priority schools (77 schools), 99 percent of focus schools (182 schools), and 98 percent of all other Title I participating schools (1,371 schools) met the mathematics 95 percent participation rate requirement for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 555: Mathematics participation status; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 1,669 Title I participating schools [86 priority, 184 focus, and 1,399 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

**Exhibit 13. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had met the state-defined four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate targets?**



**Exhibit reads:** In Michigan, among Title I participating high schools, 65 percent of priority schools (11 schools), 83 percent of focus schools (5 schools), and 91 percent of all other Title I participating schools (82 schools) met the state-defined four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate target for the “all students” group in 2011–12.

Source: 2011–12 ED*Facts*, Data Group (DG) 557: High school graduation rate indicator; 2012–13 ED*Facts*, DG 34: Improvement status - school (*n* = 113 Title I participating high schools [17 priority, 6 focus, and 90 all other Title I participating])

Note: Technical notes for this exhibit appear in the Appendix.

### Appendix

#### Exhibit A-1. Technical notes

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
<p>Exhibit 1. What percentage of Title I participating elementary, middle, high, and non-standard schools were identified as priority, focus, or other?</p>	<p>School levels were defined using <i>Common Core of Data (CCD)</i> codes, which were calculated from the school's corresponding low/high grade span: elementary (low grade: PK–3, high grade: PK–8); middle (low grade: 4–7, high grade: 4–9); high (low grade: 7–12, high grade: 12 only); and non-standard (grade configurations not falling within the elementary, middle, or high categories).                      This exhibit is restricted to elementary, middle, and high schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. <b>This exhibit excludes 99 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
<p>Exhibit 3. At the time of identification, what were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?</p>	<p><sup>a</sup> Non-standard schools are schools with a grade configuration not falling within the elementary (low grade: PK–3, high grade: PK–8); middle (low grade: 4–7, high grade: 4–9); or high school (low grade: 7–12, high grade: 12 only) categories.  <sup>b</sup> Percentage of students by race/ethnicity may not sum to 100 percent due to exclusion of students reported as “two or more races.” <i>Asian</i> includes Pacific Islander, <i>American Indian</i> includes Alaska Native, <i>Black</i> includes African American, and <i>Hispanic</i> includes Latino.  <sup>c</sup> The percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students participating in LEP programs is excluded because the difference between the state aggregate count based on <i>EDFacts</i> and the total LEP count in the Consolidated State Performance Report exceeds 15 percent.                      Student characteristics are weighted in proportion to the number of students enrolled in a school. This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. Due to missing data in <i>EDFacts</i>, analysis samples vary across school characteristics, ranging from 195 to 270 for Title I participating schools identified as priority or focus and from 784 to 1,464 for all other Title I participating schools. <b>This exhibit also excludes 99 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
<p>Exhibit 4. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in reading?</p>	<p>Percentiles are defined by the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in reading/English language arts. The percentage of schools in the bottom 5th percentile may exceed 5 percent in cases where the cut point for the 5th percentile and higher ranked percentiles (e.g., 10th, 15th) is 0 percent proficient.                      Under <i>ESEA</i> flexibility, Michigan uses a combined subgroup (“bottom 30th percentile”). Reading proficiency data, however, were not reported for the combined subgroup.                      This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 207 schools, including 70 Title I participating schools (3 priority, 0 focus, 67 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; <b>38 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 38 all other Title I participating) missing reading proficiency data for every student subgroup; and 99 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
<p>Exhibit 5. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in mathematics?</p>	<p>Percentiles are defined by the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in mathematics. The percentage of schools in the bottom 5th percentile may exceed 5 percent in cases where the cut point for the 5th percentile and higher ranked percentiles (e.g., 10th, 15th) is 0 percent proficient.                      Under <i>ESEA</i> flexibility, Michigan uses a combined subgroup (“bottom 30th percentile”). Mathematics proficiency data, however, were not reported for the combined subgroup.                      This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 207 schools, including 70 Title I participating schools (3 priority, 0 focus, 67 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; <b>38 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 38 all other Title I participating) missing mathematics proficiency data for every student subgroup; and 99 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>

03/31/15

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
<p>Exhibit 6. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroup gaps that exceeded statewide subgroup gaps by one or more standard deviations?</p>	<p><sup>a</sup> SWD = Students with disabilities  <sup>b</sup> LEP = Limited English proficient  <sup>c</sup> Econ Disadv = Economically disadvantaged</p> <p>Proficiency rates for the nonBlack, nonHispanic, noneconomically disadvantaged, nonSWD, and nonLEP subgroups were calculated by subtracting the number of proficient students and the number of students with valid scores for the Black, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, SWD, and LEP subgroups, respectively, from the number of proficient students and the number of students with valid scores for the “all students” group, and then dividing the resulting number of proficient students in the nonBlack, nonHispanic, noneconomically disadvantaged, nonSWD, or nonLEP subgroup by the number of students with valid scores in the subgroup. This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 530 schools, including 392 Title I participating schools (45 priority, 24 focus, 323 all other Title I participating) below the minimum <i>n</i> size for each student subgroup; <b>39 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 39 all other Title I participating) missing reading and mathematics proficiency data for every student subgroup gap included in the exhibit; and 99 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
<p>Exhibit 7. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rates below 60 percent?</p>	<p>The regulatory four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who formed the cohort for that graduating class. The four-year adjusted cohort rate also includes students who graduate in less than four years. Under ESEA flexibility, states identified all Title I schools with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years.</p> <p>No priority high school met the analysis threshold (i.e., 10 students in graduation cohort) for the American Indian subgroup, and no focus high school met the analysis threshold for the American Indian or Asian subgroup. This exhibit includes 12 Title I participating high schools (5 priority, 2 focus, 5 all other Title I participating) where 2008–09 grade 9 enrollment was 10 percent to 99 percent greater or less than the number of students in the 2011–12 graduation cohort.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools serving grade 12 that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit may include non-standard schools (i.e., schools with grade configurations not falling within the elementary, middle, or high categories) serving grade 12. This exhibit excludes 46 high schools, including 13 Title I participating high schools (1 priority, 0 focus, 12 all other Title I participating) below the minimum analysis threshold (10 students in the graduation cohort) for each student subgroup; <b>10 Title I participating high schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 10 all other Title I participating) missing graduation rate data for every student subgroup; and 23 Title I participating high schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>
<p>Exhibit 8. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had graduation rate subgroup gaps that exceeded statewide subgroup gaps by one or more standard deviations?</p>	<p><sup>a</sup> SWD = Students with disabilities  <sup>b</sup> LEP = Limited English proficient  <sup>c</sup> Econ Disadv = Economically disadvantaged</p> <p>This exhibit includes 12 Title I participating high schools (5 priority, 2 focus, 5 all other Title I participating) where 2008–09 grade 9 enrollment was 10 percent to 99 percent greater or less than the number of students in the 2011–12 graduation cohort.</p> <p>This exhibit is restricted to schools serving grade 12 that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit may include non-standard schools (i.e., schools with grade configurations not falling within the elementary, middle, or high categories) serving grade 12. This exhibit excludes 107 high schools, including 74 Title I participating high schools (5 priority, 3 focus, 66 all other Title I participating) below the minimum analysis threshold (10 students in the graduation cohort) for each student subgroup; <b>10 Title I participating high schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 10 all other Title I participating) missing graduation rate data for every student subgroup; and 23 Title I participating high schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b></p>

03/31/15

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
Exhibit 9. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the state-defined annual measurable objective (AMO) targets in reading?	Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent. This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 132 schools, including 24 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 24 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading AMO target; <b>9 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 9 all other Title I participating) missing data for all reading AMO targets; and 99 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b>
Exhibit 10. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in reading?	Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent. This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 164 schools, including 56 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 56 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any reading participation target; <b>9 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 9 all other Title I participating) missing data for all reading participation targets; and 99 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b>
Exhibit 11. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the state-defined annual measurable objective (AMO) targets in mathematics?	Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent. This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 132 schools, including 24 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 24 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any mathematics AMO target; <b>9 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 9 all other Title I participating) missing data for all mathematics AMO targets; and 99 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b>
Exhibit 12. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had met the 95 percent participation rate requirement in mathematics?	Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent. This exhibit is restricted to schools that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit excludes 164 schools, including 56 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 56 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any mathematics participation target; <b>9 Title I participating schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 9 all other Title I participating) missing data for all mathematics participation targets; and 99 Title I participating schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b>
Exhibit 13. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other high schools had met the state-defined four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate targets?	No Title I participating high school was reportedly accountable for the American Indian or Asian subgroup. In addition, no focus high school was reportedly accountable for the Hispanic subgroup. Percentages greater than or equal to 99.5 percent are rounded to 100 percent. This exhibit is restricted to schools serving grade 12 that provided a Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) program or Title I Schoolwide program (SWP) in 2011–12 and reported improvement status for 2012–13. This exhibit may include non-standard schools (i.e., schools with grade configurations not falling within the elementary, middle, or high categories) serving grade 12. This exhibit excludes 114 high schools, including 81 Title I participating high schools (3 priority, 3 focus, 75 all other Title I participating) reportedly not accountable for any graduation rate target; <b>10 Title I participating high schools (0 priority, 0 focus, 10 all other Title I participating) missing data for all graduation rate targets; and 23 Title I participating high schools missing data for accountability status for 2012–13.</b>

### Exhibit A-2. Excluded and modified state profile analyses

Exhibit Number	Technical Notes
Exhibit 2. What percentage of Title I participating schools in each state-defined status were identified as priority, focus, or other?	Excluded because Michigan did not have a state-defined accountability designation system for 2012–13 (Michigan introduced a state-defined accountability designation system for 2013–14).
Exhibit 3. At the time of identification, what were the demographic characteristics of priority and focus schools compared to all other Title I participating schools?	Modified to exclude the percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students participating in LEP programs because the difference between the state aggregate count based on <i>EDFacts</i> and the total LEP count in the Consolidated State Performance Report exceeded 15 percent.
Exhibit 4. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in reading?	Modified to exclude the “bottom 30th percentile” combined subgroup because Michigan did not report on this subgroup until 2012–13.
Exhibit 5. At the time of identification, what percentage of Title I participating priority, focus, and other schools had student subgroups performing in the bottom 5th percentile (for that subgroup) in mathematics?	Modified to exclude the “bottom 30th percentile” combined subgroup because Michigan did not report on this subgroup until 2012–13.