

SEAC SPP/APR Target Setting

Wednesday, February 17, 2021

Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC)
Michigan Department of Education Office of Special Education



Welcome!

- Meeting called to order
- Approve Agenda
- State Continuing Education Clock Hours (SCECHs)
- Roll Call by group (Aaron Darling via Zoom logs)

Norms

1. Identify self.
2. Explain all acronyms/jargon (acronym catcher).
3. Be present throughout the meeting, listening as passionately and respectfully as you wish to be heard.
4. Mute microphone.
5. Chat box is open and being monitored for questions.
6. Turn off camera. If you have a question, unmute, turn on your camera and wait until called upon.
7. When going to a break-out room, turn your camera and microphone on.

Purpose & Outcomes

Function 3: Advise re: State Performance Plan (SPP) Targets

The SPP consists of 17 performance indicators that measure the state's progress. Targets for the results indicators are determined by the MDE Office of Special Education (OSE) with input from the SEAC and other stakeholder groups. In order to provide helpful input into the target setting process, SEAC members must have an understanding of indicators for which targets are to be set.

Today's Focus

- Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment (results indicator)
Participation and performance of students with an IEP
on statewide assessments

Jerry Cullum, Marcia O'Brien, John Jaquith

State Assessment Proficiency Target Setting

Role of State Targets

New Sub-Types of Proficiency Rates

Evidence-based Strategies

Target Setting And Performance Reporting

- State Annual Performance Report (APR) is a Federal requirement involving performance indicators and target setting.
- Assessment participation & proficiency rates are student outcomes that must be tracked.
- Must acknowledge our current level of performance (baseline) and set targets for 6-year periods that are:
 - Measurable
 - Rigorous (better than baseline by the end)
 - Reasonably Achievable

Role of Targets & Performance Indicators

- Tools to help align focus and promote shared understandings of success across levels of the education systems (Local, ISD, State, Federal)
 - Define Success and Progress the Same way
 - Use of Dashboard to Help Monitor Performance and Gauge Progress
- Targets work best when paired with
 - **Systems Improvement Efforts** to Remove Barriers, Increase Capacity
 - **Evidence-based practices** to improve results for students
- Are an important but not sufficient piece of an effective General Supervision System for increasing capacity and improving results for students

Strategies for Evidence-based Target Setting

- Within-State History & Trends
- Compare to Similar States
- Overall District Performance Ranges
- Russian Doll (Mini-Michigan) Districts

Sub-Types of Proficiency Rates

3 New Proficiency Measures Proposed for Federal Reporting

1. Alternate Test Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs
2. General Test Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs
3. Special Education Gap in Proficiency Rates on General Test Compared to Overall Proficiency Rate for All Students

Alternate Test Proficiency Rates

- **Are in part related to the portion of Students with IEPs taking Alternate as oppose to General Assessments**
- Michigan has one of the highest Alternate Assessment rates in the U.S.
- High Alternate Assessment participation reduces graduation rates
- ESSA requires states testing more than 1% of all students with Alternate Assessments to reduce this testing rate

Alternate Test Proficiency Rates continued

- Are in part related to the portion of Students with IEPs taking Alternate as oppose to General Assessments
- Michigan has one of the highest Alternate Assessment rates in the U.S.
- **High Alternate Assessment participation reduces graduation rates**
- ESSA requires states testing more than 1% of all students with Alternate Assessments to reduce this testing rate

Alternate Test Proficiency Rates examined further

- Are in part related to the portion of Students with IEPs taking Alternate as oppose to General Assessments
- Michigan has one of the highest Alternate Assessment rates in the U.S.
- High Alternate Assessment participation reduces graduation rates
- **ESSA requires states testing more than 1% of all students with Alternate Assessments to reduce this testing rate**
 - Currently at 2.1 and 2.0% in Michigan, with goal to bring Alternate Assessment rates down to 1.5% over next 6 years
 - Projected Spring 2021 Alternate Assessment rate of 1.9%

Alternate Test Proficiency Rates: Targets & Projected Future Proficiency Rates

Based on:

- ESSA required reductions in participation rates &
- Estimate of pandemic dip in proficiency if similar to level of dip following the Great Recession

Alternate Test Proficiency Rate Targets & Projected Trends

- **Summary: Evidence-Informed Strategies**
 - Targets Based on Within State History & Trends
 - **4th Grade**
 - ELA: After 6 years, Target of 75.5% but scores could be as low as 60.8%
 - Math: After 6 years, Target of 53.9% but scores as low as 49.0%
 - **8th Grade**
 - ELA: Target of 78%, but scores as low as 69.5%
 - Math: Target of 56.2%, but scores as low as 51.9%
 - **High School**
 - ELA: Target of 72.5%, but scores as low as 61.0%
 - Math: Targets of 58.7% but scores as low as 51.7%

Sub-Types of Proficiency Rates Examined

3 New Proficiency Measures Proposed for Federal Reporting

1. Alternate Test Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs
- 2. General Test Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs**
3. Special Education Gap in Proficiency Rates on General Test Compared to Overall Proficiency Rate for All Students

General Test Proficiency Rate Targets

Starting Points Based On

- **3 Years of District Performance Averaged for**
 - 1. 4th Grade M-Step**
 - 2. High School SAT**
 - 3. Spring 2019 for 8th Grade, using new PSAT Test, &**
- **Estimate of pandemic dip in proficiency if similar to level of dip following the Great Recession**

Ending Point Based On

- **3 Levels of High Achieving District Performance**
 - 1. Above Average Districts**
 - 2. Top Third Districts**
 - 3. Top Quarter to Top 10th Districts**

General Test Proficiency Rate Targets - 2

Summary: Evidence-based Strategies

- Targets based on district performance ranges (e.g., Top Third Districts)
- **4th Grade**
 - ELA: after 6 years, targets range from 16.2% to 21.7%
 - Math: after 6 years, targets range from 15.4% to 20.5%
- **8th Grade**
 - ELA: targets range from 23.1% to 31.0%
 - Math: targets range from 7.4% to 12.5%
- **High School**
 - ELA: targets range from 13.6% to 17.9%
 - Math: targets range from 4.9% to 11.1%

Sub-Types of Proficiency Rates: Gap

3 New Proficiency Measures Proposed for Federal Reporting

1. Alternate Test Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs
2. General Test Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs
- 3. Special Education Gap in Proficiency Rates on General Test Compared to Overall Proficiency Rate for All Students**

Special Education (SE) Gap in General Test Proficiency Targets

**When Compared To Proficiency Rates for All Students
Targets Based on 3 Years of District Performance at 3
Different Levels:**

- 1. Above Average Districts**
- 2. Top Third Districts**
- 3. Top Quarter to Top 10th Districts**

SE General Test Proficiency Gap Targets

- **Summary: Evidence-based Strategies**

- Targets based on district performance ranges (e.g., Top Third Districts)
- **4th Grade**
 - ELA: after 6 years, targets range from 23.5% to 17.1%
 - Math: after 6 years, targets range from 17.0% to 10.3%
- **8th Grade**
 - ELA: targets range from 31.9% to 26.3%
 - Math: targets range from 18.2% to 10.1%
- **High School**
 - ELA: targets range from 39.0% to 31.9%
 - Math: targets range from 20.3% to 12.0%

Improvement Strategies

Breakout Room Discussion (20 min)

- SEAC will be automatically assigned into breakout rooms to discuss the presentation and improvement strategies (20 minutes)

Debrief (10 min)

- The group as a whole will reconvene and discuss/identify trends, provide feedback & ask questions

OSE Contact Information

- Please complete the SurveyMonkey feedback evaluation
- Send additional questions to:
 - Jerry Cullum (cullumj@michigan.gov)
 - Julie Trevino (trevinoJ1@michigan.gov)

Wrapping it Up...

- March Forecast –
- Wednesday, Mar. 3 - Regular Business Meeting, 9:00 - 12:00
- Thursday, Mar. 18 - Target Setting Meeting, 9:00 - 10:30
- [Parking Lot](#)
- Delegates - contact alternate if you cannot be present
- Complete email survey (check your inbox) - it matters!
- SCECHs link in chat box