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The national context: The kids are not alright

• 1 in 6 children in the US attend schools in districts performing over a grade level below the national average
• Substantial inequity in educational opportunity and outcomes
  - Students in the wealthiest districts perform ~ 4 grade levels above students in the poorest districts
  - 7% of the 1,000 poorest districts have test scores ≥ the national average; only 2% of the 1,000 richest districts have test scores ≤ the national average
  - Black and latino/a students perform 1.5 grade levels below their white peers (conditional on poverty)
  - The lowest performing districts aren’t just large and urban. They are also small and rural.
The problem is ours to fix: A return to state autonomy in education policy-setting

- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (1965)
  - Provides federal $$ (Title I) to districts with low-income families
  - Intended to equalize treatment of students regardless of poverty, geography; improve outcomes

- No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (2001)
  - Expanded role of standardized testing to measure student achievement; dictated growth and interventions for lowest-performing schools/districts

  - Returns substantial federal power over education back to the states
  - Still requires standards and assessments
  - Requires identification and supports for lowest-performing 5% of schools, schools with chronic underperformance
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Michigan spends $12,765 per-pupil (adjusted), at approximately the national average.
Michigan performs significantly below the national average on 4th grade math NAEP scores.
The Michigan K-12 Education Context

• NAEP progress results show that MI has the lowest proficiency growth since 2003 of any state; among the worst 10 states in proficiency, adjusted proficiency, adjusted scale scores

• MI’s lowest-performing schools are concentrated in urban areas, serve a largely minority and poor population

• To improve outcomes, Michigan has set a goal to be a “Top 10 in 10” state
In response to a request for suggestions on how to make Michigan a Top 10 state for education within the next 10 years, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and State Board of Education (SBE) received input from numerous stakeholders groups, education partners and individual citizens. This valuable information was provided via formal presentations to the SBE, written submissions, one-on-one and group meetings with the State Superintendent, and through more than 750 responses collected through a dedicated website.

**GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

- To be successful at becoming a Top 10 performing state in 10 years, Michigan must develop a *coherent* and *cohesive* strategy for the children, and implement that plan with continuity for multiple years. Education reform takes time; we must implement, use evidence and data to correct course, and continue with progress on key goals.
  - A “Can-Do Culture” that focuses on student-directed learning and student outcomes, and the work on instruction must take priority.

- Data and accountability will be used to help drive resources and focus improvement activities for students and educators. Attention will be on transparency in support of key goals for the entire system to make Michigan a Top 10 state for education.
  - Poverty matters, not to be used as an excuse, but as a purpose to design a Michigan system of education that motivates and excites all children about learning, keeps them in school, and provides them with hope and knowledge for a successful future.
Michigan Top 10 in 10

To realize Michigan becoming a Top 10 education state within the next 10 years, the existing structure and system of education must be challenged and reshaped. Michigan must establish an educational system that grants indelible rights for all stakeholders to succeed – a system focused more on what is best for children and their learning.

This is a framework of the strategic goals necessary to move Michigan forward.

**STRATEGIC GOALS**

1. Provide every child access to an aligned, high-quality P-20 system from early childhood to post-secondary attainment – through a multi-stakeholder collaboration with business and industry, labor, and higher education – to maximize lifetime learning and success.

2. Implement, with strong district and building leadership, high-quality instruction in every classroom through a highly coherent, child-centered instructional model where students meet their self-determined academic and personal goals to their highest potential.

3. Develop, support, and sustain a high-quality, prepared, and collaborative education workforce.

4. Reduce the impact of high-risk factors, including poverty, and provide equitable resources to meet the needs of all students to ensure that they have access to quality educational opportunities.

5. Ensure that parents/guardians are engaged and supported partners in their child’s education.

6. Create a strong alignment and partnership with job providers, community colleges, and higher education to assure a prepared and quality future workforce; and informed and responsible citizens.

7. Further develop an innovative and cohesive state education agency that supports an aligned, coherent education system at all levels (state, ISD, district and school).
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Early Literacy: Read by Grade Three Law (PA 306)

**Improved Literacy Instruction**
- Provision of highly-qualified literacy coaches
- Teacher professional development in literacy
- Adoption & dissemination of 5 “evidence-based” “major reading components”

**Monitoring, Remediation & Retention**
- Selection and use of valid, reliable & aligned K-3 diagnostic assessments
- Frequent monitoring of literacy proficiency in K-3
- Early warning & identification

**Early intervention & support**
- IRIP
- Remediation
- Inc. time on literacy instruction
- 1:1/small group instruction
- Summer support
- Parental involvement

**State determination and identification of 3rd graders failing to meet proficiency cut point**

**Pass 3rd graders who meet cut point**

**Do not retain 3rd graders with waivers**

**Retain 3rd graders who don’t meet cut point**

**Increased support and remediation**
- IRIP
- Assigning retained students with best teachers
- Inc. time on literacy instruction
- 1:1/small group instruction
- Summer support
- Parental involvement
- 1-year maximum retention

**Improved ELA literacy, grade-level performance & longer term outcomes**

**Local Context:**
Local district autonomy; student and staff characteristics; ISD and district resources and capacity; local market providers

**Michigan Context:**
Literacy Focus: Development of MI P-20 literacy system; MI Action Plan for Literacy Excellence
State government entities (MDE; state legislature; governor’s office); State-wide organizations (e.g., MAISA)
Read by Grade Three Law Implementation Timeline

- National Governors Association Report (10/1/2013)
- Third Grade Reading Workgroup Report to Governor Rick Snyder (6/3/2015)
- PA 306 (2016) Read by Grade Three Law (10/6/2016)
- Diagnostic assessment and early remediation provisions kick in (9/1/2017)
- CEPI to send certified letters to parents of 3rd graders designated for retention (6/1/2020)

- Instructional Coach Support from ISDs (10/1/2016 – and forward)
- Districts assess K-3 reading 3 times per year and provide IRIPs to identified students (9/1/2017 – and forward)
- Designation, appeals, and retention provisions (6/1/2020 – and forward)
- MiRead Pilot (9 Districts) (9/1/2018 - 1/31/2019)
- MiRead Beta Pilot (50 Additional Districts) (2/1/2019 - 6/1/2019)
- MiRead Statewide Availability (6/1/2019 – and forward)
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Not all challenges facing students can be addressed through K-12 public schools

• 1 in 5 3rd grade students in MI, and > ½ of students in a subset of schools, have been subject to one or more formal investigations for child maltreatment.

• > 36,000 homeless students in MI (nation’s 6th highest).
  - More likely to be black or Latino/a
  - Reside in urban and rural locations
  - Score 0.4 SD lower than state average in math and reading
Michigan’s Partnership Model of school and district turnaround
Partnership Model of School & District Turnaround

State Context

Local Context

MDE Identification of Low-Performing Schools/Districts

First Steps
- Planning
  - Needs assessment
  - Prioritization
  - Set goals/targets
  - Identification of partners & early collaboration

Partnerships
- Improve district and school capacity via technical assistance and expertise

Intermediate Outcomes
- Increased School Functionality
  - Partnership schools
  - Spillover into non-partnership schools
- Increased district functionality

Long-term Outcomes
- Student Achievement
  - Proficiency rates
  - Student growth
- Non-Academic Outcomes
  - Social-emotional skills and competencies
  - Improved health
  - Increased civic behavior

Distal Outcomes
- Improved Community Functioning
- Improved Economic Outcomes
  - Community stability
  - Population
  - Educated labor force

Accountability
- First-level accountability
  - Closure
  - Partnership
  - Next-level accountability
    - Assign CEO
    - Move to ISD
    - Reconfigure administration/teaching staff

Augment core district functions
- Bring greater or improved services to students
- Improved relationships and engagement between the schools/district and community
## Students in Partnership Schools and Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not in a Partnership District</th>
<th>In a Partnership District</th>
<th>In a Partnership District, Not in a Partnership School</th>
<th>In a Partnership School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14.16%</td>
<td>62.32%</td>
<td>43.73%</td>
<td>82.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>13.84%</td>
<td>11.68%</td>
<td>7.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Islander</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>70.90%</td>
<td>17.68%</td>
<td>34.69%</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one race</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.01%</td>
<td>47.92%</td>
<td>48.01%</td>
<td>47.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.99%</td>
<td>52.07%</td>
<td>51.96%</td>
<td>52.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economically Disadvantaged</strong></td>
<td>47.59%</td>
<td>80.04%</td>
<td>71.88%</td>
<td>86.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education</strong></td>
<td>15.91%</td>
<td>18.84%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Learner</strong></td>
<td>6.24%</td>
<td>10.75%</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,552,967</td>
<td>190,376</td>
<td>116,178</td>
<td>74,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACT Composite trends (2007-14) for Students in Partnership Districts

ACT Composite Trends, All Cohorts

Black ACT Composite Trends, All Cohorts

- Schools in non-Partnership Districts
- Non-Partnership Schools in Partnership Districts
- Partnership Schools
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School Choice in Michigan

• Approximately ¼ of MI students attend schools to which they are not zoned

• 10% of MI’s public school students attend charter schools (vs. 6% nationally)

• 13% of MI students exercised school choice via MI inter-district school choice (2016-17)
Students who do not attend their resident school are more likely to be Black, Hispanic & low-income.
Students are exercising school choice across the state

% Students attending charter schools by resident district

% Students attending a TPS outside their resident district
Students who exercise school choice are lower-performing, both before and after switching.
### Deep dive Detroit:
1 in 5 Detroit students leave the city for school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inside Detroit</td>
<td>7,512</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outside Detroit</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9,235</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inside Detroit</td>
<td>7,021</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Outside Detroit</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8,446</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inside Detroit</td>
<td>7,664</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Outside Detroit</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9,820</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3, 6 and 9 Combined</strong></td>
<td>Inside Detroit</td>
<td>22,197</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3, 6 and 9 Combined</strong></td>
<td>Outside Detroit</td>
<td>5,304</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27,501</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EPIC calculations based on data provided by the Michigan Department of Education, the Center for Educational Performance and Information, and the U.S. Census Bureau.
Deep dive Detroit: Students leaving Detroit attend higher quality schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Accountability Rating</th>
<th>Chronic Absenteeism Rate</th>
<th>Student Teacher Ratio</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest School</td>
<td>Nearest DPSCD School</td>
<td>Nearest School DPSCD School</td>
<td>Nearest School DPSCD School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>-6.75</td>
<td>-16.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>-9.16</td>
<td>-20.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>-2.79</td>
<td>-13.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Differences in Absenteeism and Graduation Rates are percentage point differences. Differences in Accountability Rating are reported in accountability points. Points range from 0 to 100. Source: EPIC calculations based on data provided by the Michigan Department of Education, the Center for Educational Performance and Information, and the U.S. Census Bureau. Calculations include all schools attended by students in Detroit, both inside and outside the city limits.
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First Things First:
Is There a Teacher Shortage?
First Things First: Is There a Teacher Shortage? News Coverage Says YES!

Figure 1.

Source: Authors’ calculations based on data from NewsBank.
Challenges to Understanding Teacher Shortages

 PREPARE
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MI exhibits similar trends:
Statewide Teacher Prep Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Linear (STATEWIDE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>18402</td>
<td>18483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>14372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>11287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>11099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MDE, 2017
MI exhibits similar trends:
Statewide Teacher Prep Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>4863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>4720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>4450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>3951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>3650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MI exhibits similar patterns:
Initial certificates issued

59% increase 1997-2004 (average rate of 7%/year)
29% decrease 2006-2009
Biggest single-year decrease 2013-2014

MDE, 2017
But is there really a shortage of teachers overall in MI? MI pupil count is dropping, as well.
But is there really a shortage of teachers overall in MI? Overall # of teachers remains steady.
But is there really a shortage of teachers overall in MI? We are still training more than we are hiring.
We may be missing teachers where we need them the most: secondary teachers

### New Endorsements by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Elementary Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Secondary Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MDE, 2017
We may be missing teachers where we need them the most: STEM, Special Ed

### New Endorsements by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Endorsements on Initial Certificates</th>
<th>Bilingual and ESL</th>
<th>CTE</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>8,007</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>1,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>5,988</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>1,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>5,323</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>4,461</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-54%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MDE, 2017
Why are there concentrated shortages?

Geography

- Teacher labor markets are local
  - Teachers teach close to home
  - Teachers teach close to where they went to college
MI’s distribution of TEPs and potential supply are unevenly distributed across the state.

Figure 1. 2016 Michigan college attainment rates by zip code with TEPs

Sources: College attainment rates come from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2016 American Community Survey and TEP locations are from the U.S. Department of Education’s 2016 Title II reporting system.
In sum

• There is little to indicate that there is the or even a great teacher shortage
  - In fact the market appears quite strong by some measures

• There are however longstanding problems filling needs for some children, and some teacher subjects

• In other words: the problem is not necessarily that we don’t have enough teachers, it’s that the teachers we do have are not distributed equally across schools, locations or subjects
MI has implemented several policies to address teacher quality and supply (examples)

- Educator evaluation law (2015): established requirements for rigorous evaluations of teachers based on observations and student achievement growth
- Teacher permits options redesign: increases schools’ flexibility in employing teachers where there are shortages of fully certified teachers
- Eliminated Basic Skills Exam as prerequisite for entering teacher preparation programs
- Fund allocation for literacy coaches (Read by Grade Three)
- Title 2a set aside funds prioritize teacher mentoring and induction
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• How can we know if these policies are working?
Education Policy Innovation Collaborative (EPIC)

EPIC partners with state and school district leaders to produce rigorous and objective multi-method research with consequence that strengthens evidence-based decision-making for practice and policy.
Research with consequence

Research that identifies underlying problems and inequities, isolates mechanisms that drive them, and evaluates potential solutions

Informing Policy and Practice:

Focus on:
• State- and district-level policymakers
• Structures that are central to school and district operations
• Historically disadvantaged populations

Intended to:
• Inform the field about important topics
• Help policymakers
• Improve student outcomes, esp. in highest-need areas

Collaborative:
• Multi-disciplinary
• Multi-method
• Multi-perspective
• Exploratory
• Evaluative
• Iterative
How can we generate research that is useful and appropriate for policymakers?

• Researcher-Policymaker Partnerships (RPPs)
  – Joint determination of research agendas
  – Exploratory research work
  – When necessary, quick response reviews and memos
  – Clear lines of communication
  – Trust, respect and mutual understanding of shared and separate priorities and constraints

• Research with consequence
Education Policy Innovation Collaborative

Innovations in policy & practice

Partnerships
- MDE
- Univ of MI
- LEAs
- Schools
- Funders

Impact
- Admin data
- Descriptive
- Quasi-exp
- LT outcomes

Implementation
- Case studies
- Interviews
- Surveys

Measurement
- Assessment
- Climate
- SEL
- Methods

Innovations in policy research

Improve educational outcomes for students in highest-need areas
Education Policy Innovation Collaborative (EPIC)

• Produce **rigorous** and **impactful** education research
  – Did it work?
  – What, how, who & why?
• Bring attention to **heterogeneous** inputs and outputs
  – Urban, suburban, rural
  – Poverty, race, ethnicity, ELL, special needs
  – Geography, centrality
• **Translate** research findings for policy and practitioner audiences
• Help develop **innovative solutions** to policy problems
• Model **multi-method, multi-disciplinary, multi-perspective** collaborations
• **Train** next-generation education researchers
EPIC combines the generation of rigorous evidence with deep state and local partnerships

- EPIC highlights heterogeneous effects for marginalized populations
  - Policy change often disproportionately affects marginalized populations (e.g. minority or low income students, urban or remote rural)
  - Research can and should highlight disparate impacts in order to inform policy implementation and mitigate negative policy effects

- Research and assistance can support local district and community capacity to respond to/implement state and federal policy change
Katharine O. Strunk, Ph.D.
Clifford Erickson Professor of Education Policy
EPIC co-Director
kstrunk@msu.edu
(517) 884-6289