

**REPORT FROM THE EDUCATION ROUND TABLE COMMITTEE TO
GOVERNOR-ELECT RICK SNYDER AND HIS ADMINISTRATION**

Submitted by

The Co-Chairs of the Education Round Table Committee:

Dr. Susan Martin, President of Eastern Michigan University and

David Campbell, Superintendent of the Olivet Community Schools

OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS

This report is the result of an Education Round Table meeting held at Eastern Michigan University on October 8, 2010. Governor-Elect Snyder gathered several educators from Michigan who represented various aspects of education from early childhood through the university level. Public, private, and charter educational institutions were represented. After listening to each person present key ideas for reform, he summarized what he had heard and broke it into five areas to be studied further. The five areas are:

- P-20 Metrics
- Instructional Reform
- Cost/Revenue Reform
- Early Childhood
- College-Ready/Career-Ready

Subcommittees were formed around each of these five areas. Additional people were added from the original twenty in some cases to round out the subcommittees. Each subcommittee was asked to review the current situation and provide responses to three questions in a white paper: (1) what opportunities exist; (2) what are the goals, defined metrics and timetables; and (3) what is the near-term action plan?

OVERVIEW OF THE CONTENTS OF THIS REPORT

This report contains the following:

1. A brief Introduction that builds the case for the need for educational reform

2. An overview that lists the key recommendations from each report and then shows how the subcommittee's recommendations link to Governor-Elect Snyder's 10 Point Plan Point #8: Reform Michigan's Educational System, Pages 4-10
3. P-20 Metrics Paper, pages 11-20
4. Instructional Reform Paper, pages 21-34
5. Cost/Revenue Reform Paper, pages 35-44
Bonus Ten ideas, pages 42-44
6. Early Childhood Paper, pages 45-52
7. College-Ready/Career-Ready Paper, pages 53-61

Each report was put into a standard format, however, the content of each report was not changed or reviewed by the entire roundtable group as a whole. Therefore, it is fair to say it does not reflect a collective view. In fact, individual recommendations may reflect a particular individuals' point of view. This summary is simply a compilation of the brainstorming that was done in the five subcommittees to come up with ideas to reinvent, reform, and improve Michigan's education.

A CASE FOR REFORM OF MICHIGAN'S EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

The loss of nearly a million well-compensated manufacturing jobs in Michigan brought on by globalization has deeply, negatively, and permanently affected our state's economy. Much has been written about the importance of investing in education, as education is the vehicle that will lead Michigan into a more diverse and vibrant economy. Michigan's per capita income has dropped from 12th to 40th in the last 40 years. Michigan ranks 34th in the percentage of adults having earned college degrees. Only 36% of 25 to 34 year olds in Michigan had an associates degree or higher in 2008 ranking us 34th of the 50 states. Michigan's unemployment rate is 49th in the nation. Clearly, we have a large problem that will need bold and creative leadership to resolve for the sake of our children and our state. Michigan's educational system needs to be reformed and reinvented to be more effective and more efficient. If we do not significantly reform the system, our children will pay twice: once by having a poorer quality education due to massive budget cuts and then again by having to pay very high tax rates as adults for an unsustainably expensive system, **if they stay in Michigan**. The cost of services for those who drop out of K-12 also places a burden upon current and future taxpayers.

Many studies and reports have been written on educational reform.

- The Michigan State Board of Education approved their Recommendations to Better Support Michigan's Education System-Reforms, Restructuring, and Revenues on May 11, 2010. It provides many thoughtful and strategies that would substantially make our system more effective and efficient.

- Michigan’s Defining Moment: Report of the Emergency Financial Advisory Panel (February 2, 2007) was written by a distinguished group of seasoned Michigan leaders from both political parties. It provides a rich base upon which our leaders in Lansing can make decisions for our state and is available at publicsectorconsultants.com.
- Tough Choices or Tough Times: The Report of the new Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce (December 14, 2006) was written by a highly respected group of national level leaders. It provides ideas for substantial reform to public education in order for us to adequately prepare our students for the rapidly changing economy. It is available at skillscommission.org.
- The College Board recent report on The College Completion Agenda 2010 also has a State Policy Guide that could be useful in evaluating choices for change in Michigan.
- The Lumina National Productivity Conference April, 2010 on “Navigating the New Normal” proposes a productivity index = educational resources used/degrees produced. The Lumina Foundation has set a goal for dramatic improvement to have 60% of working-age Americans earn degrees or credentials by 2,025. In Michigan, that would require an additional 1,322,257 postsecondary degrees or certificates by 2,025 or 9,722 additional per year a 6.3% increase.

We highly recommend these and other reports that are issued by bi-partisan and philosophically balanced groups of people in order to gain a broader perspective on what needs to happen in education in the years and decades to come. The following white papers are more specific and detailed than the above cited reports, so we think they will be very helpful to the administration.

The Snyder administration is inheriting a massive budget deficit. Showing the public the value they get for their tax money will be essential to move our state forward. Increased levels of transparency will be needed so that more accurate research and benchmarking can occur. Many of the ideas presented in these papers are complex and controversial. The systems and structures that sustain our current educational system took many decades to evolve. They have proven to be very resistant to change. Careful study and analysis will be essential so the changes that are made actually solve the intended problem, rather than simply producing unintended consequences. It is important that we do this well and swiftly. The public is clearly demanding substantial reform. Our students need a higher level of education than ever before and it needs to be done with fewer resources. It is our generation that is in power. Our generation will be defined by how well we set our children up for success. Let’s not let them down.

Reinventing Michigan: Rick's Top Ten

<http://www.rickformichigan.com/vision-plan/10-point-plan>

Point #8: Reform Michigan's Educational System

"Rick believes that a child's progress from pre-kindergarten through college and advanced degrees is the cycle on which the state's efforts should be focused and coordinated. Rick believes that schools, teachers and parents must renew their commitment to ensuring that each child is given the best possible preparation and education for life which is critical for future generations to be competitive and innovative."

Educational Roundtable Report Recommendations

Committee #1: P-20 Metrics (P-20)

P-20 Recommendation #1: Use a variety of data to define goals and measure progress at the prenatal through age 8 level, including: participation in early learning/care programs by at-risk/vulnerable children; kindergarten developmental preparedness; early childhood remediation; and chronic absenteeism.

P-20 Recommendation #2: Use a variety of data to define goals and measure progress from grades 4-12, including: high school graduation rates; national standardized testing attainment and achievement; participation in and completion of advanced coursework; and chronic absenteeism.

P-20 Recommendation #3: Use a variety of data to define goals and measure progress at the community college and university levels, including: degrees/certificates awarded; progressive transfer rates from two-year to four-year institutions; and credit accumulation rates.

P-20 Recommendation #4: Michigan should adopt a variety of nationwide initiatives, including the Complete to Compete Initiative, National Data Quality Campaign, and Early Childhood Data Collaborative.

Committee #2: Instructional Reform (IR)

IR Recommendation #1: Rely on research and establish channels to permit easy access to research as it evolves.

IR Recommendation #2: Create calendar "space" for schools/districts to acquire and implement research; spread/extend the school year over more of the calendar year.

IR Recommendation #3: Create regulatory/contractual "space" for schools/districts to implement pilot programs and innovative "incubator" schools. Such "space" can prevent public schools from becoming "schools of last resort."

IR Recommendation #4: Mastery learning must trump mandated seat time.

IR Recommendation #5: Use clear, rigorous and universal content standards that do not change with political winds, coupled with high expectations for all as they progress through sequential standards.

IR Recommendation #6: Establish fair and effective teacher evaluations that include value-added growth measures of student achievement. The evaluation process should also include rigorous opportunities for the development of human capital, frequent feedback loops, and ways to permit the dismissal of ineffective teachers without the prohibitive time/costs of protracted tenure hearings.

IR Recommendation #7: Encourage performance-based compensation models.

IR Recommendation #8: Eliminate overly restrictive rules regarding the use of federal dollars, especially Title 1 and Title 2.

IR Recommendation #9: Provide more readiness programs for children ages 0-5.

IR Recommendation #10: Explore the pros and cons of a statewide salary scale.

IR Recommendation #11: Explore the pros and cons of a statewide evaluation model(s) for administrators and teachers.

IR Recommendation #12: Emphasize early instruction in languages.

IR Recommendation #13: Investigate the possibility of duplicating the Kalamazoo Promise to a college education on a statewide level.

Committee #3: Cost/Revenue Reform (CRR)

CRR Recommendation #1: State employees and school employees should be united to form a single health insurance system managed by the Office of the State Employer.

CRR Recommendation #2: The age of retirement should be gradually increased to 62.

CRR Recommendation #3: Upon taking office, the Governor should issue an executive order creating the Michigan Agency of Early Childhood housed within MDE.

CRR Recommendation #4: Local school districts should be required to issue RFPs for a variety of non-instructional services such as payroll, transportation, food service, and maintenance.

CRR Recommendation #5: Instead of a mandate to provide an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for special education students age 22-26 with a full range of services delivered by certified teachers and licensed auxiliary staff, the focus for such students should shift to the development of a transition plan to guide the student's program.

CRR Recommendation #6: A school district whose fund balance is in deficit by more than 3% of expenditures should be required to implement a variety of steps, including freezing pay, freezing step increases, and eliminating contractual bumping rights.

CRR Recommendation #7: A school district with an “academic deficit” should be required to implement a variety of steps.

Committee #4: Early Childhood(EC)

EC Recommendation #1: By Executive Order, begin the consolidation and streamlining of Michigan’s 84 early childhood programs and resources into a single office of early childhood by merging the Office of Child Development and Care (Department of Human Services) with the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services (Department of Education) under a single vision, strategic direction and decision making authority.

EC Recommendation #2: Create the Early Childhood Success Fund, an innovative funding model to exhibit state leadership, leverage investors (stakeholders), coordinate public-private partnerships, create “new” resources and increase impact in early childhood strategies.

Committee #5: College and Career Readiness (CCR)

CCR Recommendation #1: Michigan should adopt common statewide placement benchmarks (i.e., ACT established collegiate-level performance measures) as agreed-upon standards for college and career readiness.

CCR Recommendation #2: Michigan should fully utilize the established Educational Development Plan (EDP) requirement that helps to ensure younger students are on target to be ready for college and career.

CCR Recommendation #3: Michigan should maintain a rigorous merit-based P-12 curriculum with identified competency-based assessments recognizing time is a variable in the learning process and the need for differentiated instruction to help students reach college and career readiness expectations.

CCR Recommendation #4: Michigan should create a unified, one-stop center and/or portal to serve Michiganders at any point in their education and career continuum.

CCR Recommendation #5: Michigan should fully implement the P-20 system that is currently under development across all private and public education sectors to help students, parents, educators, administrators and policymakers measure progress by monitoring performance from early years through college and into the workforce.

CCR Recommendation #6: Michigan transfer agreements (i.e., MACRAO) must be expanded to establish a common transfer guarantee that provides for transferability between all public higher education institutions. An invitation should be extended to private higher education in the state to participate.

The following cross-maps the above recommendations from the five Educational Roundtable Committee reports into areas outlined in Rick's 10 Point Plan Point #8: Reform Michigan's Educational System (excerpts from the 10 point plan appear in italics below)

Introduction

Michigan's Educational System Needs To Prepare Our Children To Compete Globally In A Knowledge-Based Economy

IR Recommendation #5: Use clear, rigorous and universal content standards that do not change with political winds, coupled with high expectations for all as they progress through sequential standards.

IR Recommendation #12: Emphasize early instruction in languages.

Poor Management And Antiquated Bureaucratic Systems Stand In the Way of Quality Education

Background

Michigan's Educational System Is A Race To The Bottom

Remedial Class Enrollment is At An Unprecedented Level Because High School Graduates Are Not Prepared to Succeed In College Classes

CCR Recommendation #1: Michigan should adopt common statewide placement benchmarks (i.e., ACT established collegiate-level performance measures) as agreed-upon standards for college and career readiness.

CCR Recommendation #2: Michigan should fully utilize the established Educational Development Plan (EDP) requirement that helps to ensure younger students are on target to be ready for college and career.

CCR Recommendation #3: Michigan should maintain a rigorous merit-based P-12 curriculum with identified competency-based assessments recognizing time is a variable in the learning process and the need for differentiated instruction to help students reach college and career readiness expectations.

CCR Recommendation #4: Michigan should create a unified, one-stop center and/or portal to serve Michiganders at any point in their education and career continuum.

Poor Management Is Leaving Michigan's Kids Behind

IR Recommendation #6: Establish fair and effective teacher evaluations that include value-added growth measures of student achievement. The evaluation process should also include rigorous opportunities for the development of human capital, frequent feedback loops, and ways to permit the dismissal of ineffective teachers without the prohibitive time/costs of protracted tenure hearings.

IR Recommendation #7: Encourage performance-based compensation models.

IR Recommendation #8: Eliminate overly restrictive rules regarding the use of federal dollars, especially Title 1 and Title 2.

IR Recommendation #10: Explore the pros and cons of a statewide salary scale.

IR Recommendation #11: Explore the pros and cons of a statewide evaluation model(s) for administrators and teachers.

Michigan Has Become Poorer While Career Politicians Have Failed to Assemble A Vision

Remedy

Create An Era Of Innovation To Transition Michigan To A Knowledge-Based Economy

Develop A “P-20” Education Model To Prepare Michigan’s Children To Be Globally Competitive In The New Economy

(Metrics organized by level of education: pre-K, K-12, Higher Education)

P-20 Recommendation #1: Use a variety of data to define goals and measure progress at the prenatal through age 8 level, including: participation in early learning/care programs by at-risk/vulnerable children; kindergarten developmental preparedness; early childhood remediation; and chronic absenteeism.

P-20 Recommendation #2: Use a variety of data to define goals and measure progress from grades 4-12, including: high school graduation rates; national standardized testing attainment and achievement; participation in and completion of advanced coursework; and chronic absenteeism.

P-20 Recommendation #3: Use a variety of data to define goals and measure progress at the community college and university levels, including: degrees/certificates awarded; progressive transfer rates from two-year to four-year institutions; and credit accumulation rates.

P-20 Recommendation #4: Michigan should adopt a variety of nationwide initiatives, including the Complete to Compete Initiative, National Data Quality Campaign, and Early Childhood Data Collaborative.

IR Recommendation #9: Provide more readiness programs for children ages 0-5.

EC Recommendation #1: By Executive Order, begin the consolidation and streamlining of Michigan’s 84 early childhood programs and resources into a single office of early childhood by merging the Office of Child Development and Care (Department of Human Services) with the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services (Department of Education) under a single vision, strategic direction and decision making authority.

CRR Recommendation #3: Upon taking office, the Governor should issue an executive order creating the Michigan Agency of Early Childhood housed within MDE.

CCR Recommendation #5: Michigan should fully implement the P-20 system that is currently under development across all private and public education sectors to help students, parents, educators, administrators and policymakers measure progress by monitoring performance from early years through college and into the workforce.

Collect The Performance Data Necessary to Reform the Education System Using Benchmarks And Best Practices, And Give Parents The Tools To Find The Right Schools For Their Children

IR Recommendation #1: Rely on research and establish channels to permit easy access to research as it evolves.

IR Recommendation #2: Create calendar “space” for schools/districts to acquire and implement research; spread/extend the school year over more of the calendar year.

IR Recommendation #3: Create regulatory/contractual “space” for schools/districts to implement pilot programs and innovative “incubator” schools. Such “space” can prevent public schools from becoming “schools of last resort.”

IR Recommendation #4: Mastery learning must trump mandated seat time.

Focus School Funding On Results By Increasing Collaboration, Reducing Unnecessary Overhead, And Showing Taxpayers Value For Money

CRR Recommendation #1: State employees and school employees should be united to form a single health insurance system managed by the Office of the State Employer.

CRR Recommendation #2: The age of retirement should be gradually increased to 62.

CRR Recommendation #4: Local school districts should be required to issue RFPs for a variety of non-instructional services such as payroll, transportation, food service, and maintenance.

CRR Recommendation #5: Instead of a mandate to provide an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for special education students age 22-26 with a full range of services delivered by certified teachers and licensed auxiliary staff, the focus for such students should shift to the development of a transition plan to guide the student’s program.

CRR Recommendation #6: A school district whose fund balance is in deficit by more than 3% of expenditures should be required to implement a variety of steps, including freezing pay, freezing step increases, and eliminating contractual bumping rights.

CRR Recommendation #7: A school district with an “academic deficit” should be required to implement a variety of steps.

CCR Recommendation #6: Michigan transfer agreements (i.e., MACRAO) must be expanded to establish a common transfer guarantee that provides for transferability between all public higher education institutions. An invitation should be extended to private higher education in the state to participate.

Change The Way Michigan Approaches Education; Reward Good Performance, Close Failing Systems, And Encourage Public-Private Partnerships

IR Recommendation #13: Investigate the possibility of duplicating the Kalamazoo Promise to a college education on a statewide level.

EC Recommendation #2: Create the Early Childhood Success Fund, an innovative funding model to exhibit state leadership, leverage investors (stakeholders), coordinate public-private partnerships, create “new” resources and increase impact in early childhood strategies.

EDUCATION ROUNDTABLE
Committee #1: P-20 Metrics

Mission

Define the data and models that should be used to measure Michigan's educational goals and progress.

Committee Members

Michael Boulus

Executive Director, President's Council of State Universities

Mike Flanagan

Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Michigan

Jessica Gillard

Director of Early Learning & Innovation, Early Childhood Investment Corporation (ECIC)

Gary Hawks

Retired Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Michigan

Brandy Johnson

Director, Michigan College Access Network

Justin King

Former Executive Director, Michigan Association of School Boards

Daniel J. Phelan

President, Jackson Community College

Kim Schatzel, Committee Chair

Dean, College of Business, University of Michigan-Dearborn

Tom Watkins

Retired Superintendent of Public Instruction

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recommendation #1: Use a variety of data to define goals and measure progress at the prenatal through age 8 level, including: participation in early learning/care programs by at-risk/vulnerable children; kindergarten developmental preparedness; early childhood remediation; and chronic absenteeism.

Recommendation #2: Use a variety of data to define goals and measure progress from grades 4-12, including: high school graduation rates; national standardized testing attainment and achievement; participation in and completion of advanced coursework; and chronic absenteeism.

Recommendation #3: Use a variety of data to define goals and measure progress at the community college and university levels, including: degrees/certificates awarded; progressive transfer rates from two-year to four-year institutions; and credit accumulation rates.

Recommendation #4: Michigan should adopt a variety of nationwide initiatives, including the Complete to Compete Initiative, National Data Quality Campaign, and Early Childhood Data Collaborative.

B. INTRODUCTION

According to the 2007 U.S. Census Report on Educational Attainment, Michigan ranks 30th of the 50 states for 25-35 year olds with a college degree as well as for a state population with a bachelor's degree or better¹. Additionally, Michigan ranks 20th in the nation for a state population with a high school degree¹. Individuals who do not attain the education levels (e.g., high school and college) required for a knowledge-based economy can expect a troublesome future in the workplace as well as significantly reduced income levels.

In the current recession, the unemployment rate for those that do not complete high school is nearly five times that of college graduates, nearing 20%². And for high school graduates, their unemployment rate is three times that of college graduates and approaches 13%². These statistics reveal that not completing high school or college has a profoundly serious impact on the futures of young people, as well as the future of Michigan's economy and its competitiveness.

Despite ever-growing fiscal constraints, state governments, including Michigan's, face increasing demands to provide critical public good services. As presented above, there is a direct and undeniable positive causal relationship between educational attainment and economic prosperity, as well as other highly valued societal outcomes.

States, to remain competitive both nationally and globally, and despite fiscal pressures, must increase the educational attainment of their citizenry; therefore, the need for complete and consistent performance metrics to guide and inform policy-making and scarce resource allocation has grown increasingly acute.

The goal of this short white paper, prepared by the P-20 Working Group, is to advance that effort for Michigan. Specifically, this white paper's deliverables are to:

- provide insights and recommendations regarding appropriate metrics surrounding issues of education from Early Childhood to Higher Education; and
- identify key initiatives that would advance Michigan’s progress to develop a system of metrics for education.

B. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Recommendations regarding appropriate metrics surrounding issues of education from early childhood to higher education

Several national education initiatives (e.g., Complete to Compete³, Data Quality Campaign⁴, Voluntary Framework of Accountability⁵, and Early Childhood Data Collaborative⁶) provide that education performance metrics can be organized into two categories: outcomes and progress. Breaking data into these two categories enables policymakers and the public to track how well their state and its public educational institutions are performing against completion goals, as well as whether they are on track to meet goals in the future³.

The outcome metrics quantify the end-product of the educational process and inform how students, institutions, and the state are performing towards the goal of increasing educational attainment, while the progress metrics measure student movement from semester-to-semester and year-to-year towards the completion of an academic program³. Progress measures highlight areas of challenge or possible improvement that would benefit from targeted intervention and support services to increase the likelihood of completion. Progress measures, in particular, are best positioned to yield benefit to policymakers as they indicate specific areas for action related to process improvements³.

(a) P-8 (prenatal through age 8)

These metrics follow the organization and rationale for development as presented above. **However, it is important to note a significant limitation;** that is, non-trivial challenges exist in identifying expert and evidence-based agreement on metrics for the prenatal through age 8 (P-8) cohort that are generally recognized and widely accepted.

Additionally, it should be noted, existing metrics research emphasizes that the context for examining P-8 metrics is **not limited to just educational systems** but must also be **inclusive of measures** associated with the child’s developmental progress and risks to development prior to entering pre-school (e.g., low family income, cognitive impairment of the child, emotional and social capacity of the child, and patterns of abuse related to the child and/or other family members). The P-8 metrics below are preliminary in nature and final realization of P-8 metrics should include a wide and diverse group of stakeholders. **Additionally, we advise that the work of the Early Childhood Working Group, part of the Educational Roundtable Initiative, be considered as part of this effort.**

Sources for the metrics below include: A Framework for State Policymakers – Building and Using Coordinated State Early Care and Education Data Systems, Early Childhood Data Collaborative 2010; Many Missing Pieces: The Difficult Task of Linking Early Childhood Data and School-Based Data Systems – Bornfreund and Severns, New America Foundation 2010; and, A Next Social Contract for the Primary Years of Education – Guernsey and Mead, New America Foundation 2010.

Outcome metrics are:

- **Development Risk:** percentage of children, birth to age 5, with development risk⁷;
- **Early Learning/Care Programs⁸ Accessibility:** percentage of vulnerable¹ children, birth to age 5, participating in high quality early learning and care programs;
- **Early Learning/Care Programs⁸ Remediation for School Readiness Outcomes:** percentage of vulnerable⁷ children, ages 3 and 4, participating in high quality early learning and care programs to improve school readiness outcomes;
- **Credentialed Early Childhood Education Providers:** percentage of early learning and care providers with credentials or degrees in early childhood education;
- **Kindergarten Developmental Preparedness:** percentage of kindergarteners who are developmentally on track;
- **Foundation Skill Preparedness:** percentage of 3rd graders who are grade-proficient in foundation skills (i.e., reading, writing, math, social, and emotional); and
- **Early Childhood Remediation:** percentage of children qualifying for special educational services and/or needing remediation prior to 4th grade.

Process metrics include:

- **Developmental Screening:** percentage of children receiving developmental screening in their first year (or first three years) of life;
- **Participation in Early Learning/Care Programs by At-Risk/Vulnerable⁷ Children:** percentage of at-risk/vulnerable children participating in early learning/care programs⁸;
- **Adequacy of Early Learning/Care Programs⁸ Resources in Vulnerable Communities:** percentage of early learning/care programs per 100 children ages birth-age 5 in vulnerable communities;
- **Kindergarten Participation:** percentage of age-eligible children attending full-time kindergarten; and
- **Chronic Absenteeism:** percentage of children in grades 1-3 who are chronically absent (i.e., 20 or more days per year).

(b) Grades 4-12

These metrics follow the organization and rationale for development as presented in the prior P-8 section. Their development was augmented by thinking presented in the Data Quality Campaign⁴

(DQC), “a national, collaborative effort to encourage and support state policymakers to improve the availability and use of high-quality educational data to improve student achievement.” “The campaign provides tools and resources that will help states implement and use longitudinal data systems, while providing a national forum for reducing duplication of effort and promoting greater coordination and consensus among organizations focusing on data quality, access, and use.”

It should also be noted that the important work to **establish “minimum bars of proficiency” in support of attaining a college-ready/workforce-ready population** of young people for Michigan is not a major focus of this white paper. Instead, we advise **review of College Ready/Workforce Ready Working Group’s white paper** for a full discussion of that topic.

Outcome metrics are:

- **HS Graduation Rates:** percentage of first-time 9th graders in a cohort who graduate within four, five, or six years;
- **HS National Standardized Testing Attainment and Achievement:** participation rate and scores for 12th graders on SAT, ACT, AP, and IB exams;
- **HS Rigorous Coursework and Achievement:** participation rate and completion rate of high school students in advanced math and English coursework;
- **Grade-Level Proficiency Achievement:** percentage of students – 4th, 6th, and 8th graders - meeting state proficiency standards for math, English, and science; and
- **Academic Attainment Rates:** percentage of students achieving at least one year’s academic growth in 4th, 6th, 8th, and 10th grades.

Process metrics are:

- **Success of Proficiency Achievement Remediation:** percentage of last year’s below proficient students who met the state’s proficiency standard this year;
- **Continuation of Proficiency Achievement:** percentage of proficient and advanced students achieving at least a year’s growth every year;
- **Correlation of State Proficiency and National Standardized Testing:** percentage of students who meet the proficiency standard on the state 8th grade test who also take AP and IB courses in high school and pass the corresponding AP or IB exams; and
- **Chronic Absenteeism:** percentage of children in grades 4-12 who are chronically absent (i.e., 20 or more days per year).

(c) Community College and Higher Education

These metrics follow the organization and rationale for development as presented in the prior two sections. Their development was informed by thinking from the Complete to Compete³, Data Quality Campaign⁴, and Voluntary Framework of Accountability⁵ Initiatives. It should be noted that existing research regarding Community College and Higher Education metrics suggests three main categories of metrics be considered: college readiness, student progress and persistence, as well as success outcomes.

Outcome metrics are:

- **Degrees/Certificates awarded:** annual number and percentage of certificates, associate degrees, and bachelor's degrees awarded;
- **Graduation rates:** number and percentage of certificate and/or degree-seeking students who graduate within normal program time defined as three years for an associate's and six years for a bachelor's degree. **It should be noted that the P-20 group unanimously recommend the definition for normal program time presented above be adopted for this metric.**
- **Progressive Transfer rates:** annual number and percentage of students who transfer from a two-year to four-year institution;
- **Lateral Transfer Rate:** annual number and percentage of students who transfer from a two-year to another two-year institution as well as students transferring from a four-year to another four-year institution; and
- **Time and credits to degree:** average length of time in years and average number of credits that graduating students take to earn a certificate, an associate degree, or a bachelor's degree.

Progress and persistence metrics are:

- **Credit accumulation:** number and percentage of first-time undergraduate students completing 24 credit hours (for full-time students) or 12 credit hours (for part-time students) within their first academic year;
- **Course completion:** percentage of credit hours completed out of those attempted during an academic year;
- **Retention rates:** number and percentage of students who enroll consecutively from fall-to-spring and fall-to-fall; and
- **Success in First Developmental Education Course:** number and percentage of students who successfully complete a DE course in subject areas of Math, Reading, or Writing.

College Readiness Metrics are:

- **Enrollment in remedial education:** number and percentage of entering first-time students who place into and enroll in remedial math, English, or both;
- **Success beyond remedial education:** number and percentage of first-time undergraduate students who complete a remedial education course in math, English, or both and complete a college-level course in the same subject; and
- **Success in first-year college courses:** annual number and percentage of entering first-time undergraduate students who complete college-level math and English courses within the first two consecutive academic years.

2. Initiatives to advance Michigan’s progress to develop a system of metrics for education

Although there are several initiatives that might advance Michigan’s progress to develop a system of metrics for education, the charge of brevity and focus for this white paper influenced the choice of four programs as being paramount.

(a) National Complete to Compete (C2C) Initiative³. In 2010, The C2C Initiative was established, under the leadership of The National Governors Association, to make recommendations on common higher education metrics states should collect and report publicly. The most recent 2010 publication by the organization provides the following key commentary:

“One of the most critical challenges facing states as they work to increase college completion relates to metrics. Higher education data at the state and institutional levels are too often limited and inconsistent, particularly with respect to performance. While states have made significant strides in developing higher education data systems, their capacity varies greatly. Currently, 44 states have longitudinal student unit record systems in place, but there is wide variation in the types of institutional and aggregated data collected and reported. Furthermore, by the end of 2010, it is expected that only 18 states will connect their K-12 and post-secondary data systems, and only nine states’ postsecondary system will connect to a workforce data system.”³

It is important to note that Michigan is currently working on a longitudinal student record system (see later comments on Data Quality Campaign) but has not yet achieved a connection between its Early Childhood, K-12, and post-secondary data systems nor with a workforce data system.

Again, the recent 2010 Completion to Compete publication offers the criticism that current data and reporting on how many individuals are progressing through and completing college is “alarming poor.”

“The postsecondary graduation rate collected by the Dept of Education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) only accounts for 48% of all undergraduates enrolled in 4-year public institutions and 32% of those enrolled in 2-year public institutions. The IPEDS graduation rate **does not** account for:

Part-time students – these individuals account for 37% of all college students; 61% of public 2-year college students, and more than 40% of all African-American and Hispanic students.

Transfer students – these individuals represent a significant number of college students, as 37% of students who earned a bachelor’s degree attended more than one institution, and 23% attended more than two institutions.

Moreover, it **does not** disaggregate:

Low-income students – 6.2 million students, nationally, receive Pell grants, representing an \$18 billion annual public investment. This is particularly troubling as students from below-median income families have experienced the largest increases in time-to-degree; and

Remedial students – approximately 40% of all students and 61% of students who begin community colleges enroll in remedial education courses at a cost to states of \$1 billion per year. ^{“3}

It is important for Michigan and its leadership to be active participants in this national dialogue to determine appropriate metrics for higher education as well as the policymaking that will inevitably arise from those decisions. Thus, it is respectfully recommended that the Governor commit to be active and support Michigan’s participation in the **Complete to Compete Initiative**.

(b) National Data Quality Campaign (DQC).⁴ Their most recent 2010 publication offers that “The DQC is a national, collaborative effort to encourage and support state policymakers to improve the availability and use of high-quality education data to improve student achievement. The campaign provides tools and resources that help states implement longitudinal data systems, while providing a national forum for reducing duplication of effort and promoting greater consensus and coordination among organizations focused on improving data quality, access, and use. Beginning in 2005, the DQC first worked to build the political will for states to implement the Ten Essential Elements of a longitudinal educational data system. Currently, the DQC’s emphasis is to continue to provide support and information about building robust student-level longitudinal data systems via the ten essentials elements. Additionally, the campaign has shifted focus towards helping states identify and put in place the necessary policies and practices so that key stakeholders actually use longitudinal data to help students succeed.”⁴

2009-2010 survey results from the DQC indicate that “48 states have implemented six or more of the Ten Essential Elements to ensure that policy makers and educators have the longitudinal data systems capable of providing timely, valid and relevant data. In 2010, for the first time, the DQC provided a view of progress by the states on the Ten State Actions - fundamental steps states must put in place to change culture around how data is used to inform their decisions to improve system and student performance. The list of 10 actions, though not exhaustive, is intended to push states beyond their current practices and policies to change the culture around data use and to maximize states’ infrastructure investment. Currently, the majority of states (43) have implemented three or fewer State Actions indicating that states are just beginning to take the necessary steps vital to using longitudinal data for continuous improvement.”⁴

Michigan’s progress in the DQC is competitive with most states. For 2009-2010, Michigan has met eight of Ten Essential Elements outlined as requisites for a state-wide longitudinal educational data system. In addition, Michigan has fulfilled one of the Ten Actions recently prescribed to change the state’s culture of data use and decision-making associated with efforts to improve system and student performance.⁴

It is important for Michigan to continue its progress in the DQC and its leadership to be informed and guided in its policymaking by those metrics and advised action steps. Thus, it is respectfully

recommended that the Governor and State Administration are active and support Michigan's ongoing participation in the **Data Quality Campaign**.

(c) Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA)⁵. Akin to the work of the Complete to Campaign (C2C), the Voluntary Framework of Accountability, a collaboration between The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), Association of Community College Trustees, and the College Board, "is developing a voluntary accountability system designed to measure outcomes and processes that are specific to community colleges. The Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) will provide opportunities for colleges to benchmark their student progress and completion data against peers and to provide stakeholders with critical information on the colleges."⁵

It is important for Michigan to continue its progress in the VFA and its leadership to be informed and guided in its policymaking by those metrics and advised action steps. Thus, it is respectfully recommended that the Governor and State Administration are active and support Michigan's ongoing participation in the **Voluntary Framework of Accountability**.

(d) Early Childhood Data Collaborative (ECDC)⁶. The ECDC "supports state policymakers' development and use of coordinated state early care and education (ECE) data systems to improve the quality of ECE programs and the workforce, increase access to high-quality ECE programs, and ultimately improve child outcomes."⁶ The ECDC "provides tools and resources to encourage state policy change and provide a national forum to support the development and use of coordinated state ECE data systems."⁶ Additionally, as part of their efforts, the ECDC identified 10 Fundamentals of coordinated state ECE data systems that allow stakeholders to better understand the relationships among children, program sites, and ECE workforce characteristics over time, as well as link select information longitudinally with other key programs.⁶ The intent is that the 10 ECE Fundamentals serve as a foundation to gauge state progress on issues related to Early Childhood Care and Education.

It is important for Michigan to continue its progress in the ECDC and its leadership to be informed and guided in its policymaking by those metrics and advised action steps. Thus, it is respectfully recommended that the Governor and State Administration are active and support Michigan's ongoing participation in the **Early Childhood Data Collaborative**.

Endnotes and References

¹ 2007 U.S. Census Report on Educational Attainment <http://www.census.gov/prod/2009pubs/p20-560.pdf>

² Bureau of Labor Statistics for 2008-2009 <http://www.bls.gov/>

³ Complete to Compete Initiative <http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/1007COMMONCOLLEGEMETRICS.PDF>

⁴ Data Quality Campaign <http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/>

⁵ Voluntary Framework of Accountability www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/aaccprograms/vfa/

⁶ Early Childhood Data Collaborative http://www.birthtofivepolicy.org/Portals/0/pdfs/ECDC_summary.pdf

⁷ Vulnerable children are defined as being affected by a factor(s) contributing to educational risk such as low family income (at or below 300% of federal poverty level [FPL]); diagnosed disability or identified educational delay; severe or challenging behavior; primary home language other than English; parent(s) with low educational attainment; abuse/neglect of child or parent; or environmental risk. In May 2009, the Michigan State Board of Education approved the educational risk factors, listed above, as the criteria for the Great Start Readiness

Program (state-funded preschool). The Board approved criteria that recognizes children living in families with annual income under 200% of FPL are considered vulnerable without other risk factors, while children living in families below 300% AND who have an additional risk factor are also considered vulnerable.

⁸ Early Learning and Care Programs include licensed child care centers and regulated family/group homes, informal and enrolled daycare providers, public and private preschool programs (including state-funded GSRP), Head Start, Early Head Start, services to children with disabilities, and home visiting programs designed to enhance early learning. While it is clear that many other important early childhood support and services impact young children and their families, these metrics focus on early learning and care programs that provide nurturing care and early learning experiences to children in their first five years.

EDUCATION ROUNDTABLE
Committee #2: Instructional Reform

Mission

How do we improve the quality and efficiency of teaching, including both teacher development and accountability?

Committee Members

David Campbell
Superintendent, Olivet Community Schools

Clark Durant
Co-Founder & CEO, Cornerstone Schools

Dan Quisenberry
President, Michigan Association of Public School Academies

Brit Satchwell, Committee Chair
President, Ann Arbor Education Association

Bernard Taylor
Superintendent, Grand Rapids Public Schools

Monique Uzelac
Director of Instructional Technology, Ann Arbor Public Schools

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recommendation #1: Rely on research and establish channels to permit easy access to research as it evolves.

Recommendation #2: Create calendar “space” for schools/districts to acquire and implement research; spread/extend the school year over more of the calendar year.

Recommendation #3: Create regulatory/contractual “space” for schools/districts to implement pilot programs and innovative “incubator” schools. Such “space” can prevent public schools from becoming “schools of last resort”.

Recommendation #4: Mastery learning must trump mandated seat time.

Recommendation #5: Use clear, rigorous and universal content standards that do not change with political winds, coupled with high expectations for all as they progress through sequential standards.

Recommendation #6: Establish fair and effective teacher evaluations that include value-added growth measures of student achievement. The evaluation process should also include rigorous opportunities for the development of human capital, frequent feedback loops, and ways to permit the dismissal of ineffective teachers without the prohibitive time/costs of protracted tenure hearings.

Recommendation #7: Encourage performance-based compensation models.

Recommendation #8: Eliminate overly restrictive rules regarding the use of federal dollars, especially Title 1 and Title 2.

Recommendation #9: Provide more readiness programs for children ages 0-5.

Recommendation #10: Explore the pros and cons of a statewide salary scale.

Recommendation #11: Explore the pros and cons of a statewide evaluation model(s) for administrators and teachers.

Recommendation #12: Emphasize early instruction in languages.

Recommendation #13: Investigate the possibility of duplicating the Kalamazoo Promise to a college education on a statewide level.

B. BACKGROUND

While many, including those whose recommendations appear here, agree that Michigan's educational system has reached a dangerous crossroad, the crossroad is also an *opportunity* we can and must seize to implement changes to traditional instructional delivery models. The following recommendations, perhaps more than those from any of our fellow topic groups, most directly affect the learning and lives of children. Therefore, we made no compromises here regarding the quality and effectiveness of instruction. Though cognizant of Michigan's dire financial situation, we used only educational efficacy and excellence as our litmus tests. In doing so, we hope to challenge - and where necessary, remove - some entrenched paradigms among legislators, school boards, unions, administrators and teachers in order to diminish the institutional inertia perpetuated by those that are unproductive. In this regard, we hope to identify and clear some common ground from which Michigan can become a model of educational excellence for the nation and the world in the 21st century.

If Michigan's goal is to maximize human potential and success in a manner that continuously *evolves*, our danger lies in thinking too narrowly or in assuming that we may have "arrived" after making incremental targeted changes. These mindsets limit us from the outset because human potential is limitless even though progress is always achieved incrementally. Those "arrivals" should be celebrated, but also recognized as mere way stations along a continuous journey. Michigan's task must be to create systems that serve not only as seed beds for specific pragmatic improvements over the short term, but also as an ever-expanding educational field from which *new innovations* may evolve in response to a world of needs and demands that are beginning to evolve at an exponential rate.

In a recent report, Education Evolving's Ted Koldrie makes a case for innovation-based systemic reform by using a "split-screen" approach, incorporating both improvement (now) and innovation (ongoing) into policies that serve instruction *simultaneously*. The near-term recommendations provided here make important improvements, but they will not alone inspire long-term innovation. Our greater task must be to create policy space that serves as an incubator for *continuous* innovation.

Our system of education, if it is to offer sufficient choices that in turn offer the freedom to navigate a dynamic global environment successfully, must provide disaggregated services to meet disaggregated needs at the *individual* level... the continuous expansion of sets of skills that translate between employment opportunities as they ebb and flow. To accomplish this, we must begin immediately by taking what is working best and rejecting what isn't, whether we take from traditional public schools, charter schools, teacher-run public schools, or from successful collaborations between them as examples worthy of closer inspection. Innovation and opportunity should know no boundaries.

The following ideas, *in no particular order of priority*, would improve instruction in Michigan, both over the short and long terms. To help consider these ideas in greater depth, please refer to the References provided herein as pdf attachments or links to web locations.

C. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Rely on research and establish channels to permit easy access to research as it evolves.

Teaching becomes more of a science every day as research evaluates existing practices and validates new best practices. We can provide and maintain many best practices with current resources, however, too many schools continue outmoded practices out of ingrained habit. Where best practices are known the institutional “space” to implement them properly often doesn’t exist. Yet numerous examples exist where public and charter schools have implemented best practices to the extent that at-risk students are mastering content at high levels.

Not all schools, districts, or universities share their success stories in the same place, the same way, or to the same degree. Continually scan the landscape both here and abroad. **Establish highly visible and easily accessible central exchanges online for new research and examples of successful implementations.** The exchanges could be centered on consortia of ISDs, research universities, or MDE.

In addition to collecting and publishing best practices for easier access, systems need to be put in place to close the “knowing/doing gap.” That is best done through job-imbedded professional development. ISDs are in a perfect spot to collaborate with their districts to implement such systems. Much is being said about collaboration around non-instructional business services, but in actuality collaboration around instructional practices can not only save more money than collaboration around a business service, it can also directly improve student achievement.

2. Create calendar “space” for schools/districts to acquire and implement research; spread/extend the school year over more of the calendar year.

The reality is that educators throughout the ranks are often too busy doing what they do to do what they should and could do if given the “space” to change practices effectively. Create new “space” where existing space for administrators and teachers is woefully insufficient. Remove the obstacles to stretching out and adding days to the existing school year over more of the calendar year. The purpose is *not* to merely do more of what we have been doing, but to allow

the space to implement better practices and then to offer more of a more effective product. **Allow schools or districts to spread/add days of instruction as necessary to permit what are sometimes called “intersession days”** that could be used for any concurrent combination of:

- (1) Targeted research-based instruction for selected at-risk and high-needs students;
- (2) Student-free days for lead teachers and administrators to study the latest research-based practices and to devise plans to implement them (logistics and professional development);
- (3) Establishing integral professional learning communities to monitor student achievement and adjust their practices.

This bumps up against state law that delays the start of the school year until after Labor Day and puts limits on the annual “bookends” of days allowed for instruction/planning. **Change the law or grant exceptions.** If we want education to attract the best and brightest we need to move the working year for educators toward a full calendar. Doing that would raise the beginning salaries for teachers to be more comparable with beginning salaries for like professionals, which would in turn attract more of our top graduates into education. Until such time as professional calendars and salaries can be expanded, other methods could be implemented to adjust the current school year.

In districts large enough to offer an extended calendar at selected innovative schools, teaching positions could be offered to existing staff on a voluntary basis - with involuntary transfer as the alternative - for per diem stipends or as part of a performance-based compensation system. In smaller districts where participation might have to be “all or none” in terms of the schools that participate, per diems or inclusion in performance-based systems would have to be negotiated without the voluntary option.

3. Create regulatory/contractual “space” for schools/districts to implement pilot programs and innovative “incubator” schools. Such “space” can prevent public schools from becoming “schools of last resort.”

Although our committee unequivocally recognizes the absolute necessity for educational innovation, on the questions of *how* and *to what degree* to provide regulatory/contractual space for innovation we fell across a wide spectrum and could not reach consensus that does justice to any single heartfelt view. Here we summarize the two perspectives that define the spectrum’s width with as much clarity as possible to initiate further discussion on this bedrock issue. It is crucial to note before reading the two perspectives that they **do not** necessarily imply a line or preferences between charters/privates and publics. Both platforms have varying track records of performance that speak for themselves; neither has proven to be a panacea despite having different regulatory environments. The perspectives must be weighed solely

within the context of whether by using the “split screen” approach described in the introduction they will permit innovations to take root and flourish while offering ample opportunity and choices for all of Michigan’s students. Both perspectives come from having the best interests of students at heart, while each doubts the other’s efficacy.

Perspective 1: Remove regulatory obstacles imposed by PERA/Tenure/MiSchoolCode

This approach has the advantage of promoting thought toward innovation that is unhampered beforehand by restrictive paradigms that are perpetuated by regulatory “givens.” Very simplistically, this could be called the “If we clear the forest (regulations), settlers (needs) will be encouraged to come to build cabins (innovations)” approach. As described by one committee member, it springs from four key premises:

- (1) freedom works;
- (2) competition enhances choices for people, efficiencies and focus in operations; the function of price is important to align resources with need efficiency and effectiveness;
- (3) lower barriers to entry to allow greater differentiated quality players to enter the instructional delivery market; and
- (4) by eliminating many current regulations and the local contract provisions they support, unprecedented freedom in terms of educational design would be created as relating to building-based autonomy in terms of budget allocations, personnel (hiring, assignments, and firing), and programming with "equal" funding available.

On a district-wide level where regulations/contracts require a certain number of hours, common calendars, or mandated start/stop times to create barriers to change, they should be removed or opportunities should be created to waive them in order to implement innovation. Work rules, seniority rules in regard to layoff/recall or transfer, tenured status, rules that block the establishment of “alternative model” schools within school districts, or rules that prevent districts from exporting innovative “satellite” schools to other districts should be eliminated.

By eliminating regulatory roadblocks to the maximum extent, innovation will flourish to the maximum extent, in both large and small districts, in both publics and privates/charters. It is a largely deregulated, market based approach in which innovation will arise and evolve according to market driven ideas and outcomes. Principle #1: freedom works.

Proponents of Perspective 2 (below) argue that such broad deregulation would bring results analogous to the results of the deregulation of the financial markets in the name of unfettered markets: political and cultural wars at best, systemic collapse at worst.

Perspective 2: Grant specific local exemptions to facilitate specific local innovative proposals

Very simplistically, this could be called the “As settlers (needs) arrive, clear enough forest (regulations) to let them build their cabins (innovations).”

Some Michigan districts have successfully used local contract variances to collaboratively design and pilot innovative programs without changes to PERA/Tenure/MiSchoolCode. Such examples are too few but have been proven possible and are now ever more likely to occur as the need for innovation becomes more apparent. However, in cases where local management/labor collaboration cannot provide local variances sufficient to pilot innovative programs or schools, create an overriding mechanism to invoke local exceptions to work rules, staffing and compensation - whether site-based or district-wide - *to the extent necessary to launch and adequately measure a pilot’s results*. If the innovation proves its merits as judged by objective measures (test scores, attendance rates, graduation rates, parent/student surveys, enrollment levels), make the exceptions permanent and repeat the process as necessary. Indeed, collect and publish those as examples for other districts and locals (see #1 above). This approach allows local specificity to accomplish local goals while causing the least transitional disruption.

Where an entire pilot school is to be launched within a district large enough to staff it through voluntary transfers among schools, the need for exceptions to staffing rules decreases. Staff initially through voluntary transfers followed by mandatory involuntary transfers as necessary according to certification and highly qualified status. However, seniority rules where they exist in terms of layoff/recall should be honored. This strikes a balance between the district’s ability to innovate and an employee’s right to a job but not necessarily to a job preference. Ineffective employees should be addressed through evaluation, not a staff shuffle.

A teacher’s innovative duties and work should be recognized specifically within a performance-based compensation system that parallels the performance-based criteria used to judge the innovation itself.

In smaller districts where staff transfers to and from innovative schools or programs are not possible, the reliance upon a mechanism to invoke exemptions from regulations becomes more acute, as does its relative impact upon staff. In such cases, the need for a performance-based compensation system that rewards participation in innovations increases.

Proponents of Perspective 1 argue that if this more incremental approach were sufficient to promote innovation to the degree innovation is necessary, it would have already done so and

no mechanism to invoke targeted local regulatory exemptions would be necessary going forward.

From either perspective:

Teachers should be state certified and highly qualified as per state regulations, with exceptions for where innovative instruction lies outside of content areas and specialties already regulated.

We must recognize that there will always be people less able to leverage the options that lie outside of their home districts, particularly in regard to transportation. Besides the guidelines mentioned above, high concentrations of poverty require more resources to overcome its effects. Equity of opportunity does not necessarily mean equal dollars. Resources should be allocated according to need to the greatest extent possible. Without the “space” to innovate, traditional public schools will be shackled or forced to fall so far behind that no one but the most limited parent/student consumers would be left behind to pick over the depleted remains, thus creating pockets of public schools of “last resort.”

4. Mastery learning must trump mandated seat time.

Teachers will attest to the fact that a disproportionate amount of their time is spent accommodating the needs of students at both ends of the mastery spectrum while trying to differentiate curricula that is targeted for the middle. The goal should not only be to teach each child forward from where they are, but to make that possible with more than admonishments about “differentiating instruction” within a system of social promotion between grade levels based primarily on age, not mastery. While the current trend is to develop individualized learning plans for each student, many aspects of our current practices in effect promote “one size fits all.” This dichotomy, in its most extreme cases, approaches “magic wandism” that decreases the efficiency of teaching staff while increasing frustration. A variety of approaches are possible.

One non-controversial solution would be the broader and more flexible use of online learning and technology coupled with relaxed requirements for “seat time” once mastery is proven - whether online or from a seat - and students are ready to “move on.” This approach is instructional in itself... we should upgrade the use of technology to meet the abilities of students that often far exceed the abilities of their teachers. Today’s students grew up online and accept networking as a simple fact of life. This underutilized potential could be exploited via paperless classrooms and collaborative projects (example: Moodle). This freedom from the traditional limitations of paper and classroom locations dictated by start/stop bells creates space for innovations unfettered by clocks, walls and ideas imprisoned on paper. It allows for wider participation, fosters networking with partners far afield, and offers broader palettes of topics and resources. Expand the application of technology to mirror its application in the

world beyond school.

References: <http://www.maine.gov/mlti/index.shtml> and <http://www.inacol.org/>

Another would be to require frequent use of formative assessments for every grade/course within a more flexible school “year” (see #2 above) to more quickly identify students who are lagging behind in specific subjects and offer them extra help on a “real time” basis in order to keep students on paths to mastery. The frequent use of formative assessments should be included in teacher evaluation criteria wherever that is not already the case.

A more controversial approach would be to modify grade-level social promotion with subject-based mastery promotion. Simply stated: In the same way that we all agree that not all children learn at the same pace in the same way in the same subjects, nor should they be prevented from advancing at their own pace in one subject because they lag behind in another. Blurring the distinctions between grade levels that assume a pre-defined level of readiness in all subjects is less onerous socially and politically than ending social promotion in a way that ties all subjects to each other as an arbitrary grade level set. If attempted, this would require changes to the way that teachers are assigned subjects and students are assigned to teachers. Subject content would be broken into smaller “wheels” and students would “wheel” forward upon mastery regardless of the month of the year. The difficulties of such restructuring could be ameliorated with technology to some degree, depending upon the age of the child (less with younger students, more with older). The arguments pro and con can be summarized as “individualized achievement-based learning rather than the ‘institutional tracking’ imposed by grade levels” vs. “insidious ability-based tracking with all of the social stigma that implies,” respectively. This topic is beginning to get attention in some areas of the nation. The answer probably lies in whether one views mastery as a reflection of achievement looking back or ability looking forward... an emotionally charged “chicken/egg” scenario, where both perspectives are backed by research.

- 5. Use clear, rigorous and universal content standards that do not change with political winds, coupled with high expectations for all as they progress through sequential standards.**

Michigan has wisely adopted the new national standards although corresponding national assessments are a few years out. The new assessments will include more open-ended constructive response and short essay questions (higher level dot *connection*) than are currently utilized by the MEAP (lower level dot *collection*). This requires a shift to higher level thinking in *all* content areas. We should make it a priority in *every* school and district to complete the process of alignment to higher national standards and to prepare a culture of high uniform expectations for all students prior to the arrival of the national assessments. This can

be achieved by establishing common curricula and assessments locally that pre-mirror the national standards and assessments. ISDs are already working with their districts and with each other to create the curricula, the instructional methods, and the assessments aligned to the new national standards. Every district and school should have the freedom to innovate, but none should have to suffer the duplication of effort where each aligns on its own or with the blinkered field of vision created by isolation.

- 6. Establish fair and effective teacher evaluations that include value-added growth measures of student achievement. The evaluation process should also include rigorous opportunities for the development of human capital, frequent feedback loops, and ways to permit the dismissal of ineffective teachers without the prohibitive time/costs of protracted tenure hearings.**

The “bad teacher” has become the poster child for much that ails public education, a problem that often gets reduced in the public’s mind to a “tenure” problem. Although “bad” employees are a small percentage of all professions including education, they have a disproportionately adverse impact when it comes to educating children where the stakes are so high. Teachers are loath to criticize a peer in public, choosing instead to withhold judgmental and honor their peer’s “professional sovereignty.” But the reality behind the curtain is that a majority of teachers resent ineffective teachers as much or more than the rest of the public does because they impede the mission of education and teachers’ professional reputation.

So how can “bad teachers” be developed into “good teachers” where possible over the course of an ongoing professional growth curve? And when that fails, how can “bad” teachers be reliably identified and, if necessary, dismissed?

Probationary teachers pose no problem in terms of dismissal. During the four years of probationary status, teachers are in effect at-will employees. Administration can evaluate them and let them go as necessary prior to tenure.

Whether new teachers are given the support and meaningful professional development required to deserve tenured status is open to debate, as is the question of whether tenured teachers receive supports to continuously develop professionally into lead teachers based on merit rather than seniority.

In the case of tenured teachers, it gets more complicated. Tenure is a form of due process firmly set in law reinforced by thoughtful subsequent decisions that now serve as precedents. But the process has in practice been reduced to a series of “hoops” that districts must jump through without any errors in order to dismiss a tenured teacher. This tension foments more push by administration, more resistance by teachers. The resulting focus on dismissal rather than development has fouled the original intent of tenure’s due process from the perspectives

of both the employee and the employer for any of three reasons: 1) existing evaluation models are often too subjective to be reliable and unions can defend teachers by attacking the evaluator's conclusions, or 2) claims of procedural missteps can send the process back to step one, or 3) districts will pursue tenure hearings in situations where slam-dunk gross malfeasance is evident, but may shy away where competence is the issue due to the prohibitive cost of winning or losing. Win or lose, the teacher in question must be paid during a lengthy suspension. Add in the cost of a substitute teacher and an attorney, and the cost to the district can easily creep into six figures win or lose. Thus the due process for one is a process the other can't abide or afford. The tighter the budget and the time available for instruction, the more prohibitive the cost. The process is now too slow to be affordable.

A more comprehensive solution that champions the best intentions and goals of the district and the employee would be to strengthen professional development within the "space" described above in #2, to utilize *objective* evaluation models that include *reliable* measures of student *growth*, and to use recent legislation that requires annual evaluations to provide more frequent feedback to teachers. Then with all of that in place, implement a *significantly expedited* hearing conducted by a network of arbitrators to decide whether the teacher should be dismissed. The state used to have five administrative law judges but now uses only one. We could hire four new ALJs for the price of four protracted tenure cases. If necessary, amend tenure law to expedite tenure cases by eliminating the Tenure Commission and relying solely upon the expedited ruling of an ALJ. Do whatever it takes to preserve due process up to the point of judgment while *expediting* the process so that the teachers can rise (growth through professional development) or fall (dismissal) on their own merits once they have been judged fairly.

Evaluation models should use *objective* criteria to gauge instructional efficacy (the Charlotte Danielson model is one example) coupled with *value-added growth* measures of student achievement. This second component is not currently in place in Michigan due to the inability of our current state standardized tests to provide any growth measurements that can be *attributed to the teacher*. However, we could switch to a more reliable test (local common assessments or NWEA get mentioned as candidates until the national test is ready) that would be administered at the beginning *and* end of *each* year rather than merely once in the fall after a long summer that was preceded by time with a different teacher. Only this use of two data points can measure growth in any meaningful way *and* identify the teacher responsible for it. With a reliable evaluation of teacher efficacy, the tenure process gains fairness for the teacher and the financial efficiency that comes with a faster and more reliable process for the district. Students get better teachers. *But as we use research to guide instruction, so should we use research to guide teacher evaluations.*

We should also encourage some degree of peer review that is much more common in other states than in Michigan. Toledo, OH, for example, is a nearby model to investigate where administration and the union have collaborated to implement peer review. Peer review, once it is reclassified from “anathema” to “safe to discuss” by the union, would foster buy-in among teachers towards maintaining teacher quality and the integrity of the evaluation process.

Until an adequate network of tenure arbitrators is established to ensure prompt decisions, the Tenure Commission needs to be more sheltered from political winds. Their judgments are too often a reflection of the prevailing political moods. More consistency is necessary until reliable evaluation models and an expedited tenure review system is established.

References: The Widget Effect: to download executive summary or full report
<http://widgeteffect.org/>

Using Tests to Evaluate Classroom Teachers (attached as pdf)

Current Research on Teacher Evaluation Brief (attached as pdf)

Problems With the Use of Test Scores to Evaluate teachers (attached as pdf)

7. Encourage performance-based compensation models.

With a more reliable evaluation model that has a student growth component in place (above), incorporate evaluations into performance-based compensation models. Some other possible performance criteria:

- Participation in district committees
- Working in a professional learning community and/or as a participant in an innovative pilot
- Working in a “turn around” school or with heavy concentrations of underachieving students
- Reliable research-based teacher evaluations

8. Eliminate overly restrictive rules regarding the use of federal dollars, especially Title 1 and Title 2.

MDE imposes restrictions that surpass the federal restrictions that come with much needed Title 1 and 2 money! These restrictions, first and foremost, hinder innovation where the need is greatest. They also restrict resources at a time in Michigan when both innovation and dollars are needed most. The restrictive rules combine the worst of bad targeting and bad timing.

9. Provide more readiness programs for children ages 0-5.

Studies confirm that money and time spent here echoes to the lasting benefit of the child, the district and the state for years on end. Being widely studied it is pretty clear that for every \$1 spent on early childhood \$17 dollars is saved in adult life. This is a return on investment that any investor should cherish. Five years of early childhood intervention, 0-5, costs less than one year supporting a person in prison. In spite of all the agencies working toward this end in Michigan there are still thousands of children who are not being served. This makes no sense economically or educationally. The state needs to put more effort and dollars in this area in order to save dollars in future K-12 spending and post-secondary spending on remediation. This is not a cost, but an investment that will pay proven dividends in the long term. This is an opportunity for community agencies, hospitals, doctor offices, community groups, and schools to work together to make sure that every student comes to Kindergarten ready to learn and succeed as productive citizens for their entire lifetimes.

10. Explore the pros and cons of a statewide salary scale.

Our group was made aware of Washington state's use of a statewide pay scale. Washington allocates funds to districts based upon their costs rather than on their student count. This is an intriguing idea worth looking into for no other reason than it is likely to present pros and cons that merit exploration.

Reference: Consider A Statewide Teacher Wage Scale (attached as pdf)

11. Explore the pros and cons of a statewide evaluation model(s) for administrators and teachers.

Here again, our regulatory environment poses obvious obstacles. However, our widespread need to change current models to address evaluative efficacy as per #6 also offers an opportunity to consider standardization to some degree to hopefully promote evaluative efficacy in a timely manner. Approach MEA/AFT and MASB/MASA to see if they are interested in tackling this at the state level.

12. Emphasize early instruction in languages.

Offer Chinese, Arabic, and other languages on the federal list of critical languages in addition to more traditional European languages. Begin instruction in the early elementary grades where research has proven unequivocally that languages are acquired far more quickly and thoroughly than in later years. Teach languages to eventual rudimentary *fluency* by the end of middle school while their brains are language sponges. Then scaffold upwards in high school by using interdisciplinary instruction to solidify foreign language within the context of other subjects

rather than requiring language too late in the developmental cycle as a mere exit requirement.

13. Investigate the possibility of duplicating the Kalamazoo Promise to a college education on a statewide level.

This would immediately focus national attention on Michigan's reinvention that could be leveraged for more than just educational gain. Kalamazoo's enrollment jumped by over 20% within two years of their promise's launch. Current families and students immediately directed their life aspirations and academic efforts upward as new families and students directed their feet to Kalamazoo. The House Fiscal Agency did a study of what it would cost and the long-term educational/economic benefits. This may seem like pie in the sky given our current financial status, but it is a tremendously seductive idea that merits serious attention as a long-term goal.

EDUCATION ROUNDTABLE
Committee #3: Cost/Revenue Reform

Mission

How do we target available dollars to have the greatest impact in the classroom, including issues of shared services, consolidation, and reduced health care and pension costs?

Committee Members

Robert Bobb
Emergency Financial Manager, Detroit Public Schools

Dave Campbell
Superintendent, Olivet Community Schools

Dan DeGrow, Committee Chair
Superintendent, St. Clair RESA

Clark Durant
Co-Founder & CEO, Cornerstone Schools

Jon Felske
Superintendent, Wyoming/Godwin Heights Public Schools

Robert Moore
Deputy Superintendent of Finance & Operations, Oakland Schools

Dan Quisenberry
President, Michigan Association of Public School Academies

James Stapleton
Regent, Eastern Michigan University

Bernard Taylor
Superintendent, Grand Rapids Public Schools

Tom Watkins
Former Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Michigan

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recommendation #1: State employees and school employees should be united to form a single health insurance system managed by the Office of the State Employer.

Recommendation #2: The age of retirement should be gradually increased to 62.

Recommendation #3: Upon taking office, the Governor should issue an executive order creating the Michigan Agency of Early Childhood housed within MDE.

Recommendation #4: Local school districts should be required to issue RFPs for a variety of non-instructional services such as payroll, transportation, food service, and maintenance.

Recommendation #5: Instead of a mandate to provide an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for special education students age 22-26 with a full range of services delivered by certified teachers and licensed auxiliary staff, the focus for such students should shift to the development of a transition plan to guide the student's program.

Recommendation #6: A school district whose fund balance is in deficit by more than 3% of expenditures should be required to implement a variety of steps, including freezing pay, freezing step increases, and eliminating contractual bumping rights.

Recommendation #7: A school district with an "academic deficit" should be required to implement a variety of steps.

B. BACKGROUND

Education in Michigan, like the State itself, is at a dangerous crossroads. We face severe budget restraints and a need for re-inventing ourselves to adjust for the realities that we face in 2010. While we acknowledge the reality that there will be no new revenue in the short-term, we see a need to seek a system that has stability and growth for future educational funding. The ideas we are presenting will hopefully illustrate change that would make education more efficient and are things we need to do given the times we live in. The one comment not contained in our recommendations is a criticism of how the legislature and the Governor solved the FY 2011 budget problem. They removed \$208 million from the School Aid Fund and gave it to the General Fund. We believe this broke the pact with the schools whereby they gave up the right to seek operating funds from the voters in exchange for a new SAF. This money needs to be restored and this cannot happen again. Schools must live within their means, but State government cannot be allowed to remove part of the means for general fund problems.

C. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. We propose that State employees and school employees be united to form a single health insurance system managed by the Office of the State Employer.**

Each employee would be offered a basic health care plan for themselves and/or their family. They would have the option of purchasing additional coverage above the basic plan and paying for the coverage. We would also require a payment of 10% to 15% of the cost of insurance on a sliding scale based on salary. In addition, local school districts would be relieved of the onerous task of negotiating health care insurance with their employees. The Office of the State Employer would manage the combined system. These two actions would save at least \$400 million.

2. The retirement age for public school employees should be gradually increased to 62.

Currently an employee who started at age 22, bought five years, and worked 25 years could collect a pension at age 47. The current system is not sustainable in future years thus, the age of retirement should be increased to 55 as soon as legally possible.

Currently new employees must work 10 years to receive a 30% subsidy of retiree health care premium. They earn an additional 4% subsidy for each year worked up to a maximum of 90% subsidy. We recommend that the system be changed, for new employees hired after October 1, 2011, to 2.4% for each year after the first 10 years. Thus, an employee would not receive a 90% subsidy until they have worked 35 years, 30% after 10 years and $(2.4 \times 25 = 60)$ the full 90% after 35 years. This compares with achieving full vesting after 25 years now. This will save dollars and put us in line with the future where people will live and work longer. We also need to implement measures to contain health care costs for retirees (state and public school employees) that are benchmarked to other states.

3. Upon taking office, the Governor should issue an executive order creating the Michigan Agency of Early Childhood housed within MDE. The order would transfer all dollars, State and Federal, and accompanying personnel that deal with children age 0 to 5. Although housed within MDE the provision of early childhood services would remain with community agencies as well as schools. We would expect that this office would work with the private sector and foundations to seek funds.

Currently Michigan has more than 80 separate early childhood initiatives that are spread across multiple departments and budgets in state government. These initiatives have separate missions, policies, and goals. They also have separate staff, administration, and budgets. As one can imagine, this leads to turf wars and a lack of accountability and not knowing whether we are improving the lot of children, and getting them ready to start and succeed in school. It is a system no one would consciously create and it is designed, like so much of education, for adults and government, NOT children. Other states are changing:

STATE	PA	MD	IL	OH
Name of Office	Office of Child Development & Early Learning	Division of Early Childhood Development	Office of Early Childhood Development	Center for Early Childhood Development
Year Established; Method	Governor created in 2004	In 2005 legislation transferred all programs	Governor announced creation in 2009	In 2009 legislation created CECD within the OH Dept of Education

Our hope and belief is that this approach will lead to a streamlined and effective use of public dollars. It will also clearly indicate that our new Governor understands that effective early childhood spending yields a return on investment unmatched elsewhere in education. While the payoff is not in the life span of term limited legislators, it is an important key, maybe the most important, in our attempt to create a new, successful Michigan.

Because of our belief in the importance of early childhood programming, this is the ONLY section of our paper that we will talk about additional dollars. If more dollars are available, due to reinvention efforts, we advocate for early childhood. A small investment of \$10 million matched with \$10 million from other sources will have an impact. It is the opportunity for the Governor, in an era of cuts and saying no, to have early, meaningful success.

4. Local school districts should be required to issue RFPs for a variety of non-instructional services.

All of us acknowledge that there are savings that can be had by consolidation of certain services. We also acknowledge that not every consolidation saves money. It is also important to note that many consolidations already exist through many parts of the State. Collaborations around business services already exist regionally and on an ISD, countywide basis, with ISDs and the private sector already performing many functions for local school districts.

Whether a collaborative or an individual district, we propose that local school districts should be required to issue RFPs for services such as, but not limited to:

- Payroll
- Human resources
- Technology
- Transportation
- Supply purchases
- Food services
- Facility maintenance/custodial operations including snow removal and grounds
- Energy consolidation/fuel purchases

We also recommend that these RFPs be done on a countywide basis by ISDs as the market would be inundated with RFPs from over 500 school districts and districts would be spending much time and energy recreating the documents and process.

In addition, requiring RFPs for these services is a new mandate and will have to comply with the Supreme Court ruling on new mandates being funded. In some instances, RFPs may not save money, especially where labor concessions have been made or where collaborations have already brought efficiencies. Where RFPs do save dollars, they should be implemented although districts would not be required to take the low bid. There are often valid reasons for taking a higher bid.

We would also note that there are consolidations besides business services that are occurring. Many ISDs consolidate professional development, curriculum and assessment development, and content area coaching. These items often save far more than business consolidations and they should continue to be encouraged. We urge districts, especially small ones, to explore these types of partnerships.

- 5. Instead of a mandate to provide an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for special education students age 22-26 with a full range of services delivered by certified teachers and licensed auxiliary staff (physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech therapists, and teacher consultants), the focus for such students should shift to the development of a transition plan to guide the student's program.**

Since the enactment of Administrative Rules for Special Education in Michigan in the 1970s, school districts have been required to provide education to students meeting special education eligibility requirements from birth through age 26. The Federal mandate, which all other States abide by, only requires education for students ages 3-21. For that reason, Michigan school districts do not receive Federal special education funds for students aged 22-26.

There is also a concern across the State that as more students who are special education eligible fail to meet the increased requirements for a diploma, they will instead opt to receive special education services for a longer period of time, even until age 26.

The intent of the birth-to-26 mandate is to provide special education services to all students with disabilities that will meet all students' unique needs in order to move students into employment and community living. We also believe that, typically, maximum skill achievement is attained before the age of 21. The needs of students change by that age and they must learn practical skills, such as transitioning to being part of a larger community.

We propose that instead of a mandate to provide an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) with a full range of services delivered by certified teachers and licensed auxiliary staff (physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech therapists, and teacher consultants), the focus for special education students aged 22-26 shift to the development of a transition plan to guide the student's program. The plan would provide for practical application of the student's skills to the particular student's living and working situation. The transition program could be delivered

by paraprofessionals with an emphasis on community living skills, recreation, and employment, where appropriate.

A strong alliance with local ARCs, Community Mental Health, Michigan Rehabilitation Services, and local centers for independent living could expand current cooperative contracted agreements to include students between the ages of 22-26.

The bottom line question is whether Michigan in 2011 can afford to be the only state providing the services it does until age 26? The alternative outlined will serve student and parent needs, and save significant money, approximately \$30-40 million.

6. A school district whose fund balance is in deficit by more than 3% of expenditures should be required to implement a variety of steps, outlined below.

Michigan currently has a significant number of school districts in deficit -- both financial deficit and academic deficit. Districts in deficit desperately need additional tools to deal with their problems. Currently employees can merely stall negotiations and continue to get step increases, no pay cuts, not be required to pay any additional share of health insurance increases, and not untie restrictions for staffing, seniority bumping, and class size. Boards of education can ignore the recommendations of their administrators or fail to implement the deficit elimination plans submitted to the state.

We propose that a district whose fund balance is in deficit by more than 3% of expenditures be required to:

- Give no pay increase
- Freeze step increases
- Freeze employer payments on health insurance and require employees to pay the increases, plus 10% of current health insurance cost
- Eliminate class size requirements as long as district is in deficit
- Eliminate all bumping rights of personnel and allow district to dictate assignments. This is needed because districts in deficit typically face significant declining enrollment. Districts often spend the first six weeks shuffling personnel from building to building and classroom to classroom. The effect is devastating on education.
- Require districts to issue RFP to third parties in the private sector, ISDs, and other public entities on all non-educational services to see if money can be saved. Such services would include, but not be limited to, maintenance and custodial services, transportation, technology, food service, curriculum services, human resources, and payroll.

These requirements would remain in effect until a district has a positive fund balance equal to or greater than 5% of its expenditures.

We would further recommend the law be changed in the future, effective July 1, 2013, that all districts are required to have a positive fund balance equal to or greater than 10% of its

expenditures unless given a written exception by the state superintendent, but in no case may it be less than 5%.

7. A school district with an “academic deficit” should be required to implement a variety of steps.

We propose that a district whose student achievement is in the bottom 10% of Michigan districts on graduation rate and/or student proficiency of state standards as measured by the MEAP and/or MME be required to eliminate bumping rights (outlined in Recommendation #6, above), as well as the following:

- Give building and district leadership the ability to hire and retain staff based on growth of student performance and progress with school improvement goals
- Provide flexibility in school day and calendar, staffing, budget, work rules, and seat time rules
- Require districts to implement frequent formative assessment of student mastery of the content standards, and report progress at least quarterly to the state superintendent

The above requirements would remain in effect until a district has statistically significant growth in student performance for at least three consecutive years, and has moved out of the bottom 10% of Michigan school districts in both graduation rates and MEAP/MME scores.

When a school district goes into either financial or academic deficit, the Governor will deputize the current district superintendent, the ISD superintendent, or a state appointed superintendent giving that superintendent full authority to implement the emergency tools listed above and make all other decisions relative to the financial and academic wellbeing of the district with or without the approval of the local board of education. That deputized superintendent will remain in position until the financial and/or academic deficits are removed and systems to prevent future deficit are in place. Only the Governor can remove a deputized superintendent from his/her position.

Bonus Ten

1) Online Learning

Today's students are comfortable with modern technology and are proficient with their learning tools. While Michigan has moved forward in this area, we need to move faster. Any traditional local school should be able to allow a student to be online and only attend 1 hour per week per class. North Carolina has a high school in the mountain areas that is totally online. Students attend only for extra help and for extracurricular activities.

Having this option available would move students toward mastering a subject versus seat time, and not hold some students back. This type of learning is not suited for every student, but our Governor-elect is a poster child for the need to move in this area.

2) Teacher Quality

In some nations, such as Finland, many top students enter teaching. Not so in Michigan. We recommend creation of the Governor's Scholarship program, which would include the awarding of 100 \$10,000 scholarships to be used at any college each year with the only requirement being that the student must teach at least 10 years in Michigan. A student would get the scholarship each year for four years. The scholarship would be awarded to the highest ACT scores, with GPA being a tie breaker. The scholarship would be in addition to any other aid. Cost – 4 million dollars per year, once four years have elapsed.

3) School Days

Since 2002, we have seen the number of instructional days in schools decline. Instructional days are consistently traded away for hours instead of salary increase. Some schools are down to 160 instructional days. One hundred and eighty instructional days should be the floor, not the ceiling. No pay raise should be expected or given for converting back to 180-days.

4) Career Changes into Education

As the rest of the nation moves toward making it easier to change careers and to enter into education, Michigan has recently moved in the opposite direction. There has to be a better system to allow bright, passionate people to change careers other than forcing them to spend thousands of dollars, plus years in college, in mid-life. It is ironic that the head of the chemistry department at the University of Michigan cannot teach AP chemistry in a high school. The Governor of Michigan could be president of Michigan State University, but not superintendent of Ann Arbor Schools. A post graduate degree in law, an MBA, or other criteria should allow a person to be a school superintendent.

5) **Gifted Programs**

One third of Michigan's high school dropouts are gifted students. We spend hundreds of millions of dollars on special education and a pittance on gifted programs in K-8. High schools at least do have advanced placement courses. Districts should be required to spend 1% of their budget on gifted programs for K-8.

6) **Textbooks**

Traditional textbooks will soon be outdated. The largest beneficiary of our current system is United Parcel Service and companies that make backpacks. The technology exists to put all textbooks on a device that doubles as a computer and the students' textbook. Croswell-Lexington School District, in rural Sanilac County, is moving toward electronic textbooks in the coming school year. We should be a leader in this initiative and get schools to move toward electronic textbooks now. It will save money, and is the future.

7) **Professional Development for Teachers**

Currently, 22-year old education major graduates from college, with debt, and within a short time must spend additional time and money to get a master's degree, in order to get a significant pay increase. The young people teach all day, and for some coach after school, and then have to spend thousands of dollars to sit in a classroom and "supposedly" become better teachers. These individuals accrue more debt and spend significant time away from home. This system has one purpose...to send more money to our universities. It is NOT a system designed for our young teachers. Local districts, in conjunction with ISDs, can deliver professional development in the summer months and other times, that is excellent and relevant, not to mention free. As a result, a young teacher could save \$12,000-18,000 and significant personal time. The universities will scream, but this cash cow does nothing to encourage people to go into teaching and remain in the system, and yet the current system exists in EVERY contract in the state.

8) **High School**

School, high school in particular, is designed to require seat time over mastery of a subject. When a student reaches high school they should be allowed to spend their \$7,300 per year at the high school, community college, four year college, or for a class taken in person or online. The current system is designed for adults to make sure no one gets "out" before their four years are up. While that may make sense for many students, we hold many others back. A student should also be able to test out of any class. Local districts will not be happy, it costs them money, but again who do we run schools for, adults or students?

9) **Flexibility**

The Governor and MDE need to work with local school districts and ISDs to guarantee maximum flexibility for the spending of State and Federal dollars. Schools need this flexibility to implement change.

10) **Statewide Salary Schedule**

Michigan should examine the potential of a statewide salary schedule. This would allow educators to work on education instead of negotiations. Factors such as cost of living, subjects with teacher shortages, performance, and the percentage of poorer families could be considered. Look to the state of Washington for a state that has a schedule.

EDUCATION ROUNDTABLE

Committee #4: Early Childhood

Mission

How do we improve the quality of early childhood instruction, including intervention programs?

Committee Members

Robert Bobb
Emergency Financial Manager, Detroit Public Schools

Dan DeGrow
Superintendent, St. Clair RESA

Phil Fisher
Philanthropist & Community Activist

Michael Flanagan
Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Michigan

Carol Goss
CEO, Skillman Foundation

Gary Hawks
Former Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, State of Michigan

Justin King
Former Executive Director, Michigan Association of School Boards

Judy Samelson
CEO, Early Childhood Investment Corporation

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recommendation #1: By Executive Order, begin the consolidation and streamlining of Michigan’s 84 early childhood programs and resources into a single office of early childhood by merging the Office of Child Development and Care (Department of Human Services) with the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services (Department of Education) under a single vision, strategic direction and decision making authority.

Recommendation #2: Create the Early Childhood Success Fund, an innovative funding model to exhibit state leadership, leverage investors (stakeholders), coordinate public-private partnerships, create “new” resources and increase impact in early childhood strategies.

Long-Term Vision: While these two recommendations highlight our near-term strategies, what is also needed is support for the comprehensive Great Start vision that addresses how Michigan will return to economic vitality through an educated, high quality workforce starting with school readiness as its foundation.

B. BACKGROUND

1. Keeping the Promise of a Great Start

Michigan faces daunting challenges and great opportunity at the same time. The families of young children in Michigan are desperate for state leaders to demonstrate, through an unprecedented commitment to the school readiness of EVERY child, that they are serious about customer service in government and values-based budgeting. Families want investment that improves the odds for the state’s poorest children, levels the playing field, and assures that the potential of no child is lost on the way to the school house door.

2. Correct Michigan’s Future Now!

Young children in Michigan face great risks and the statistics are worsening: 10% of births are to women under the age of 20; 39.4% of births are to single mothers, and 16.5% are to mothers with less than a high school education. Nearly 23% of Michigan's young children now live in poverty. These factors make Michigan's youngest children at-risk for school readiness, as evidenced by the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP scores, showing 64% of fourth grade students in Michigan are "below proficient".

Detroit’s statistics are more challenging: 20% of births are to teen-aged mothers, three-fourths of which are births to unmarried mothers and 36% of births are to mothers with less than a high school education. Nearly 50% of Detroit’s pre-school aged children live in poverty; and 73% of fourth grade students are “below basic” as measured by NAEP scores. These child well-

being statistics and low academic proficiency scores will not prepare Michigan's young citizens for competition in a global economy.

3. Empirical Evidence (ROI = Value Based Budgeting)

- High quality early childhood education/development experiences provide a 17:1 long term rate of return (Heckman); far exceeding the return on most investments, private or public. (Rolnick and Grunewald).
- The return on investment (welfare savings, remedial education, increased tax revenue and incarceration avoidance) returned \$16.14 per dollar invested. (High Scope Foundation)
- The return on investment in human capital is greater the earlier the support is implemented and maximized when support is targeted to vulnerable children. (Heckman)
- The state saves \$1.15 billion *annually* in state education, social services, and government spending (and increased tax revenues) as a result of \$1.4 billion in Pre-K investment over 25 years. (Wilder).
- In a values-based budget environment, early childhood resources would be aligned around a single vision, local community need/asset maps and strategic improvement plans, and would be accountable to families. Quality assurance would reward high quality programs and effective public-private partnerships.

C. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Two recommendations will put Michigan back on the map competitively.

- 1. By Executive Order, begin the consolidation and streamlining of Michigan's 84 early childhood programs and resources into a single office of early childhood by merging the Office of Child Development and Care (Department of Human Services) with the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services (Department of Education) under a single vision, strategic direction and decision making authority.**

The developmental needs of children leading to school readiness are many and interrelated. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the emotional and intellectual wiring of the brain is formed during the first three years of life. If a child is not reading at grade level in the third grade, their chances of graduating high school are near zero. Children in poverty know 10,000 fewer words than their suburban counterparts when entering third grade. (Hart and Risly)

Too many children are walking through the kindergarten door with an achievement gap created by poor investment choices on the part of the public sector. Incremental implementation, an absence of systems thinking and structural design flaws have led to an inefficient,

uncoordinated and underfunded early childhood system. These choices cost public education millions in remediation without any assurance that children will ever catch up. (Michigan annually spends \$100 million to repeat kindergartners.) They become the children most likely to drop out, become victims or perpetrators of crime; end up on welfare or in the corrections system.

Children's needs are interrelated; programs and resources need to be interrelated. Programs and resources working together in a well-defined system will change our approach from one of running 84 programs, to one of need-based, family-centered support, vastly improving the state's return on investment.

The ***Michigan Office of Great Start – Early Childhood*** would serve as the administrative home for early childhood programs with a single vision, strategic direction and decision making authority. The Office of Great Start would:

- Implement a coherent, streamlined approach to the funding of early childhood programs, assuring reduced administrative costs, non-duplication of services and improved financial efficiency.
- Integrate and consolidate functions to achieve better outcomes for infants and toddlers, leading to improved school readiness.
- Invest based upon a comprehensive set of child and family status outcomes and indicators leading to improved accountability and effectively targeted investment.
- Partner with the state's public/private early childhood initiative, the Michigan Early Childhood Investment Corporation, to leverage and maximize public investment with private and nonprofit initiatives, emerging national and federal efforts, and to connect to local communities through the state Great Start network.

Near Term Outcomes:

- Increased school readiness;
- Improved early elementary school test scores;
- Reduction in early education costs; and
- Closer alignment between public and private sectors.

Long Term Outcomes:

- Reduction in costs for K-12 education, health care, corrections, social welfare and other public supports;
- Reduction in remediation costs for higher education, business and industry, and

- Increased income and sales tax revenues and increased economic investment.

Currently **84 public programs** support young children and their families, with total state and federal funding estimated at **\$3.1 billion**. Public funding is split nearly evenly between state and federal sources. Roughly **90 percent** of the funding supports children in three goal areas: K–3 Education, Pediatric and Family Health, and Family Support. Most public funding for early childhood is focused in Medicaid and TANF which means that little investment is targeted at the evidenced-based initiatives known to produce return on investment. Therein, additional investment should be targeted to these initiatives.

2. Create the Early Childhood Success Fund, an innovative funding model to exhibit state leadership, leverage investors (stakeholders), coordinate public-private partnerships, create “new” resources and increase impact in early childhood strategies.

The State of Michigan is facing a \$1.68B deficit and, in the short-run, will be unable to increase funding to early childhood development initiatives or supports. Therefore, it is imperative that the state restructure enhancements to the existing system, leading to efficiency (savings), coordination accountable for specific metrics of success (leadership) and effectively leverage stakeholder passions through a collaborative fund. Savings to the current inefficient system will be redirected to support the new early childhood development strategies. Creating “new” funding methodologies will expand the success of early childhood development and have a meaningful, and long lasting, impact. Finally, with a focus on “Value Based Budgeting” innovative platforms will be required to equitably focus on expanding **Sources** while prioritizing **Uses** of supports toward solutions with a proven return on investment and predetermined outcomes.

The goals of the ***Early Childhood Success Fund*** will be to:

- Provide a well-coordinated opportunity for all stakeholders to make a meaningful difference in early childhood outcomes in Michigan.
- Create a pool of new funding resources focused on, and devoted to these same early childhood success strategies.

The ***Early Childhood Success Fund*** would invest first in:

- Every young child’s learning is nurtured by access to high quality early learning experiences. The lever for this first use is the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), along with using the Early Development Indicator (EDI) as an assessment measurement of kindergarten readiness. The incentive for this first use could be a higher rate of reimbursement or bonuses or access to Quality Enhancement Funds.

- Every young child has a pediatrician or family practitioner and receives regular, preventive health care. The lever for this opportunity is the Pediatric Medical Home model.
- Every parent of a young child is supported in their role. The lever is a comprehensive home visitation program for at-risk families with children ages birth to age 5.

Each of these investments presents an opportunity for public and private funds to be brought together to catalyze change. Research supports these investments as fundamental to school readiness and most importantly school success.

Mission Related Investments (MRI), Program Related Investments (PRI), and/or grant funds may be employed to advance the implementation as evidenced on the attached models.

3. The Long-Term Vision

While these two recommendations **(also embraced by state business leaders through the Children’s Leadership Council of Michigan)** highlight our near-term strategies, what is also needed is support for the comprehensive Great Start vision that addresses how Michigan will return to economic vitality through an educated, high quality workforce starting with school readiness as its foundation. A one-page framework is attached.

1. James Heckman, “Heckman Equation.” PowerPoint presentation, James Heckman, 2009
2. Rolnick & Grunewald, “Early Childhood Development: Economic Development with a High Public Return” Fed Gazette, March, 2003
3. http://www.highscope.org/file/Research/PerryProject/3_specialsummary%20col%2006%2007.pdf
4. Chase, Richard. et.al. *Cost savings analysis of school readiness in Michigan*. St. Paul, MN: Wilder Research. 2009
5. Betty M. Hart and Todd R. Risly. Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., 1995

Early Childhood Success Fund

Fund Structures

Model 1: Mission Related Investment (Market Rate Returns) Summary Terms:

Entity Type:		Bond Offering
Fund Size:		\$500M to \$1B
Fund Type:		Tax-exempt bond
Coupon Rate:		6-8%
Maturity:		Five years
Support:		Letter of credit enhancement
Leverage:		State or foundation match
Collateral:		(TBD) Designated portion of state lottery proceeds, school funds, etc.
Investor Types:		Government, National funders, Public and private foundations, Social VC entrepreneurs, Profit motivated investors, the public, etc.
Uses of Proceeds:		Three uses of the Early Childhood Success Fund

Model 2: Program Related Investment (Concessionary Returns) Summary Terms:

Entity Type:		L3C
Fund Size:		(TBD) \$50M
Fund Type:		Socially responsible investment fund
Coupon Rate:		(TBD) Two Percent (2%)
Maturity:		Ten years
Support:		Lead donor support of a portion of the corpus
Leverage:		State or foundation match
Collateral:		(TBD) State support, foundation supports
Investor Types:		Government, National funders, Public and private foundations, Social VC entrepreneurs, Profit motivated investors, the public, etc.
Uses of Proceeds:		Three uses of the Early Childhood Success Fund

Model 3: Traditional Grant Fund Summary Terms:

Entity Type:		Funding collaborative
Fund Size:		(TBD) \$25M
Fund Type:		Grant fund
Coupon Rate:		(TBD) None
Maturity:		(TBD) Ten year grant period or ten year Initiative
Support:		Lead donor support of a portion of the corpus
Leverage:		State or foundation match
Collateral:		(TBD) None
Investor Types:		All granting organizations
Uses of Proceeds:		Three uses of the Early Childhood Success Fund

Foundations like the Kellogg Foundation make Mission Related Investments (MRI) that focus on education and learning to improve healthy child development, provide support for parents and caregivers, build innovative education and learning partnerships among government, business, schools, families and communities. Investments are prioritized that are scalable and/or can catalyze additional capital for impact. These types of investments are expected to generate market or near-market risk adjusted rates of return. There are many asset classes for these investments including cash, fixed income, equity and private equity.

EDUCATION ROUNDTABLE
Committee #5: College-Ready/Career-Ready

Mission

Develop policy recommendations to transition students from Pre-K
to post-higher education.

Committee Members

Jim Ballard

Executive Director, Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals

Pam Becker

Professor, Eastern Michigan University

Mike Boulus

Executive Director, Presidents' Council, State Universities of Michigan

Deborah Cole

Executive Director of Community/Continuing Education, Lansing Community College

Mary Deluca

Director of Children's Services, Community Action Agency

Mike Hansen

President, Michigan Community College Association

David Nixon

President, Monroe Community College

Kevin Oxley

Superintendent, Jackson County Intermediate School District

Daniel Phelan, Committee Chair

President, Jackson Community College

Christine Quinn

President, South Central Michigan Works!

Donna Randall

President, Albion College

Kim Schatzel

Dean of the College of Business, University of Michigan-Dearborn

Kathy Wilbur

Vice-President, Central Michigan University

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recommendation #1: Michigan should adopt common statewide placement benchmarks (i.e., ACT established collegiate-level performance measures) as agreed-upon standards for college and career readiness.

Recommendation #2: Michigan should fully utilize the established Educational Development Plan (EDP) requirement that helps to ensure younger students are on target to be ready for college and career.

Recommendation #3: Michigan should maintain a rigorous merit-based P-12 curriculum with identified competency-based assessments recognizing time is a variable in the learning process and the need for differentiated instruction to help students reach college and career readiness expectations.

Recommendation #4: Michigan should create a unified, one-stop center and/or portal to serve Michiganders at any point in their education and career continuum.

Recommendation #5: Michigan should fully implement the P-20 system that is currently under development across all private and public education sectors to help students, parents, educators, administrators and policymakers measure progress by monitoring performance from early years through college and into the workforce.

Recommendation #6: Michigan transfer agreements (i.e., MACRAO) must be expanded to establish a common transfer guarantee that provides for transferability between all public higher education institutions. An invitation should be extended to private higher education in the state to participate.

B. INTRODUCTION

According to ACT's *The Condition of College & Career Readiness for Michigan* report, readiness for college and career is the measure of education excellence at the K-12 level. Simply earning a high school diploma is no longer enough to succeed in an increasingly complex, diverse and technology-driven world. (ACT, 2010) A more accurate measure of success is whether Michiganders are prepared for college and career.

Michigan's Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) reported that only 75.5% of high school students completed high school with a regular diploma in four years or less. The percent of Michigan's population, aged 25 and over with a high school degree or higher, was 88%. Michigan ranks 21st in the country, down from 16th in 2006 (Bebow, 2009). According to the 2008 census data, 35% of Michigan's 5.3 million working-age adults (25-64) hold at least a two-year degree, even though research suggests that 60% of all jobs in Michigan will require at least a two-year degree. If Michigan continues to increase attainment at the rate

it did from 2000-2008, the State will achieve a college-attainment rate of 43%. This will fall far short of Lumina’s year 2025 “Big Goal” of 60% (Lumina Foundation for Education, 2009).

Despite modest progress since 2006, too many Michiganders are not prepared for 21st-century career opportunities. For Michigan to realize a highly skilled and educated workforce, pathways must exist to facilitate transitions from P-12 to further education, workforce training and career. To address this challenge, Governor-elect Snyder established a College and Career Readiness Subcommittee to undertake a review of the current situation and provide responses to three questions: (1) what opportunities exist; (2) what are the goals, defined metrics and timetables; and (3) what is the near-term action plan?

The Subcommittee was comprised of representatives from Michigan community agencies, educational associations and P-20 organizations. The Subcommittee was committed to sharing recommendations with Governor-elect Snyder’s administration for consideration in policymaking. Working together, the Subcommittee envisioned a day when every Michigan citizen would benefit from six policy recommendations (outlined below), which have been shown to be critical for college and career success.

Definition of terms:

To help in its deliberation of opportunities and solution sets, the Subcommittee established common definitions for the work. These definitions included:

Career Readiness: Career readiness, as defined by the Association for Career and Technical Education, “involves core academic skills and the ability to apply these skills to concrete situations in order to function in the workplace and in daily activities; employability skills (such as critical thinking and responsibility) that are essential to any career; and technical, job-specific skills related to a specific career pathway.” (Association for Career and Technical Education, 2006, p. 1)

College Readiness: In announcing the Race to the Top Fund guidelines in 2009, U. S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan called for states to ensure that “students exiting one level are prepared for success, without remediation, in the next.” To that end, data suggest that students who reach certain score levels in given subjects stand a better chance of succeeding in collegiate-level coursework than those who do not produce such scores. (Gewertz, 2010)

C. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Michigan should adopt common statewide placement benchmarks (i.e., ACT established collegiate-level performance measures) as agreed-upon standards for college and career readiness.**

To realize a highly skilled, educated workforce, it is critical to express clear and consistent messages about what level of performance is “good enough” to demonstrate college and career readiness. “Too often, high school students graduate to find that what they learned in high school has not truly prepared them for first-year courses in college or workforce training programs.” (ACT, 2010, p. 11) Both ACT and WorkKeys are administered to all high school juniors. Through the ACT and WorkKeys assessment systems, ACT has identified the minimum placement test scores in each subject area that indicate whether students are prepared for college and career, based upon actual performance data.

To set clear readiness expectations, Michigan should adopt common statewide placement benchmarks as agreed-upon standards for college and career readiness. Likewise, a cross-walk matrix should be established for comparative purposes with other assessment tools, such as Accuplacer and Compass. Michigan should recognize ACT and WorkKeys systems as its common diagnostic placement tools for college and career ready assessment. The College and Career Readiness Subcommittee recommends that these changes occur by December 2011.

2. Michigan should fully utilize the established Educational Development Plan requirement that helps to ensure younger students are on target to be ready for college and career.

High school is too late to learn whether students are on – or off – target for college and career. Younger students who take rigorous curricula are much better prepared to graduate from high school ready for college and career. College/workforce ready benchmarking and linking interventions for 6th and 8th graders will make students, parents and teachers more aware of the importance of the middle-school grades that are essential to make sure young students are on target for college and career readiness and to help teachers intervene in more timely ways (ACT, 2010).

All 7th grade Michigan students participate in the creation of an Educational Development Plan (EDP). Michigan should adopt practices that fully utilize EDPs so that these are living documents that are relevant, continuously updated, easily accessible and follow individuals throughout their lives. The College and Career Readiness Subcommittee recommends that the State Superintendent ensure that the established EDPs are fully implemented at the 7th grade and updated annually by September 2011.

3. Michigan should maintain a rigorous Merit-based P-12 curriculum with identified competency-based assessments recognizing time is a variable in the learning process and the need for differentiated instruction to help students reach college and career readiness expectations.

The Michigan State Board of Education, in June, adopted the Common Core Standards, announced by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers. The standards apply to mathematics and English language and allow participating states to more accurately compare student performance between states.

Early adoption of the standards, which Michigan officials helped to develop, would put Michigan among the first states in the nation to embrace the national guidelines. Michigan Department of Education officials report their intent is to align the final goals of the math and English curriculums with college entrance and work standards.

There are some examples that exist nationwide that can be instructive to Michigan as we grapple with some of the same national challenges. Achieve, an independent, bipartisan, non-profit education reform organization, is involved in the effort to make college and career readiness a national priority so that the transition from high school graduation to postsecondary education and careers is seamless. According to Achieve's 2008 *Closing the Expectations Gap*, Michigan already aligns high school standards with college and workplace expectations. (Achieve: American Diploma Project Network, 2008) Michigan aligns graduation requirements with college and workplace expectations and administers college and career readiness tests to all high school students.

Clearly, Michigan has raised P-12 standards and has ensured that curricula are aligned with these higher expectations. These courses are better preparing individuals for college and career. However, early data trends do not show an increase in college and workforce readiness. While the curricula has been designed to model best practices, professional development for educators has not been uniformly modified to support teaching the content in a way that students with varying learning styles can learn it. Time is a variable in the learning process and instructional differentiation is critical in helping students achieve college and career readiness.

Consequently, the College and Career Readiness Subcommittee recognizes and supports the current Merit-based curriculum. To further increase the effectiveness of the curricula, the Subcommittee recommends that, by September 2012, the State Superintendent align professional development to school improvement plans to teach educators how to deliver curricula to suit a variety of learning styles.

4. Michigan should create a unified, one-stop center and/or portal to serve Michiganders at any point in their education and career continuum.

To achieve a highly skilled, educated workforce, it is critical to set common academic expectations and benchmarks based on competency. Michiganders need a comparable level of knowledge and skills whether they're going to college or onto a career. Unfortunately, individuals get lost in transition, especially if they are not associated with the P-12 or higher education system (i.e., displaced workers or dropouts). The University of Michigan reports that the national high school dropout rate is 1 in 4, not 10% as the federal government estimates. The high school dropout rate has not changed significantly in the past few decades. (Whittle, 2007) According to the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI), Michigan's high school dropout rate for 2009 was 11%. (Center for Educational Performance and Information, 2009)

When Michiganders who are disassociated with the K-12 or higher education systems get lost in transition, they do not have a defined pathway to follow to education or career attainment. “Postsecondary education and training typically does not coordinate, dual enroll, or align services with adult education in the way that it increasingly does with high schools.” (Strawn, 2007) Consequently, based upon the realization of these and other data, the subcommittee envisioned a number of associated goals, metrics and timetables for implementation as presented below:

Some transitions include:

- High school to college
- High school to career
- Drop out to education
- Drop out to career
- Community college to baccalaureate-granting institutions
- Baccalaureate to advanced degree
- Community college to career
- College graduate to career
- Career to continuous education

Depending on the pathway, examples of metrics include:

- Graduation rates including transfer graduation rates
- Percentage of HS graduates completing an AP, IB, AICE or dual enrollment course
- Placement into courses
- First year success rate and retention
- Placement into career
- Employment rate
- Transfer rates
- Occupational competency test scores
- Licensure/recertification rates

Michigan should create a unified, one-stop center and/or portal to serve Michiganders at any point in their education and career continuum. An inventory and assessment of Michigan’s education and workforce development program and services is necessary to identify and define the options that are currently available. An expansion of the existing College Access Portal to include career and adult education options would serve as a one-stop center for Michiganders struggling with college and career readiness. The College and Career Readiness Subcommittee recommends that this action plan be implemented by December 2011.

5. Michigan should fully implement the P-20 system that is currently under development to help students, parents, educators, administrators and policymakers measure progress by monitoring performance from early years through college and into the workforce.

In his recent report, *College- and Career-Ready: Using Outcomes Data to Hold High Schools Accountable for Student Success*, Chad Aldeman (2010) emphasizes the importance of a multi-dimensional accountability system in not only aligning high school and postsecondary standards but also in tracking students into the workforce. “The next step is to use the data to evaluate high schools and hold them accountable for preparing their students to succeed.” Florida, for example, is currently attempting to link educational experience with employment outcomes in

a new college and career-readiness index by tracking full-time wage data through its Unemployment Insurance System. Aldeman suggests other measures of career potential such as apprenticeships, industry certifications and military service may also be used to measure predictability of future occupational success.

Michigan is serious about ensuring that more of its citizens are prepared for college and career in the 21st century and has accepted the challenge of establishing a longitudinal P-20 data system to ensure availability and use of high-quality education data to improve student achievement. Preliminary work is underway through support from federal grants and private institutions. Recognizing the significance of this task, a separate P-20 Subcommittee was also convened and has recommended tracking and data collection mechanisms for policy consideration. The College and Career Ready Subcommittee endorses this recommendation as well and recommends that the Director of the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) implement the P-20 data system by December 2011. It is essential that policymakers, educators, parents and others have access to this information and know how to use it.

- 6. Michigan transfer agreements (i.e., MACRAO) must be expanded to establish a common transfer guarantee that provides for transferability between all public higher education institutions. An invitation should be extended to private higher education in the state to participate.**

Currently, students experience difficulty with transferring credits from one higher education institution to another. It is not uncommon for students to re-take the same course at another institution of higher education because one particular institution of higher education would not accept the work that had been previously completed by the student at another Michigan institution of higher education. This practice inhibits student success.

To ease the pain of transfer, reduce cost redundancy, and to accelerate students along their educational pathways for quicker workforce integration, a common transfer guarantee must be established that provides for lateral transfers, as well as higher education ladder transfers. All general education liberal arts courses should establish a common approach to curriculum and course numbering so that, regardless of a student's educational destination, there is no question regarding transfer. Common transfer programs should also be of a similar approach (i.e., engineering, teacher education and nursing). The College and Career Readiness Subcommittee requests that Governor-elect Snyder convene a meeting by December 2011 of all Michigan higher education presidents. The purpose of the meeting would be to establish an expanded transfer agreement that all institutions of higher education will commit to with full participation.

D. CONCLUSION

Workforce data strongly suggest that most of the career opportunities for Michiganders will require some form of postsecondary education. To secure our state's future and a quality

standard of living for all its residents, we must provide support systems and resources that will ensure students acquire the academic, technical and employability skills necessary to be college and career ready and establish a framework that encourages lifelong learning and career advancement.

A commitment to statewide placement benchmarks, Education Development Plans, a unified, one-stop education center, P-20 alignment and transfer guarantees should drive our education reform efforts to improve college and career readiness. The Subcommittee appreciates the opportunity to have these recommendations considered by the Snyder Administration.

REFERENCES

- Achieve: American Diploma Project Network. (2008). *Closing the Expectations Gap*. Retrieved November 19, 2010, from Achieve: <http://www.achieve.org>
- ACT. (2010). *The Condition of College & Career Readiness: Class of 2010*. Retrieved November 10, 2010, from ACT: <http://www.act.org>
- ACT. (2010). *WorkKeys*. Retrieved November 10, 2010, from ACT: <http://www.act.org>
- Aldeman, C. (2010, January). College- and Career-Ready: Using outcomes data to hold high schools accountable for student success. Retrieved March 3, 2010 from: <http://www.educationsector.org/publications/college-and-career-ready>
- Association for Career and Technical Education. (2006). *What is "Career Ready"?* Retrieved November 19, 2010, from ACTE: <http://www.acteonline.org>
- Bebow, J. (2009, December 29). *High School Completion*. Retrieved November 19, 2010, from The Center for Michigan: <http://www.thecenterformichigan.net>
- Center for Educational Performance and Information. (2009). *Michigan Cohort Graduation and Dropout Rates*. Retrieved November 19, 2010, from Michigan.gov: <http://www.michigan.gov>
- Gewertz, C. (2010, November 17). *How to Define College Readiness? Good Question*. Retrieved November 19, 2010, from Education Week: <http://www.edweek.org>
- Lumina Foundation for Education. (2009). *A Stronger National Through Education*. Retrieved November 10, 2010, from Lumina: <http://www.luminafoundation.org>
- Race to the Top Program Executive Summary, (Washington, DC: US Department of Education, November 2009).
- Strawn, J. (2007, September, 28). *Policies to Promote Adult Education and Postsecondary alignment*. National Commission on Adult Literacy: Center for Law and Social Policy.
- Whittle, A. (2007, September 28). *High School Dropout Rate 1 in 4, According to Study*. Retrieved November 19, 2010, from Associated Content: <http://www.associatedcontent.com>