

American Diploma Network (ADP) Michigan Action Plan

The Challenge

Today, more than ever, Michigan appreciates the powerful and important role education at all levels plays in the success of its citizens and its economy. Governor Jennifer M. Granholm has set a goal to double the number of people in Michigan who receive postsecondary degrees or credentials of value over the next ten years. Governor Granholm commissioned her Lt. Governor, John Cherry, to find ways to reach that goal. The Lt. Governor's Commission for Higher Education and Economic Growth, (Cherry Commission) published a report with 19 recommendations in December 2004. Michigan is now among leading states in embracing a commitment to enhance the rigor and relevance of our 4,003 schools and 1,688,432 students K–12, while aggressively connecting 482,979 high school students in 962 high schools with next steps in postsecondary education.

Today's postsecondary institutions and workforce have changed across the country. Michigan, as one of the 22 states that have signed on to the American Diploma Project, agrees it is increasingly important that today's youth receive the education and skills necessary to enter a postsecondary institution with the ability to learn and to later enter the workforce with the confidence to excel. Michigan is working with the National Governor's Association and the American Diploma Project to strengthen and improve America's high schools so students are better equipped and prepared to handle the challenges they will meet in the 21st century.

In the pages that follow, Michigan will address how they are implementing the four policy objectives of the American Diploma Project.

- 1. Through consensus between subject experts, educators, leaders, and members of the business community, ADP is working to align high school curriculum and standards with the knowledge necessary for postsecondary education and employment.*
- 2. Increasing the requirements and providing more challenging courses to high schoolers will better prepare them for the challenges they will face once they graduate from high school.*
- 3. By aligning high school exams and college entrance exams, ADP is providing students with an early indicator of college and work readiness, incentives to work hard in high school, preventing participation in remedial college courses, and reducing the overall number of exams high school students must take, while increasing the efficiency of those exams.*
- 4. High schools and postsecondary institutions will be held more accountable with such measures in place.*

SUMMARY OF MICHIGAN ADP ACTION PLAN

To address the American Diploma Project objectives, Michigan will use grant dollars obtained through the NGA Honor State Grant program to focus on two goals – creating high school content standards that are aligned to postsecondary education and training, and increasing early college-level learning opportunities in high school.

Academic Content Standards:

Within the next two years, MDE will revise high school content standards, create a variety of ways to use these standards (by course, integrated sequentially, and as end-of-high-school expectations), publish and disseminate the standards, and provide professional development to ensure effective implementation.

All high schools will offer a rigorous standards-based curriculum to all students. Michigan is currently developing a high school assessment that will double as a college-entrance exam. The Michigan Merit Exam, embedded with the ACT, will measure student mastery of the rigorous curriculum and instruction. It aligns with both the NGA and ADP recommendations of administering a college and work readiness assessment in high school and with the Action Agenda's recommendation to create tests of college and work readiness.

The thorough introduction, public comment, review, and revision will allow school administrators and teachers to become familiar with the new high school content standards. As schools report they are offering the recommended courses of the newly proposed graduation curriculum requirements, Michigan will need to ensure - through the use of new content standards and new assessments - that all high schools are teaching to the new standards. The implementation phase includes extensive professional development to ensure thorough understanding and outreach to all high schools and CTE programs so that use of the standards will be rapid and uniform. The assessment system, Michigan Merit Exam, will demonstrate gains in teaching and learning.

Measurements for Success:

There will be several measures of success, although not all of them will show results immediately.

- ✧ Increase in graduation rates. Data elements will be reported annually on the Michigan School Report Card and through the National Education Data Partnership. These elements include percent proficient on statewide assessments, graduation, and dropout rates.
- ✧ The newly proposed high school curriculum graduation requirements and an increase in the number of students participating in the Michigan Scholars program.
- ✧ Decrease remediation at the college level. The Cherry Commission recommended postsecondary institutions to provide local and statewide data on

the number of students who require remediation beginning in the 2005-2006 school year.

- ✧ Increase the number of students enrolling in postsecondary institutions.
- ✧ Increase the number of students completing degrees and certificates. The Cherry Commission also recommended postsecondary institutions to provide degree completion data starting with the 2005-2006 school year.

Dual Enrollment/College Credit-earning Courses:

Recommendation 7 in Governor Mark R. Warner's "Ten Steps to a State Action Agenda" refers to expanding college-level learning opportunities in high school. Michigan data show only weak participation in dual enrollment, Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate programs. Michigan plans to use the NGA grant to develop policy in order to remove barriers to participation of minority and disadvantaged students in college-level learning opportunities with focus on high-priority schools. A subcommittee will meet January 25 to begin this process.

Michigan's objective is to ensure access to dual enrollment and college credit-earning courses for all high school students by developing policy. This will allow students to achieve their education goals more quickly, reduce the cost of postsecondary degrees, and give many students a better understanding of their own potential to succeed at college-level work. We propose to design complementary policies that organize existing funding for K-12, vocational Career and Technical Education (CTE), and higher education to support shared credit, accelerated learning, and college credit-earning course-taking for a much greater share of students. This will include developing policy that could tie dual enrollment funding to career pathways and postsecondary occupational programs. Link dual enrollment and college credit learning courses with useful career guidance and decision information, being developed through an enhanced economic/occupational data function, so young people are moving on paths that promise economic opportunity in the years ahead.

Measurements for Success:

Once policy has been approved measuring the increase in dual enrollment/college credit-earning courses participation is a straightforward process. The data will be published in annual reports and on the SchoolMatters website.

The direct measures of progress toward the goal are:

- ✧ Increase the number and percentage of students taking college credit-earning courses
- ✧ Increase the number of students taking tests for college credit-earning courses, the number passing, and the number participating in dual enrollment
- ✧ Increase in minority students taking college credit-earning courses. The current statistics for participation in AP classes: 81.3% white students, 7.1% Asian students, 3.6% African American students, and 8% Mexican American, Native American, and Puerto Rican students.

- ✧ Begin annual report of the number of students attending postsecondary institutions of education.
- ✧ Begin annual report of the number of students who complete postsecondary education or training with a degree or other significant credential.

Another measure of progress will be data that link early college experience with career guidance information so that students are prepared for successful employment in areas of economic growth in Michigan.

MICHIGAN’S PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTING ADP IMPERATIVES BY 2008

Academic Content Standards

English Language Arts and Mathematics
April 2005 – June 2007

Month	Strategy/Activity	Responsible	Product
April 2005	Establish work group structure/roles, proposed products, project representatives, budgeting detail, work plan.	MDE – Director of OSI	Overall work plan
May 2005	Identify project staff – coordinator, work group chairs.	OSI	Staff list
	Convene first meeting of core members.	OSI	
	Contact potential work group members requesting their commitment.	Chairs and Project Coordinator	List of work group members
	Identify copies of reading materials to accompany letter of invitation.	Project Coordinator	Letter & readings
	Identify work group members and submit names to project coordinator.	Chairs	Formal list of work group
	Letter of invitation from MDE/OSI to work group members – sent by chairs.	OSI (letter) Chairs Project Coordinator	Matrix

	Develop cross-walk between K – 8 GLCE, MCF, ADP, SAT/ACT, CTE 16 Career Cluster Academic Foundations, other.		
June 2005	Convene first meeting of work group members. Work groups begin to identify content expectations for Mathematics and English (9 – 12).	OSI, Chairs, Project Coordinator, work group members	Agenda Draft document
July 2005	Draft documents are submitted to project coordinator for internal MDE review. Initial graphics design. Internal review, formatting, presentation to State Board of Education for preliminary review.	OSI, Project Coordinator Project Coordinator OSI, Project Coordinator	Draft documents
August 2005	Draft documents return to work group chairs for edits. Draft documents are returned to project coordinator for web review.	Project Coordinator	
November 2005 – Mid-January 2006	Content Expectations Web/Field Review	Chairs, Project Coordinator, Work Groups	Web posting
November 2005 – February 2006	ELA and Math Course Content Expectations (CCE) – Initial development of CCE based on Content Expectations	Chairs, Project Coordinator, Work Groups	Course Content Expectations in ELA/Math first draft
January 2006	Content Expectations - National Review	Project Coordinator, OSI	Draft with edits from national reviewer
January 2006– March 2006	Development of curriculum guides and activities to increase academic rigor in CTE courses and increase career/contextual learning in academic courses using the 16 Career Clusters.	Contracted CTE Consultant	Set of curriculum guides and activities
February	Revise Content Expectations	Chairs, Project	Produce Final

	based on national review	Coordinator, Work Groups	Drafts
March 2006	High School Content Expectations Presentation to State Board of Education for approval.	OSI, Project Coordinator	Final draft documents
April 2006	Rollout and Dissemination of High School Content Expectations in ELA and Math	OSI Staff	Final Documents
April 2006	Share drafts of Course Content Expectations in ELA and Math with Board of Education	OSI, Project Coordinator	Draft documents
April 2006—June 2006	Web/Field review of Course Content Expectations in ELA and Math	Chairs, Project Coordinator, Work Groups	Web posting
April 2006 -	Dissemination activities begin. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop dissemination workshop content and format. • Identify key presenters. • Convene 2 large statewide conferences. • Convene 3 regional ISD meetings for initial roll-out. • Convene 10 regional roll-out sessions for LEA staff. • 16 Workshops around the state (one for each of the 16 Career Clusters) for academic and CTE Teachers on academic rigor and career/contextual learning. 	OSI, Project Coordinator Office of Career and Technical Preparation	Formatted content expectations documents Dissemination packet Power point CD with info
May 2006- November 2006	Development of professional learning support and companion documents to support the HSCEs	Chairs, Project Coordinator, Work Groups	Set of curriculum guides and activities
April – July 2006	Identify companion documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent’s Guide • Instructional Support • Literature guides • Update of 16 Career Clusters with revised Academic Foundations 	OSI, Project Coordinator CTE Consultants	Set of parent-friendly companion documents
August/September	Board approval of Course Content Standards in ELA and Math	OSI, Project Coordinator	Final Draft of Courses in the ELA, Math

			content areas
Fall 2006	Dissemination of Course Content Expectations	Chairs, Project Coordinator, Work Groups	Published document
Fall 2006-Spring 2007 and beyond	Develop professional learning support and companion documents to support the CCEs	Chairs, Project Coordinator, Work Groups	Set of curriculum guides and activities

Science Content Expectations Timeline *work groups responsible will be content chairs, project directors MDE staff as listed above.

Date	Timeline and Products
November 2005	Create Timeline and Scholar Team
December 2005	Assemble Scholar Team
January 2006	Course Standards Developed
February 2006	Course Standards Developed
March 2006	Small Group Review Edits
April 2006	MDE Internal Review Formatting
May 2006	State Board of Education Review Web/Public Review
June 2006	Web/Public Review
July 2006	Group Edit
August 2006	National Review
September 2006	National Review
October 2006	Group Edit with Rationale
November 2006	State Board of Education Approval
December 2006	State-wide Dissemination

Social Studies Course Content Expectations *work groups responsible will be content chairs, project directors MDE staff as listed above.

Date	Timeline and Products
May 2006	Create Timeline and Scholar Team Incorporate Comments from National Review
June 2006	Assemble Scholar Team

June—August 2006	Course Standards Developed
September 2006	Small Group Review Edits MDE Internal Review Formatting
October 2006-- November 2006	State Board of Education Review Web/Public Review
	Web/Public Review
December 2006 –February 2007	Group Edit Resubmit for National Review
March 2007	Group Edit with Rationale State Board of Education Approval
October 2007	State-wide Dissemination

Dual Enrollment/College Credit-earning Courses:

I. Expanding College Credit-Earning Opportunities

Month	Strategy/Activity	Responsible	Product/Process
December 2005— March 2006	<p>Provide research-based information on dual enrollment programs and policies.</p> <p>Assist in development of priorities for Michigan.</p> <p>Determine features that should be supported by Michigan state policy.</p> <p>Provide rationales for policies developed by Leadership team and MDE staff.</p> <p>Produce a final report for use in drafting model college credit policies for Michigan.</p>	<p>Community College Research Center (CCRC) consultants</p> <p>NGA College Credit Subcommittee</p> <p>Michigan High School Initiative Postsecondary/ Secondary Transitions Action Team</p> <p>NGA Leadership Group</p> <p>MDE Staff</p>	<p>Contract with a National Consulting Firm. (CCRC) (December, 2005)</p> <p>Form a work team subcommittee from the NGA Leadership Team. (December, 2005)</p> <p>Work with state interagency team to develop state policies removing barriers to student participation in college equivalency courses, particularly for underrepresented students.</p> <p>Design complementary policies that organize existing funding for K-12, vocational, and higher education to best support shared credit, accelerated learning, AP course taking and test taking.</p>
March--July 2006	Partner with Career and Technical Education in the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (DLEG) to enhance articulated program	<p>NGA Leadership Team College Credit Subcommittee</p> <p>Michigan High School</p>	<p>Participate with the Center for Education Performance Information planning efforts (November 2005)</p>

II. Creating Recommendations and Model Policies for College Credits

Month	Strategy/Activity	Responsible	Product/Process
March—July 2006	Create report with recommendations for state model policies and legislation needed to increase student access to college credit opportunities.	CCRC NGA Leadership Team NGA College Credit Subcommittee MHSI Postsecondary/ Secondary Transitions Action Team	Review current Michigan policies; provide research from other states; collect current data. (January 2005) Present initial report to NGA College Credit subcommittee Gather feedback and ideas. (January 25, 2005) Revise and present final report to Leadership Team. (March 15) Present recommendations to the State Board of Education for policy revisions/complementary legislation. (April 2005) Create legislation for introduction that will replace the current funding formula for dual enrollment that acts as a disincentive, with legislation that encourages college credit programs and provides incentives for collaboration

			between postsecondary and secondary institutions.
--	--	--	---

III. Increase student awareness and access to college credit courses

Month	Strategy/Activity	Responsible	Product/Process
July 2006— June 2007	<p>Identify target high priority schools.</p> <p>Create informational and companion documents to inform students and parents of college credit opportunities.</p> <p>Inform key school personnel about new state policies.</p> <p>Disseminate revised practices, policy information, and companion documents through MDE/DLEG and higher education groups.</p> <p>Develop an Advanced Placement Summer Training Institute for staff in targeted high schools.</p> <p>Provide technical assistance for schools interested in creating college credit opportunities such as dual enrollment, early/middle college, tech prep programs</p>	<p>NGA Communications subcommittee</p> <p>NGA Leadership Team</p> <p>MDE Staff</p> <p>MHSI Action Team</p> <p>CCRC</p> <p>Middle College Consortium</p>	<p>Brochures for parents and students; documents for school administrators and high school counselors.</p> <p>Dissemination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video Conference session: 10 sites • PD sessions for ISD and LEA staff materials, presentations, supplies, consultant travel • Dissemination Materials: brochures, web-site guidance • Conference Presentations Michigan Association of School Administrators, Michigan Association of School Boards, Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, Michigan Counselors

			<p>Association, etc.</p> <p>Certified Advanced Placement courses available for high school students.</p> <p>Networks, collaborative opportunities for college credit programs.</p>
--	--	--	--

Michigan's Leadership Team

Name	Title	Agency or Organization
Diane J. McMillan, Team Leader	High School Redesign Consultant	Michigan Department of Education
Sue Carnell	Education Advisor	Office of the Governor
Michael P. Flanagan	Superintendent of Public Instruction (7/5/05)	Michigan Department of Education
Dr. Jeremy M. Hughes	Chief Academic Officer/Deputy Superintendent	Michigan Department of Education
Dr. Michael A. Boulus	Executive Director	Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan
Jim Sandy	Director, Education Excellence Program	Michigan Chamber of Commerce
Rep. Herb Kehrl (deceased) Replacement pending	Representative	Michigan House of Representatives Legislator
Jim Ballard	Executive Director	Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals
Patty Cantu	Director, Office of Career and Technical Preparation	Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth
Kathleen Straus	President	State Board of Education
Dr. Ed Roeber	Director, Office of Assessment and Accountability	Michigan Department of Education

Dr. Yvonne Caamal Canul	Director, Office of School Improvement	Michigan Department of Education
Lois Doniver	Secretary – Treasurer	AFT (American Federation of Teachers) of Michigan (Formerly Michigan Federation of Teachers)
Lu Battaglieri	Executive Director	MEA (Michigan Education Association)

Other Michigan Activity

1. Michigan has set objectives for increasing the high school graduation rate to 85% in school year 2006–2007 and to 90% in 2008–2009. Graduation rates for individual high schools are reported in the Michigan School Report Card, and statewide graduation rates are reported through the State Report Card. Our data collection system is not currently capable of disaggregating the graduation information. Our goal is to produce disaggregated and more reliable data for graduation by 2007–2008.
2. Michigan is working on a plan to produce 4-year cohort high school graduation data. The Single Record Student Database contains single-year files of student data using a unique identifier for each student, but the Center for Education Performance and Information (CEPI), which houses our data, does not have a data warehouse. CEPI was awarded a federal grant to acquire the warehouse that will enable us to do longitudinal reporting. The goal is to have access to longitudinal data by school year 2007–2008. A work group is currently refining the definitions for graduate, transfer, drop out, etc. When the NGA publishes the issue brief with recommendations in July 2005, we plan to incorporate its work.
3. Michigan is committed to participating actively in the National Education Data Partnership initiative. SchoolMatters is the current incarnation of the Standard & Poor’s School Evaluation Services. Michigan and Pennsylvania were the first two states to participate in the original School Evaluation Services website and continue to do so. Michigan publishes school information on the Michigan Department of Education website and the CEPI website, and contributes to the NCES data collection annually. All of these data sources, along with a newly developed longitudinal database system, will be shared with the NGA Honor States Grant Program as required by the grant.

The Cherry Commission also recommended the development of a lifelong education tracking system to allow data sharing among all educational agencies by 2007. One of the benefits of such a system is that individual student data can be accessed by teachers to provide personalized education planning. While individual plans are not widely used now, this will be a step toward making an individual planning process more practical.

4. Aligned governance structure for P-16: Michigan has no legislatively mandated governance structure for P-16, but has used a network of education organizations to provide the opportunity for P-16 issues to be raised and collaboratively discussed. Among those networks are the Education Alliance and Michigan Business Leaders for Education Excellence. Another critical network is the 40 members of the Cherry Commission which includes university and college presidents, lawmakers, state department directors, and other individuals representing business, labor, recent college graduates, skilled trades, and K-12 education.
5. In order to build awareness and public will for high school redesign efforts, Michigan will develop a detailed communication plan containing the following activities:
 - ✧ Collaborate with outside stakeholders to reach school administrators, school boards, business leaders, teachers, and parents.
 - ✧ Produce speaking points about the latest news in high school redesign to provide local school boards with information updates at their regular meetings.
 - ✧ Work with stakeholders to solicit examples of local high school success stories that can be used with the media to highlight successes.
 - ✧ Partner with local superintendents to get out the message about promising practices that can be replicated in high schools.
 - ✧ Provide quick tips for parents and school board members about what to look for in a successful high school.
 - ✧ The Governor's 11th Annual Education Summit on March 27, 2006 will focus on High School Reform.