



Michigan's 2020-21 Benchmark Assessments

AUGUST 2021

Education Policy Innovation Collaborative

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION | MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

236 Erickson Hall, 620 Farm Lane, East Lansing, MI 48824 | (517) 884-0377 | www.EPICedpolicy.org

Section One:

Introduction

As the COVID-19 pandemic took hold in March 2020, Michigan's schools—like most others across the country—were forced to close their doors and transition to remote instruction for the remainder of the school year. While many Michigan school districts gave students the option to return to learn in person for the 2020-21 school year, an estimated 47 to 64% of students across the state started the year in a fully remote format. By the end of the school year, 22 to 42% of Michigan K-12 students were still learning remotely (Hopkins, Kilbride, & Strunk, 2021). Whether enrolled remotely or in-person full- or part-time, students experienced challenging learning conditions during the 2020-21 school year. As many across the state and country have noted, this past school year was unprecedented in the level of disruption faced by many, if not most, K-12 students.

There is mounting evidence that students across the country and around the world have missed important opportunities to learn during the pandemic. Early estimates of unfinished learning from state and national assessments suggest that students experienced much lower learning gains in 2020-21 relative to previous years. This is particularly the case for students without sufficient access to parent or teacher supports (Kuhfeld et al., 2020) and for low-income, Black, and Hispanic or Latino/a/x students (Azevedo et al., 2020; Baisley et al., 2020; West & Lake, 2021b; Dorn et al., 2020a, b; Kogan & Lavertu, 2021; Kuhfield & Tarasawa, 2020) and for those learning remotely (West & Lake, 2021b; Kogan & Lavertu, 2021; Sass & Goldring, 2021).

In order to understand student learning and progress toward educational goals during the pandemic, the Michigan legislature mandated a new data collection and reporting requirement for local school districts for the 2020-21 school year ([2020 PA 149](#)). This report is the first in a series that will be given to the governor and the senate and house standing committees responsible for education legislation in the Michigan legislature to provide insight into Michigan students' progress toward learning goals during the 2020-21 school year. The Education Policy Innovation Collaborative (EPIC) at Michigan State University prepared this report, in collaboration with the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), the Center for Educational Performance and

Information (CEPI), the Michigan Data Hub (MDH), and the Michigan Education Data Center (MEDC) at the University of Michigan as an initial summary of the student learning data collected with these new requirements.

MICHIGAN’S “RETURN TO LEARN” LEGISLATION

On August 20, 2020, Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer signed a series of three “Return to Learn” bills intended to provide districts with flexibility to adapt their programs as necessary to safely provide instruction during the pandemic ([2020 PA 147](#), [2020 PA 148](#), [2020 PA 149](#)). For the 2020-21 school year only, the state legislature waived many instructional requirements, including minimum numbers of days and hours and what learning activities count toward the attendance and enrollment calculations used to determine their state aid allocations. Along with this increased flexibility, the “Return to Learn” legislation outlined a new set of requirements for the 2020-21 school year to ensure that districts continued to adequately meet students’ needs without the same instructional requirements in place.

As a condition for receiving state aid for the year, the legislation required each district to develop an extended COVID-19 learning plan describing how it would deliver instruction and establishing educational goals for the 2020-21 school year. These educational goals were to include increased student achievement or growth as measured using one or more benchmark assessments, overall and for all subgroups of students. Districts were required to assure that they would select and administer appropriate benchmark assessments to all K-8 students at the beginning and end of the school year to determine whether students made meaningful progress toward mastery of state standards in reading and mathematics.

The “Return to Learn” legislation provided districts the option to choose one of four state-approved benchmark assessments or one or more benchmark assessments that contain progress monitoring and enhanced diagnostics in reading and/or progress monitoring in mathematics. Alternately or in addition, districts were allowed to choose a locally developed benchmark assessment that meets the same requirements. While the legislation prohibited the use of these data for accountability purposes, districts that elected to use an approved provider’s benchmark assessment were required to compile and report their results through the MDH network for use in a statewide aggregate report for the governor and the senate and house standing committees responsible for education legislation in the Michigan legislature.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

MDE and CEPI have partnered with MDH and two university research partners—EPIC at Michigan State University and MEDC at the University of Michigan—to compile the benchmark assessment data districts provided under the “Return to Learn” legislation and prepare this and the following legislatively mandated reports. The primary purpose of the reports is to assess the extent of learning Michigan students experienced during the 2020-21 school year, examine how learning differed across student groups and district types (including by instructional modality offered), and identify any “best practice districts” that sustained large and positive achievement gains during the pandemic.

This report is the first in a series that will be delivered to the governor and house and senate standing committees responsible for education legislation (see Sections 104.12 and 104.16 of MCL 388.1704 as amended by [2020 PA 149](#)). In addition to providing the number and proportion of students who scored significantly behind grade level on benchmark assessments during the 2020-21 school year, we assess the extent to which these results may be generalizable to the population of Michigan public school students. Because all benchmark assessment data were not available for analysis until August 2021, this report is necessarily limited to only basic analyses. Further reports will address the additional questions outlined in the “Return to Learn” legislation.

In the remainder of this report, we first review the available evidence from studies that assess student learning progress in other states or nationally during the pandemic. We then discuss the data and methods we use in this report. Section Four provides results from our analyses and Section Five describes the content of future reports in this series. We conclude with a brief discussion of the implications of our findings for Michigan K-12 education as we enter the 2021-22 school year.

Section Two: Background and Relevant Literature

Across the country, educators and students alike have reported that teaching and learning during the pandemic were challenging, requiring educators gain new skills and resources and necessitating that students learn in unfamiliar and often difficult circumstances (e.g., Chen et al., 2021; Ferren, 2021; Francom et al., 2021; Hamilton et al., 2020; Pitluck & Jacques, 2021). In Michigan, as well, teachers, principals, and district superintendents all reported that pandemic instruction was difficult for them and their students (Cummings et al., 2020; Hopkins, Turner, Lovitz, Kilbride, and Strunk, 2021). Survey evidence shows that Michigan educators were concerned that many students missed critical instructional time, had inadequate access to technology, lacked support for at-home learning, and received insufficient services (e.g., meals, counseling) during the 2020-21 school year. In addition, educators indicated a need for training and guidance to help them provide adequate instruction during the pandemic. These things, combined with the extramural burdens of the pandemic, have led to difficulties keeping students engaged in schoolwork, locating students, and maintaining student attendance (Cummings et al., 2020; Hopkins, Turner, Lovitz, Kilbride, and Strunk 2021b; for a review of the literature, please see West & Lake, 2021a).

It is therefore no surprise that a growing number of national and state-specific reports are showing that there were fewer opportunities for students to learn during the pandemic—both in the spring of 2020 and during the 2020-21 school year—than in a typical year. This has resulted in less—and sometimes far less—student growth on standardized achievement tests. The remainder of this section summarizes the growing literature describing the potential implications of the pandemic for unfinished learning during the 2020-21 school year.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

Early projections of the potential effect of the pandemic on student learning painted a dire picture. Using historical data from a large national sample of 3rd-8th grade students who completed NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Growth diagnostic assessment during the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years, Kuhfeld and colleagues (2020) estimated that students would return to school in fall 2020 with approximately 63 to 68% of typical learning gains in reading and 37 to 50% of typical gains in mathematics.

As the 2020-21 school year progressed and ended, more assessment data became available to test Kuhfeld et al.'s (2020) predictions, both nationally and in individual states. In a recent report, the Center on Reinventing Public Education (CRPE) detailed the overarching findings from the most rigorous of these studies. They found that, on average, elementary and middle school students began the 2020-21 school year having mastered less academic content than previous cohorts, and that learning rates were substantially slower during the 2020-21 academic year than would typically be expected. This discrepancy in learning between the 2020-21 year and previous years is estimated to be equivalent to several months of learning during a typical year. Results suggest that the disruption to student learning was greater in math than in ELA (West & Lake, 2021b).

Student Achievement at the Beginning of and During the Fall of the 2020-21 School Year

Research makes clear that students entered the 2020-21 school year with lower levels of learning mastery than in previous years. Kogan & Lavertu (2021) estimated changes in 3rd-grade achievement for students completing Ohio's Third-Grade ELA assessment in both fall 2019 and fall 2020. Overall, average ELA scores across the two testing periods dropped by 0.23 standard deviations—approximately one-third of learning gains seen in a traditional school year. Additionally, the share of students scoring "proficient" on the assessment decreased by 9 percentage points, while the share of students scoring high enough to warrant promotion to the 4th grade fell by 8 percentage points.

A preliminary analysis comparing fall-to-fall changes in ELA and mathematics scores from 18 school districts in California's CORE Data Collaborative tells a similar story. In their study, Pier et al. (2021) analyzed fall test scores for 4th-10th grade students who

took NWEA's MAP Growth or Renaissance Learning's Star 360 Assessment diagnostics to compare changes between fall 2019 and fall 2020 to prior growth rates. The authors found that growth across both tests and subjects was roughly 10 to 30% lower in both elementary and middle school grade levels compared to a typical school year.

Analyses using regionally and nationally representative datasets yield similar results. Curriculum Associates released an October 2020 report using data from 12 states across the United States to examine changes in the number of 1st-8th grade students who scored below grade level during the fall 2020 i-Ready assessment period (Curriculum Associates, 2020c). Historically, on average, 27% and 23% of tested students scored two or more grade levels below their current grade in reading and mathematics, respectively. In the fall of 2020, these shares increased to 28% in reading and 29% in mathematics—a small 1 percentage point increase in reading but a more sizable 6 percentage point increase in math. A second report from Dorn et al (2020a) also used data from Curriculum Associates to compare academic growth between fall 2019 and fall 2020 to historical trends. In their analysis, Dorn and colleagues used i-Ready mathematics and reading assessment data from 25 states and found that fall 2019 to fall 2020 mathematics and reading test score growth was 33% and 13% lower compared to a typical school year, respectively. Together these studies make clear that students entered the 2020-21 school year with less content mastery than students had in previous years.

Additional studies show that, on average, students did not “catch up” to typical learning levels during the 2020-21 school year. For instance, researchers at Georgia State University's Georgia Policy Labs analyzed low-stakes, formative assessment scores from three metro-Atlanta school districts between 2017-18 and 2020-21 (Sass & Goldring, 2021). The authors used pre-pandemic achievement trends to predict 2020-21 student achievement in the absence of COVID-19 shutdowns, then compared these projections to actual scores from assessments completed in the fall and winter of 2020-21. By the winter of 2020-21, observed achievement in both elementary and middle school grades lagged predictions by as much as 7 months in both mathematics and ELA.

Similarly, at the national level, research suggests that by winter 2021, students were not achieving at levels comparable to a typical school year. For example, Amplify Education compared matched early literacy diagnostic test scores from middle-of-school-year DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) assessments for approximately 400,000 students across 41 states. They found that the share of kindergarten and 1st grade students considered “at-risk” increased by approximately 65% between the 2019-20 and 2020-21 school years, from 28 to 47% and 26 to 43% kindergarten and 1st grade, respectively (Amplify Education, 2021).

Heterogeneity in the Effects of the Pandemic on Student Learning

There are myriad reasons for this interrupted rate of learning during the pandemic, ranging from the massive toll the pandemic took on educators' and students' emotional and physical health, disruptions to learning, shifts to remote or hybrid instruction, and other extramural elements of the pandemic itself. The CRPE report (West & Lake, 2021b) highlights that, on average, students received much less in-person instruction than in a typical school year, with many—and often the most traditionally underserved students—receiving little or no in-person instruction at all. This resulted in reduced learning time, and in some cases, lower quality instruction.

This last point is critical for any understanding of the effects of the pandemic on student learning. While average measures of interrupted learning are themselves quite concerning, it is clear from the research CRPE (West & Lake, 2021a, b) reviewed that the effects of COVID-19 on students varied across student populations and the pandemic has had a greater, negative effect on achievement and achievement growth for specific student groups. In particular, economically disadvantaged, Black and Hispanic or Latino/a/x students, and English learners exhibited lower learning gains during the 2020-21 school year than did their more advantaged and White peers (Amplify Education, 2021; Dorn et al., 2020a; Kogan & Lavertu, 2021; Pier et al., 2021; Sass & Goldring, 2021).

There was variation in learning gains across grade levels, as well. Most studies show that students in earlier grades experienced the largest drops in test scores and were more likely to score well below grade level (Amplify Education, 2021; Curriculum Associates, 2020c; Pier et al., 2021). In contrast, however, Dorn et al. (2020a) found that fall-to-fall mathematics growth for students in the earliest grade levels was nearly consistent with historical trends and academic declines were larger for older students.

Pandemic effects also varied across districts. Studies from Ohio, Georgia, and California showed that the variation in learning rates between districts widened during the pandemic, with student progress on standardized achievement tests in some districts relatively unaffected by the pandemic while other districts experienced steep declines in achievement growth (Kogan & Lavertu, 2021; Pier et al., 2021; Sass & Goldring, 2021).

Importantly, some of this variation may be explained by the instructional modality districts used or students selected; students who received more in-person instruction learned more during the 2020-21 school year (West & Lake, 2021b). For instance, Kogan & Lavertu (2021) show that test score declines in Ohio were more pronounced

in districts that began the academic year offering fully remote instruction compared to those using hybrid or in-person learning. Similarly, in the three metro-Atlanta districts Sass and Goldring (2021) studied, students who received in-person instruction during the fall 2020 semester generally experienced more academic growth per instructional day compared to students learning primarily in a remote setting. Specifically, math and reading achievement growth per instructional day was approximately 10 to 100% higher for elementary students who received in-person instruction for 50 to 70% of their instructional days compared to students in the same grade levels who received remote instruction 90 to 100% of the time.

Student Achievement at the End of the 2020-21 School Year

As end-of-year assessment data have become available, there is growing evidence that confirms the predictions of unfinished learning based on fall and mid-year assessments. In fact, growth may have slowed further during the spring semester. Two studies used national assessment data from NWEA and Curriculum Associates to analyze learning growth over the course of the 2020-21 school year (Curriculum Associates, 2021; Lewis et al., 2021). Importantly, both studies show that students across most grade levels made mathematics and reading gains in the spring semester. However, achievement continued to fall below historical performance trends. These declines appeared to be most dramatic in math, at least according to NWEA MAP Growth Assessment. Compared to spring 2019 achievement levels, median mathematics and reading achievement on the spring 2021 NWEA MAP Growth Assessment was 8-12 (math) and 3-6 (reading) percentile points below previous spring achievement levels. Similarly, comparing spring 2021 i-Ready mathematics and reading scores to historical trends, the percentage of students who were ready for grade-level work this spring dropped 5-12 (math) and 2-13 (reading) percentage points relative to a typical year.

Both reports also confirmed earlier findings of significant differences across grade levels, with the largest decreases in grade-level proficiency occurring in the earliest grades. Mathematics and reading achievement on spring 2021 MAP Growth Assessment dropped 11-12 (math) and 5-6 (reading) percentile points for students in 3rd-5th grade, while students in 6th-8th grade experienced decreases of 8-9 (math) and 3-4 (reading) percentage points. For elementary i-Ready mathematics and reading scores, reductions in the percentage of students ready for grade-level work were roughly twice as large as similar drops in middle school grade levels.

Finally, corroborating evidence from earlier in the school year, NWEA and Curriculum Associates both found significant heterogeneity in spring 2021 scores across student groups. Across both MAP Growth tests, decreases in median test scores were larger for Hispanic or Latino/a/x, Black, and American Indian and Alaskan Native students compared to White or Asian American test scores across all grade levels. Similarly, fewer students in schools serving mostly Black, Hispanic or Latino/a/x, low-income students were considered “on grade-level” compared to schools with mostly White or high-income students.

CAVEATS

It is important to make clear certain caveats about this research. Across the country and in Michigan, we know that fewer students enrolled in school and that absenteeism was up during the 2020-21 school year (Belsha, 2021; Cavitt, 2021; Levin, 2021; Mahnken, 2021; Pendharkar, 2021). This translates into lower-than-usual participation in assessments, adding to the difficulty of drawing clear conclusions about student performance during the pandemic (Fensterwald, 2020; Sawchuk, 2021). Moreover, participation rates vary by student demographics and district type, as we discuss in detail for the Michigan context in Section Three of the report. The result of lower and differential participation is that estimates of learning growth during the 2020-21 school year are likely rosier than the true reality (Dhillon, 2021; The Hunt Institute, 2021). In particular, students disproportionately affected by the pandemic may comprise a substantial portion of the missing student assessment data, contributing to inequitable learning experiences across the country (Barnum, 2021).

Section Three:

Data and Methods

Each year, millions of K-12 students across the country participate in benchmark assessments. Benchmark assessments are designed to help educators and administrators track students' progress toward grade-level standards and learning goals, and to provide feedback to help drive future instruction. In Michigan, districts were required to administer benchmark assessments to all K-8 students at both the beginning and end of the 2020-21 school year ([2020 PA 149](#)).

Based on requirements laid out in the legislation, MDE approved four benchmark providers for districts to use and allowed them to use a different assessment(s) or create their own local benchmark assessment if it contained the appropriate progress monitoring and/or enhanced diagnostic assessments for reading and mathematics. In this section, we describe the unique characteristics of each MDE-approved benchmark assessment, identify and compare the Michigan school districts that chose to offer each assessment and those that chose to offer their own assessment, discuss implications of assessment choice and method of providing the data for the population examined in this report, and explain how we analyze test scores from each vendor to determine the number and share of Michigan students that scored “significantly below grade level” during the 2020-21 school year.

MDE-APPROVED BENCHMARK ASSESSMENTS

MDE was tasked with approving four to five assessment providers, subject to several criteria outlined in the “Return to Learn” legislation ([2020 PA 149](#)). Each assessment must:

- be commonly administered in Michigan;
- be aligned to Michigan’s content standards;
- complement the state’s summative assessment system;
- be internet-delivered and include a standards-based assessment using a computer-adaptive model to target the instructional level of each pupil;

- provide information on pupil achievement with regard to learning content required in a given year or grade span;
- provide immediate feedback to pupils and teachers;
- be nationally normed;
- provide multiple measures of growth; and
- provide for multiple testing opportunities.

The four benchmark assessment providers MDE approved are NWEA, Curriculum Associates, Renaissance Learning, and Data Recognition Corporation (DRC). Each of these providers issued a transparency statement and other documentation verifying that their assessments satisfy the required criteria.

NWEA: MAP Growth

NWEA's MAP Growth Math and Reading assessments are online, computer-adaptive tests constructed to measure and track academic growth for all K-12 students. These tests are typically administered three times per year (fall, winter, and spring). Each assessment is aligned to the Michigan Academic Standards (MAS) in mathematics and ELA and provides a strong indicator of student performance on the Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) (NWEA, 2020a).

According to the NWEA's MAP Growth webpage, MAP Growth Math and Reading assessments each include between 40 and 53 questions and most students take less than an hour to complete each test. The MAP Growth assessments for K-2 contain fewer questions (43), and typically take less time to complete (40 minutes across two 20-minute testing sessions; NWEA, n.d., 2020b). The MAP Growth Math assessment instructional areas include numbers and operations, measurement and data, operations and algebraic thinking, and geometry. The MAP Growth Reading assessment includes four subsections, testing a students' skill in "meaning and context" and "language, craft, and structure" for both informational and literary text. The size of the test bank for each assessment is updated regularly to reflect changes in Michigan's content standards and large enough to allow for students to be tested up to four times each academic year without presenting the same test item to a student more than once in a two-year period (NWEA, 2020c).

Curriculum Associates: i-Ready

Curriculum Associates offers the i-Ready Mathematics and Reading Diagnostic assessments that draw from a bank of approximately 5,800 test items built on college- and career-ready standards and aligned with MAS. These online, computer-adaptive

assessments are available for all K-12 students (Curriculum Associates, 2020b). The i-Ready Diagnostics are strongly correlated with the M-STEP; a large-scale study Curriculum Associates conducted found an average correlation of .89 in mathematics and .83 in reading/ELA when comparing i-Ready and 2017 M-STEP outcomes (Curriculum Associates, 2020a).

The i-Ready Mathematics assessment tests skills in numbers and operations, algebra and algebraic thinking, measurement and data, and geometry. According to Curriculum Associates i-Ready Technical Manual, the K-8 math diagnostics consist of 66 to 72 questions, where students are presented 14 to 20 questions across each of the content areas. The i-Ready Reading assessment tests students' knowledge in phonics, phonological awareness, high-frequency words, vocabulary, and two unique reading comprehension topics (informative text and literature). The length of each i-Ready Reading assessment varies by grade level. The assessment for K-2 students consists of 72 to 81 questions equally distributed across all six content areas.¹ For students in 3rd-8th grade, the reading diagnostic contains 78 to 87 total items, beginning with 54 questions in vocabulary and both reading comprehension content areas and ending with 24 items focusing on phonetics and high-frequency words (Curriculum Associates, 2018).²

Renaissance Learning: Star 360

Renaissance Learning's Star Mathematics, Reading, and Early Literacy assessments are all computer-adaptive tests that help monitor student progress toward college- and career-ready standards. Star Mathematics is designed for students in 1st-12th grade, while the Early Literacy and Reading assessments are meant for students in grades K-3 and K-12, respectively. These assessments are still available to students in other grade levels, however, students will receive percentile ranks only for assessments that are normed for their grade level (Renaissance Learning, 2020a, b).

According to Renaissance Learning's technical manuals for the mathematics and reading assessments, all three of these assessments are fixed-length tests consisting of 27 questions for Early Literacy or 34 questions for both Mathematics and Reading. On average, each assessment can be completed in less than 25 minutes.³ Each assessment draws on a large item bank that allows for multiple administrations without the risk of repetition or overexposure on specific items. The mathematics diagnostic bank is approximately 6,200 questions and these items test students in numbers and operations, algebra, geometry and measurement, data analyses, statistics, and probability. The bank of reading questions is approximately 6,600 items and these items test student ability in word knowledge and skills, comprehension strategies and constructing meaning, analyzing literary text, understanding the

author's craft, and analyzing argument and evaluating text. Finally, the Early Literacy assessment (also referred to as the Early Literacy and Numeracy assessment), which draws from the smallest bank of test items (3,400), is designed to assess students in three broad domains (i.e., word knowledge and skills, comprehension strategies and constructing meaning, and numbers and operations) throughout their early growth period (Renaissance Learning, 2021a, b).

DRC: Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments and MDE Benchmark Assessments

Finally, DRC's Smarter Balanced Math and ELA Interim Assessments were selected as the no-cost option referenced in the "Return to Learn" legislation ([2020 PA 149](#)). Each assessment is aligned to the Common Core State Standards in mathematics and ELA and is designed for students in 3rd-12th grade (DRC, 2020). The Interim Comprehensive Assessments (ICAs) are designed to measure a broad set of content and standards similar to the M-STEP (which is based on the Smarter Balanced end-of-year summative assessment). According to DRC's Smarter Balanced Interpretive Guide, each ICA is a fixed-form test requiring approximately three to four hours to complete (DRC, 2021).

Although the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments are not available for grades K-2, MDE is providing the Michigan Early Literacy and Mathematics Benchmark Assessments (also referred to as the "K-2s") at no cost to districts, as has been the case since 2017 (MDE, 2020b). These short, "game-like" benchmark assessments MDE developed are offered three times per year and are fully aligned with MAS and the M-STEP. The fall administration is intended to measure baseline knowledge on the content students will learn throughout the year, while the winter and spring tests monitor progress and learning throughout the school year. Each assessment is untimed and completed during two administration periods, both of which take less than 45 minutes to complete. The early literacy assessment covers five content domains: reading—literary text, reading—informational text, reading—foundational skills, writing, and language. The mathematics assessment covers four domains for 1st-2nd grade: operations and algebraic thinking, number and operations in base ten, measurement and data, and geometry, along with a fifth domain for kindergarten only: counting and cardinality. Once students complete an assessment, results are available to schools within 48 hours (MDE, 2020a, b, c).

BENCHMARK ASSESSMENT DATA

Under the "Return to Learn" law, districts must administer either a benchmark assessment from the MDE-approved provider list, an assessment that provides

progress monitoring, or a local benchmark assessment to all K-8 students at the beginning and end of the 2020-21 school year. Districts that chose an assessment from one of the four approved providers were required to provide aggregate data regarding the results of these assessments through the MDH no later than June 30, 2021. The MDH is designed to collect student-level data, and districts were encouraged to submit student-level data rather than aggregating the data themselves. Doing so allows MEDC and EPIC to complete all necessary aggregations in a consistent manner across districts, while still ensuring that MDE and CEPI do not access any individual student-level data, as stipulated in the “Return to Learn” law ([2020 PA 149](#)).

Of the 848 Michigan school districts that serve students in grades K-8, 748 opted to use an MDE-approved benchmark assessment and 654 submitted benchmark data through MDH for the purpose of this report. These districts educate 840,078 K-8 students (87% of all Michigan K-8 students). We provide details on vendor use and submission below.

Definitions of “Significantly Behind Grade Level”

The “Return to Learn” legislation requires MDE to identify the number and percentage of students in the state who are “significantly behind grade level” ([2020 PA 149](#)). Typically, cut-scores for determining whether a student is above or below a particular performance level are determined through a formal standard-setting process involving a carefully selected and trained panel of educators, curriculum specialists, and other stakeholders. However, because the legislation affords so much flexibility to districts to select an assessment that meets the needs of their students, this process would need to be repeated for each combination of an assessment provider, grade level, and subject area (more than 70 instances in total) to establish cut scores for “significantly behind grade level” that are comparable across all assessments. This simply was not feasible given the amount of time and resources provided under the legislation.

In lieu of a formal standard-setting procedure, MDE and EPIC consulted with each of the assessment providers about the existing metrics, cut scores, and performance levels that have already been established for each assessment. We then asked each provider to recommend the specific metrics, cut scores, or performance levels that are most appropriate for identifying students who are “significantly behind grade level,” based on their own expertise of a particular assessment. We consider these definitions to be the best available proxies for formally established standards for “significantly behind grade level.” However, these proxies may not align perfectly with the cut scores that a standard-setting committee would have selected.

It is also important to note that the recommended definitions from different assessment providers have substantively different meanings and interpretations. For this reason, we analyze data from each provider separately, and do not assume that students who are classified as “significantly behind grade level” using one assessment would receive the same classification using a different assessment.

NWEA recommended that we use the MAP Growth score thresholds from their Michigan-specific linking study (which used test scores from assessments completed before the onset of the pandemic) for students who are projected to fall within the “Not Proficient” category on the M-STEP assessment at the end of the year (NWEA, 2020a).⁴ The scale score ranges corresponding to each projected M-STEP performance level are different for the fall and spring, as students have not yet received most of their instruction for the year when they complete their fall MAP Growth assessments. Because M-STEP testing begins in grade 3, these projections are only available for 2nd-8th grade. For grades K-1, NWEA recommended using their universal screening benchmarks, which establish the 30th percentile as the cut score for identifying students who “have severe learning difficulties and may need intensive intervention” (He & Meyer, 2021).

Curriculum Associates recommended that we use the score ranges from their grade placement tables to identify students who are two or more grade levels below their chronological grade. For instance, an 8th grade student would be classified as “significantly behind grade level” if their i-Ready scale score places them at or below the 6th grade level. The lowest possible grade placement is “emerging kindergarten,” which is considered one grade level below kindergarten. Thus, there is no way to identify whether a kindergarten student is “two or more grades below,” as there is only one possible level below their chronological grade. Instead, we use the emerging kindergarten category to identify kindergarten students who are “significantly behind grade level” (Curriculum Associates, 2018).

Renaissance Learning’s recommendation was to use their existing benchmark for the Star 360 assessments for students who are performing below grade-level expectations, based on their percentile ranks relative to the norming sample for the appropriate grade level and subject area.⁵ Renaissance Learning refers to this as the “intervention” or “at risk” level. Students in the lowest quartile of achievement relative to the norming sample (i.e., with percentile ranks of 24 or below) are placed in this level; the cut score is the same across the Star Mathematics, Reading, and Early Literacy assessments, and across all tested grade levels (Renaissance Learning, 2021a, b).

DRC recommended that we use the lowest of the four achievement level categories established for the Smarter Balanced ICA assessments (Level 1: “Did not meet standard”)

as a proxy for “significantly behind grade level” for 3rd-8th grade (DRC, 2021). Prior to our request, there were no existing score thresholds set for the MDE K-2 Early Literacy and Mathematics Benchmark Assessments that would be appropriate proxies for a “significantly behind grade level” standard, and DRC established a new set of cut scores for “significantly behind grade level” for each of these early grades and both subjects. We use these thresholds to identify K-2 students who are “significantly behind grade level” on the K-2 Early Literacy and Mathematics Benchmark Assessments.

These definitions differ across vendors in a few fundamental ways. For the Renaissance Learning Star 360 and K-1 NWEA MAP Growth assessments, the performance standards for “significantly behind grade level” are norm-referenced, meaning that they are based on how students performed in relation to other students from across the U.S. before the pandemic. For these assessments, the cut scores for “significantly behind grade level” are set at a fixed percentile rank (the 24th and 30th percentiles for Star 360 and MAP Growth, respectively). This implies that 24% and 30% of students from the nationally representative norming samples, prior to COVID, scored below the thresholds for “significantly behind grade level” (NWEA, 2020a; Renaissance Learning, 2021a,b). We use these as reference points for determining whether Michigan students who completed these same assessments in 2020-21 are more likely, equally likely, or less likely to be classified as “significantly behind grade level,” relative to the pre-COVID norming sample.

The recommended thresholds for NWEA MAP Growth (2nd-8th grade), Curriculum Associates i-Ready, DRC Smarter Balanced ICA, and the K-2 Early Literacy and Mathematics Benchmark Assessments, on the other hand, are criterion-referenced, meaning that they are based on how the content knowledge or skill level that a student demonstrates on the assessment compares to standards regarding what students in a particular grade level are expected to know or be able to do. For these assessments, we compare the percentages of students classified as “significantly behind grade level” in the fall and spring to determine whether students who were behind in the fall have progressed toward reaching a particular performance criterion.

Importantly for how the results are interpreted, the performance standards for NWEA MAP Growth are based on *predictions* to project students’ future performance on the M-STEP, while the standards for the other three assessments are based on students’ current performance at the time they are tested. Projections based on fall benchmark assessment scores consider the fact that students had not yet received most of their instruction for the year. Thus, these projections indicate whether students are *on-track* to reach a particular performance criterion by the end of the year, not necessarily whether they already reached the criterion at the time they were tested.

Moreover, the “significantly behind grade level” definitions for NWEA MAP Growth (2nd-8th grade) and MDE’s K-2 Early Literacy and Mathematics Assessments are the only ones that are specific to Michigan, as opposed to thresholds that are used across states. All these differences underscore the importance of analyzing and interpreting the performance data for each assessment separately.

The specific scale score or percentile rank cut scores used to identify students who are “significantly behind grade level” for each assessment provider, subject, and grade level can be found in Table A.1 in the appendix.

DATA AGGREGATION AND ANALYSIS

Before aggregating the student-level benchmark assessment data provided through the MDH, we restricted the sample in several ways. First, we excluded any data from districts that are not required to report data under the “Return to Learn” legislation, students who are not in grades K-8, results from assessments in subject areas other than math and ELA, and results from assessments that are not normed for the grade level of the assessed student (i.e., Star Early Literacy assessments taken by students above grade 3 and Star Math assessments taken by students in kindergarten).

To ensure that comparisons of assessment results from the fall and spring reflect changes in student performance as opposed to changes in the populations of students tested, we further restricted the sample to students who participated in comparable benchmark assessments in both the fall and spring. Since the analysis must take place at the district aggregate-level, students could only be included if the same district administered their fall and spring assessments.

In the event that a student completed the same assessment in the same district more than once in the fall or spring, only their first-reported fall test and last-reported spring test were included in the analysis; this ensures that fall tests represent performance from as close as possible to the beginning of the school year and that spring tests represent performance from as close as possible to the end of the school year. In the rare event that a student was given assessments for more than one grade level, we used the fall 2020 data from the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) to identify the grade level in which the student is enrolled, and we included assessments for only this grade level in the analysis. This process ensures that no student is counted more than once in aggregate calculations for a single district for the same assessment. However, in rare cases, students are included in calculations for more than one district if they participated in comparable assessments in both the fall and spring in more than one district.⁶

Next, we constructed binary indicators to identify students as “significantly behind grade level” in each subject and time period based on the definition and cut scores each assessment provider recommended. To construct the aggregate data file used for the analysis, we calculated the counts of non-missing values, sums, and averages of these indicators across all students in the same district and grade level who completed an assessment from the same provider, to arrive at the total number of students tested, total number of students classified as “significantly behind grade level,” and percent of tested students classified as “significantly behind grade level,” respectively. We then combined the resulting district-level aggregate dataset with data from individual districts that constructed their own aggregate data files and provided these in a format consistent with ours in lieu of submitting student level data through the MDH (described in greater detail below).

To summarize results across the state, we then calculated the total number of students tested and total number of students classified as “significantly behind grade level” across all districts that provided the same assessment to the same grade level. Finally, we divided the total number of students “significantly behind grade level” by the total number of students tested to arrive at a statewide percentage for each grade level, subject, and assessment provider.

Analytic Sample

Under the “Return to Learn” legislation, Michigan school districts that were open and serving K-8 students throughout the 2020-21 school year were expected to submit benchmark assessment data in some form. For this analysis, we identified districts of interest as those with open dates prior to the official fall student count date (October 7th, 2020), that remained open as of June 1st, 2021, and that served students in at least one grade level within the K-8 range. The analysis that follows is representative of 629 of the 848 Michigan school districts that meet all these criteria. The remaining 219 districts could not be included for a variety of reasons described throughout the remainder of this subsection.

The “Return to Learn” legislation specifies a few options for districts as alternatives to the four approved benchmark assessment providers. Districts that chose an alternative option were not required to provide data to the MDH, but rather to complete a survey through the Grant Electronic Monitoring System/Michigan Administrative Review System (GEMS/MARS; [2020 PA 149](#)). Appendix Table A.2 outlines which districts selected each vendor and whether their data were provided and used in this report. (Districts are classified based on the data submitted to MDH and provided to EPIC by 3pm on August 16th, 2021.) Further, Table 3.1 details all the following sample exclusions. One hundred and twenty districts selected an alternate

vendor or locally developed assessment and submitted data through GEMS/MARS, while another 18 indicated on a survey at the beginning of the year that they did not plan to submit any benchmark assessment data.⁷ An additional 13 districts could not be included in the analysis because they did not provide the necessary authorization for MEDC and EPIC to access their data in the MDH for the purpose of this report. Forty-three districts authorized MEDC and EPIC to access their data, however, they had not uploaded any data into MDH at the time of the analysis (in mid-August 2021).

The remaining 654 districts provided some form of benchmark assessment data. Of these, 21 opted to create their own aggregate data files rather than submit student-level data through MDH. However, 19 of these districts did not include all the information necessary for the analysis. One district provided student-level data, however, the assessment records from the district were for high school students, and the analysis is limited to grades K-8 only. Five districts provided data for K-8 students, but only for one assessment period (fall or spring) and could not be included as a result. Finally, one district submitted data to MDH in a format that could not be integrated into the analysis in time for the report. The remaining 629 districts (627 that provided student-level data and 2 that provided aggregate files) are represented in the analysis. These districts teach 79% of the population of K-8 students in Michigan.

Further, only a subset of students enrolled in these districts are represented in the analysis. To ensure that our analysis captures changes in students' performance from fall to spring rather than changes in test participation rates, students are only included in the analysis if they were tested in both the fall and the spring using an assessment from the same provider for the same content area and grade level. In total, 58,386 students could not be included because their districts only provided data from one assessment (fall or spring) for them. Because the legislation requires us to conduct the analysis using district-level aggregate data rather than student-level data, we further restricted the analytic sample to students whose fall and spring tests were administered by the same district. This ensures that differences between aggregate measures from the fall and spring represent changes in performance across a consistent set of students, and do not capture changes in average performance due to student mobility between districts. Omitted from the analysis were 3,367 students who were tested in different districts in the fall and spring.

After completing the exclusions listed above, 629 total districts and 590,819 students (61% of all Michigan K-8 students) are included in the final analytic sample for this report. This group of districts includes 519 using NWEA's MAP Growth, 45 using Curriculum Associates' i-Ready assessments, 64 using Renaissance Learning's Star 360 assessments, and 23 using DRC's ICA and MDE's K-2s. Twenty-two districts administered assessments from two different providers.

**TABLE 3.1. Michigan K-8 District and Student Coverage
by Analytic Sample Exclusion**

Exclusions	N Districts	% Districts	N Students	% Students
All Districts	848	100.0	967,066	100.0
GEMS/MARS only	120	14.2	92,901	9.6
Planned not to report	18	2.1	2,509	0.3
No data authorization	13	1.5	7,590	0.8
Signed authorization, no data	43	5.1	23,988	2.5
Subtotal	654	77.1	840,078	86.8
Insufficient aggregate data	19	2.2	70,044	7.2
Technical issue with file format	1	0.1	412	<0.1
Insufficient student-level data	5	0.6	3,071	0.3
Enrollment for Sample Districts	629	74.2	766,551	79.3
No student data submitted	0	0	113,979	11.8
Data for only one assessment	0	0	58,386	6.0
Tested in multiple districts	0	0	3,367	0.3
Analytic Sample	629	74.2	590,819	61.1

Notes: Districts are classified based on the data submitted to MDH and provided to EPIC by 3pm on August 16th, 2021. "GEMS/MARS only" includes districts that administered a local assessment not accepted by MDH. Districts that did not administer one of the four MDE-approved benchmark assessments were required to report the local benchmark assessment(s) to both the MDE and CEPI (2020 PA 149). "Planned not to report" includes districts that did not intend to submit benchmark data to MDH or provide local assessment information in GEMS/MARS (e.g. eight of these districts are ISDs, which typically operate only a small number of specialized schools and programs; another two are virtual-only charter schools). "No data authorization" includes districts that did not sign a data-use agreement for EPIC and MEDC to analyze their assessment data. "Signed authorization, no data" includes districts that signed a data-use agreement but did not submit benchmark assessment data to MDH. "Insufficient aggregates" includes districts that created their own district-level aggregate achievement measures but did not provide enough information to be included in the analysis (e.g. districts failed to provide counts of students scoring in each proficiency level). "Technical issue with file format" includes one district that submitted data to MDH in a format that could not be integrated into the analysis in time for the report. "Insufficient fall/spring K-8" includes districts that failed to report assessment data for both fall and spring testing periods or K-8 grade levels. Sources: Benchmark assessment data submitted by districts directly to the Michigan Data Hub, survey responses from districts that chose to use local benchmark assessments (submitted through GEMS/MARS), summary data from the Michigan Data Hub regarding which districts provided authorization for EPIC to access their benchmark assessment data, and district responses to an initial survey from the Michigan Data Hub about the assessments they intended to use and data they intended to report to fulfill requirements of the "Return to Learn" legislation.

To understand how students in benchmark districts compare to the full population of Michigan K-8 students, Tables 3.2 through 3.5 present average, district-level student characteristics for four different groups of students: the full population of Michigan K-8 students, all K-8 students in a benchmark assessment district, all K-8 students in a

benchmark assessment district that participated in testing, and all students included in either the mathematics or reading/ELA analytic samples. Student characteristics for all four groups are reported separately by assessment provider.

As seen in the first column of Table 3.2, across the entire state, most K-8 students are either White or Black. More than half of Michigan's K-8 students are economically disadvantaged, and approximately a quarter are eligible for special education or English learner services. Only a small percentage of Michigan K-8 students are migrants, homeless, or have a family connection to the military. In general, the student populations in MAP Growth districts are relatively similar to the full population of K8 students, which is not surprising given that these districts educate nearly 60% of all Michigan K-8 students. However, the average MAP Growth district has slightly more Black students and educates fewer students eligible for special education services compared to the state as a whole. Once we look within these districts at students that participated in testing in either the fall or spring, or were included in the analytic samples, we see that for MAP Growth districts in particular, Black, economically disadvantaged, students eligible for special education services, and homeless students were all less likely to participate in testing or to be included in the analytic sample relative to their White and advantaged peers and to students who are not eligible for special education services.

TABLE 3.2. Summary Statistics of K-8 Students in All Michigan Districts and MAP Growth Assessment Districts				
Demographics (%)	All MI	All Enrolled in MAP Growth Districts	Tested at Least Once	Analytic Sample
Female	47.4	48.2	49.0	49.0
Asian	1.8	1.8	2.8	2.9
Black	19.0	21.0	16.9	16.0
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	7.4	7.8	8.3	8.2
White	65.4	63.0	66.1	67.3
Econ. disadvantaged	62.2	62.4	52.8	51.0
Special education	18.6	14.7	12.3	12.0
English learner	4.7	4.9	6.6	6.7
Migrant	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1
Homeless	2.1	2.1	1.3	1.1
Military connected	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.6
<i>N</i> students	967,066	571,642	491,318	443,645
% of all MI K-8 students	100.0	59.1	50.8	45.9

Notes: The "All MI" column includes the full population of K-8 students across Michigan. The "All MAP Growth" column includes all students who attend a district that offered the MAP Growth benchmark assessment in the 2020-21 school year. The "Tested" column includes all students who both attended

a district offering MAP Growth assessments and participated in benchmark testing during at least one semester. The “Analytic Sample” column includes students who were tested in both the fall and the spring using an assessment from the same provider for the same content area and grade level. Sources: School districts submitted information regarding the assessment offered directly to the Michigan Data Hub. These data were provided to EPIC through a collaboration between EPIC, MEDC, and MDE. Student enrollment data is from the Michigan Student Data System.

Table 3.3 shows that i-Ready districts are less representative of the full population of K-8 students than MAP growth districts. Specifically, i-Ready districts serve a larger proportion of Asian and Black students, as well as English learners. Again, the racial composition of tested students in i-Ready districts, including those in the analytic sample, skews further from the full population of Michigan K-8 students; students in this group are considerably more likely to be Asian, Black, or Hispanic or Latino/a/x relative to the rest of the state. Additionally, students who participated in benchmark testing were less likely to be economically disadvantaged or eligible for special education services.

TABLE 3.3. Summary Statistics of K-8 Students in All Michigan Districts and i-Ready Assessment Districts				
Demographics (%)	All MI	All Enrolled in i-Ready Districts	Tested at Least Once	Analytic Sample
Female	47.4	48.3	49.0	49.0
Asian	1.8	3.2	5.5	5.7
Black	19.0	24.6	36.9	36.8
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	7.4	6.4	9.4	9.5
White	65.4	61.3	44.5	44.4
Econ. disadvantaged	62.2	59.2	59.6	58.8
Special education	18.6	13.0	11.8	11.6
English learner	4.7	6.7	10.2	10.5
Migrant	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Homeless	2.1	2.0	1.4	1.3
Military connected	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.3
N Students	967,066	129,106	110,572	104,123
% of all MI K-8 students	100.0	13.4	11.4	10.8

Notes: The “All MI” column includes the full population of K-8 students across Michigan. The “All i-Ready” column includes all students who attend a district that offered the i-Ready benchmark assessments in the 2020-21 school year. The “Tested” column includes all students who both attended a district offering i-Ready assessments and participated in benchmark testing during at least one semester. The “Analytic Sample” column includes students who were tested in both the fall and the spring using an assessment from the same provider for the same content area and grade level. Sources: School districts submitted information regarding the assessment offered directly to the Michigan Data Hub. These data were provided to EPIC through a collaboration between EPIC, MEDC, and MDE. Student enrollment data is from the Michigan Student Data System.

Compared to the rest of the state, including MAP Growth and i-Ready districts, students who participated in benchmark testing and were educated in Star 360 and ICA/K-2 districts are overwhelmingly White and the least likely to be economically disadvantaged (shown in Tables 3.4 and 3.5). A considerably smaller share of these students are also eligible for special education or English learner services compared to the full population of Michigan K-8.

TABLE 3.4. Summary Statistics of K-8 Students in All Michigan Districts and Star 360 Growth Assessment Districts				
Demographics (%)	All MI	All Enrolled in Star 360 Districts	Tested at Least Once	Analytic Sample
Female	47.4	46.7	48.7	48.9
Asian	1.8	0.6	1.3	1.4
Black	19.0	3.5	5.2	5.0
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	7.4	8.0	9.7	9.1
White	65.4	81.8	78.0	78.9
Econ. disadvantaged	62.2	56.3	49.8	47.3
Special education	18.6	17.1	13.0	12.6
English learner	4.7	2.6	3.8	2.8
Migrant	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Homeless	2.1	2.1	1.0	0.8
Military connected	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
<i>N</i> students	967,066	69,486	49,311	40,409
% of all MI K-8 students	100.0	7.2	5.1	4.2

Notes: The "All MI" column includes the full population of K-8 students across Michigan. The "All Star 360" column includes all students who attend a district that offered the Star 360 benchmark assessments in the 2020-21 school year. The "Tested" column includes all students who both attended a district offering Star 360 assessments and participated in benchmark testing during at least one semester. The "Analytic Sample" column includes students who were tested in both the fall and the spring using an assessment from the same provider for the same content area and grade level. Sources: School districts submitted information regarding the assessment offered directly to the Michigan Data Hub. These data were provided to EPIC through a collaboration between EPIC, MEDC, and MDE. Student enrollment data is from the Michigan Student Data System.

TABLE 3.5. Summary Statistics of K-8 Students in All Michigan Districts and ICA/K-2 Growth Assessment Districts

Demographics (%)	All MI	All Enrolled in ICA/K-2 Districts	Tested at Least Once	Analytic Sample
Female	47.4	49.5	48.1	48.1
Asian	1.8	0.3	0.3	0.4
Black	19.0	0.8	0.6	0.6
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	7.4	3.0	3.9	3.7
White	65.4	88.8	89.6	90.0
Econ. disadvantaged	62.2	54.8	39.0	36.5
Special education	18.6	14.2	11.0	10.6
English learner	4.7	1.9	1.0	1.0
Migrant	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Homeless	2.1	4.4	1.7	1.4
Military connected	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1
N students	967,066	14,874	8,444	7,275
% of all MI K-8 students	100.0	1.5	0.8	0.8

Notes: The “All MI” column includes the full population of K-8 students across Michigan. The “All ICA/K-2” column includes all students who attend a district that offered the ICA/K-2 benchmark assessments in the 2020-21 school year. The “Tested” column includes all students who both attended a district offering ICA/K-2 assessments and participated in benchmark testing during at least one semester. The “Analytic Sample” column includes students who were tested in both the fall and the spring using an assessment from the same provider for the same content area and grade level. Sources: School districts submitted information regarding the assessment offered directly to the Michigan Data Hub. These data were provided to EPIC through a collaboration between EPIC, MEDC, and MDE. Student enrollment data is from the Michigan Student Data System.

IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERPRETING RESULTS

The differences between the four assessment providers and their respective definitions of “significantly behind grade level” are critical to interpreting the results that follow in the next section. The data from each provider address different questions about how Michigan students performed this year.

For instance, results from NWEA’s MAP Growth assessment for 2nd-8th grade answer the questions, “At the beginning of the school year, how many students were not on-track to score above the “Not proficient” category on the end-of-year M-STEP? Did their learning trajectories change from fall to spring?” Results from the i-Ready and Smarter Balanced ICA assessments, on the other hand, address questions such as, “Are

students demonstrating the knowledge and skills that are expected for their grade level? Did students who were behind in the fall make progress toward grade-level standards over the course of the year?" The Star 360 assessments and the K-1 MAP Growth assessments provide additional context, with insight into how Michigan students' performance in 2020-21 compares to how students across the country performed before the pandemic.

However, these analyses are based on imperfect and incomplete data. Only 74% of districts and 61% of students in the state are represented in our analysis, and those who are represented may not be reflective of those who are not included. Although the districts using NWEA's MAP Growth assessments are largely representative of the state, the students within those districts with comparable benchmark assessment data from the fall and spring were less likely to be economically disadvantaged, Black, or receiving special education services than those who did not have comparable assessment data. Districts using the other three assessment providers, on the other hand, are quite different, in terms of student composition, from the state as a whole. Districts that used the i-Ready assessments represent a larger share of Black students, while Star 360 and Smarter Balanced ICA districts tend to have more White students and fewer economically disadvantaged students. These differences are particularly important to keep in mind when comparing results from one provider to historical data for the state of Michigan or a nationally representative sample.

As discussed earlier, research exploring trends in academic achievement over the past 18 months makes clear that the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on students varied across student populations and the pandemic has had a greater, negative effect on achievement and achievement growth for economically disadvantaged, Black, and Hispanic or Latino/a/x, as well as English learners (e.g., Amplify Education, 2021; Dorn et al., 2020a, b; Kogan & Lavertu, 2021; Pier et al., 2021; Sass & Goldring, 2021). Given that these specific student populations are underrepresented in the analytic samples for some of the benchmark assessment providers, it is possible that the following results overstate any academic growth observed throughout the 2020-21 school year. In addition, our analysis may overestimate student performance across the state, as many of the reasons why a student would not participate in benchmark testing (e.g., insufficient access to technology or internet for remote testing, absence from school) are also likely to have negative effects on student learning.

Section Four: Results

In this section, we present fall and spring counts of the number and percentage of Michigan students who are “significantly behind grade level” after completing benchmark assessments throughout the 2020-21 school year. As previously discussed, definitions of “significantly behind grade level” substantively differ across providers. We therefore analyze data from each provider separately and do not assume that students who are classified as “significantly behind grade level” using one assessment would receive the same classification using a different assessment.

NWEA: MAP GROWTH

To identify students who are “significantly behind grade level,” NWEA recommended that we use the MAP Growth score thresholds from their Michigan-specific linking study for students who are projected to fall within the “Not Proficient” category on the M-STEP assessment at the end of the year (NWEA, 2020a). Because M-STEP testing begins in 3rd grade, this proficiency category is only available for students testing in 2nd-8th grade. For grades K-1, NWEA recommended using the universal screening benchmarks (i.e., K-1 students with percentile ranks of 30 or below) that help identify students who “have severe learning difficulties and may need intensive intervention” as a proxy for “significantly behind grade level.”

To interpret the following results, note, the “significantly behind grade level” definition for NWEA is different from the other assessment providers in that it’s based on a projection of future performance rather than a summary of students’ current performance at the time they are tested. In other words, given a student’s score on the MAP Growth Assessment at a particular time during the year, how are they expected to perform on the M-STEP at the end of the year? Projections based on students’ fall benchmark assessment scores take into account that students have not yet received most of their instruction for the year; thus, if a student is projected to score in the “proficient” category, this does not necessarily mean that they have *already* achieved grade-level proficiency, only that they are on-track to do so by the end of the year.

Table 4.1 provides results from our analyses of NWEA benchmark assessment scores. As a reminder, NWEA districts in the analytic sample represent over 61% of all Michigan school districts (519 total) and 46% of all Michigan K-8 students. Overall, both the number and percentage of students expected to be “Not Proficient” on either the math or ELA M-STEP assessment increased between the fall and spring semesters. Across all grade levels, more than 438,000 and 432,000 students had valid mathematics and reading assessment scores in both testing periods, respectively. Among these students, 127,178 (29%) and 108,785 (25%) were projected to score within the lowest proficiency category on the M-STEP based on their fall 2020 scores, increasing to 155,693 (36%) and 141,550 (33%) in the spring semester. If students followed a typical trajectory during the 2020-21 school year (i.e., a pre-COVID trajectory), we would expect to see similar percentages of students projected to be “Not Proficient” in both the fall and spring. By contrast, if students were accelerating their learning over the year, we might expect to see fewer students projected to be “Not Proficient” in the spring relative to the fall assessment. However, by the time students took the MAP Growth assessments in the spring of 2021, a larger percentage was projected to be in the “Not Proficient” category on the M-STEP, suggesting that learning trajectories from the fall to spring were slower than in a typical year.

TABLE 4.1. Number and Percentage of Students “Significantly Behind Grade Level” on NWEA’s MAP Growth Assessments

Grade	All Students	Fall		Spring		Diff. (pp)
		N	%	N	%	
Mathematics						
All	438,841	127,178	29.0	155,693	35.5	6.5
Kindergarten	38,702	4,221	10.9	8,070	20.9	10.0
First	44,704	10,022	22.4	12,083	27.0	4.6
Second	48,337	12,840	26.6	16,170	33.5	6.9
Third	50,232	17,462	34.8	19,413	38.6	3.8
Fourth	50,209	13,359	26.6	16,400	32.7	6.1
Fifth	51,426	19,369	37.7	23,676	46.0	8.3
Sixth	51,418	17,520	34.1	20,950	40.7	6.6
Seventh	52,190	18,499	35.4	21,195	40.6	5.2
Eighth	51,623	13,886	26.9	17,736	34.4	7.5
Reading						
All	432,149	108,785	25.2	141,550	32.8	7.6
Kindergarten	36,920	2,514	6.8	8,688	23.5	16.7
First	43,955	9,979	22.7	12,844	29.2	6.5
Second	45,987	14,022	30.5	15,231	33.1	2.6
Third	49,268	14,148	28.7	16,986	34.5	5.8
Fourth	49,657	14,256	28.7	18,033	36.3	7.6
Fifth	50,687	14,755	29.1	18,638	36.8	7.7
Sixth	50,939	13,774	27.0	17,801	34.9	7.9
Seventh	51,990	13,829	26.6	17,443	33.6	7.0
Eighth	52,746	11,508	21.8	15,886	30.1	8.3

Notes: A student was included in the MAP Growth Mathematics or Reading analytic samples if they completed a benchmark assessment in the same subject and grade level in both the fall and spring semesters. Students could only be included if the same district administered their fall and spring assessments. Grade-specific, NWEA cut scores for all four MAP Growth proficiency levels in mathematics and reading can be found in Table A.1 in the Appendix. All four proficiency levels are linked to the M-STEP, and the lowest proficiency level is used as a proxy for “significantly behind grade level” (NWEA, 2020a). Source: School districts submitted assessment data directly to MDH. These data were provided to EPIC through a collaboration between EPIC, MEDC, and MDE.

As reference points for interpreting these projections, Table 4.2 provides the statewide percentages of Michigan students who scored within the “Not Proficient” category on the 2019 M-STEP assessment (CEPI, 2019). These percentages are comparable to the projected percentages based on fall MAP Growth scores, suggesting that, if students’ learning trajectories for the remainder of the year were similar to typical trajectories before COVID, a similar percentage of students would be expected to score within the “Not Proficient” category in 2021 as in 2019. However, projections based on the spring

MAP Growth results indicate that the percentage of students in the “Not Proficient” category would likely be higher than in 2019.

TABLE 4.2. Statewide Percentage of Students Scoring “Not Proficient” on the 2019 Mathematics and ELA M-STEP Assessments		
Grade	Mathematics	English Language Arts
Third	27.5	30.4
Fourth	24.7	33.4
Fifth	36.5	32.3
Sixth	34.3	31.7
Seventh	35.9	29.7
Eighth	27.0	22.4

Source: Grade-specific student percentages by proficiency level for the 2019 M-STEP Mathematics and ELA assessments were retrieved from mischooldata.org (CEPI, 2019).

Finally, to interpret results for kindergarten and first-grade students, recall that the “significantly below grade level” cut scores for these grades are based on the universal screening benchmark for identifying students who may be in need of “intensive intervention,” which corresponds to the 30th percentile on each MAP Growth assessment. By definition, this threshold indicates that 30% of students in the national norming sample scored below the universal screening benchmark. Hence, we can use 30% as a reference point for determining whether Michigan K-1 students were more or less likely to score below the universal screening benchmark than students in the same grade levels prior to COVID.

In Michigan, the number and percentage of students below the universal screening benchmark increased between the fall and spring for both mathematics and reading. Increases were largest for kindergarten (10% and 17%). However, since less than 30% of Michigan kindergarteners scored below the benchmarks for math and reading in both the fall and spring assessments, these results suggest that Michigan kindergarteners who took the MAP Growth assessments are less likely than students in the pre-COVID national norming sample were to score below the benchmark. By spring 2021, however, approximately 30% of Michigan first-graders scored below the reading benchmark, suggesting that Michigan first-graders are now about as likely as students in the norming sample to score within the “intensive intervention” category.

CURRICULUM ASSOCIATES: I-READY

Curriculum Associates recommended we use the score ranges from their grade placement tables to classify students who are performing “two or more grade levels below” their tested grade as “significantly behind grade level.” As stated previously, the lowest possible grade placement in these tables is “emerging kindergarten,” which is considered one grade level below kindergarten (Curriculum Associates, 2018). Thus, there is no placement level equivalent to “two or more grades below” for kindergarten students and we use the emerging kindergarten category to identify both kindergarten and first-grade students who are “significantly behind grade level.” Thus, results for kindergarten are interpreted differently than results for other grade levels.

Approximately 5% of Michigan districts (45 total) used the i-Ready benchmark assessments in the 2020-21 school year; our analytic sample for these districts represents 11% of all Michigan students. As we noted in the Data and Methods section, students who completed an i-Ready assessment in both semesters are disproportionately Asian, Black, Hispanic or Latino/a/x, and eligible for English learner services compared to the full population of Michigan K-8 students.

Table 4.3 provides results from our analyses of Curriculum Associates’ i-Ready assessments for the approximately 100,000 students who had valid i-Ready scores in both the fall and spring of the 2020-21 school year. Approximately 40% of these students scored two or more grade levels below their tested grade in the fall (41,536 and 40,107 students in mathematics and reading, respectively), decreasing to 29% with a similar score in the next semester (29,551 students in math and reading, though, despite these groups being exactly the same size, they are not all the same students). This 10 to 12 percentage point reduction in the number of students scoring two or more grade levels below their tested grade in mathematics or reading suggests that many of the students who were two or more grade levels behind at the beginning of the year have made progress toward the performance standards for their grade level. This is to be expected, as unlike the interpretation of the NWEA scores, the i-Ready definition for “significantly behind grade level” is based on the grade level placement of a student at the time they were tested (i.e., was the student two or more grade levels below their tested grade in the fall? Were they still two or more grade levels below in the spring?). The percentage decreases from fall to spring because students are learning and progressing throughout the year, but they decrease at a slower rate than would be expected in a pre-COVID year. The implications are the same for NWEA and i-Ready, but the results appear different because the NWEA results in Table 4.1 increase from fall to spring and the numbers in the i-Ready results in Table 4.2 decrease from fall to spring. However, this is simply a difference in the

interpretations of the two definitions, and not a qualitative difference in the findings for these two assessment providers.

TABLE 4.3: Number and Percentage of Students “Significantly Behind Grade Level” on Curriculum Associates’ i-Ready Assessments						
Grade	All Students	Fall		Spring		Diff. (pp)
		N	%	N	%	
Mathematics						
All	100,534	41,536	41.3	29,551	29.4	-11.9
Kindergarten	9,725	5,654	58.1	3,082	31.7	-26.4
First	11,728	1,694	14.4	802	6.8	-7.6
Second	12,164	4,075	33.5	2,355	19.4	-14.1
Third	11,958	4,810	40.2	2,996	25.1	-15.1
Fourth	12,198	5,275	43.2	3,702	30.3	-12.9
Fifth	12,236	5,224	42.7	4,053	33.1	-9.6
Sixth	10,671	4,926	46.2	3,980	37.3	-8.9
Seventh	9,838	4,757	48.4	4,058	41.2	-7.2
Eighth	10,016	5,121	51.1	4,523	45.2	-5.9
Reading						
All	101,632	40,107	39.5	29,551	29.1	-10.4
Kindergarten	10,183	4,943	48.5	1,977	19.4	-29.1
First	12,118	1,026	8.5	440	3.6	-4.9
Second	12,454	3,999	32.1	2,375	19.1	-13.0
Third	12,292	4,831	39.3	3,378	27.5	-11.8
Fourth	12,447	4,294	34.5	3,286	26.4	-8.1
Fifth	12,317	5,891	47.8	4,748	38.5	-9.3
Sixth	10,433	5,201	49.9	4,576	43.9	-6.0
Seventh	9,429	4,856	51.5	4,312	45.7	-5.8
Eighth	9,959	5,066	50.9	4,459	44.8	-6.1

A student was included in the i-Ready Mathematics or Reading analytic samples if they completed a benchmark assessment in the same subject and grade level in both the fall and spring semesters. Students could be included only if the same district administered their fall and spring assessments. Grade-specific, Curriculum Associates cut scores for all four i-Ready proficiency levels in mathematics and reading can be found in Table A.1 in the Appendix. The lowest of these proficiency levels identifies students who are “two or more grade levels below” their tested grade and this cut score was used as a proxy for “significantly behind grade level.” The lowest possible grade placement on the i-Ready assessments is “emerging kindergarten,” which is considered one grade level below kindergarten, and this placement level was used to identify both kindergarten and first-grade students who are “significantly behind grade level” (Curriculum Associates, 2018). Source: School districts submitted assessment data directly to MDH. These data were provided to EPIC through a collaboration between EPIC, MEDC, and MDE.

Across 1st-8th grade, the percentages of students who are “significantly behind grade level” increase for higher grade levels. However, this pattern is consistent with historical data Curriculum Associates provided to EPIC for Michigan school districts that administered the i-Ready assessments during the 2018-19 school year, shown in Table 4.4. Lastly, both the number (5,654 and 4,943 students in mathematics and reading, respectively) and percentage (58% and 49%) of kindergarten students classified as “emerging kindergarten” during the fall testing period are high relative to the results for other early grade-level students. These large figures are likely an artifact of the “significantly behind grade level” definition used for this grade level, as opposed to an indicator of particularly poor performance, since the classification for this grade level includes students who score one or more grade levels below their tested grade, while the “significantly below grade level” designation for all other grade levels identifies students scoring two or more grade levels below their tested grade. Hence, the “significantly below grade level” category for kindergarteners is less restrictive and will capture more students at the bottom of the achievement distribution relative to other grade levels.

TABLE 4.4. Historical Data Provided by Curriculum Associates, Percentage of Michigan Students Two or More Grade Levels Below, 2018-19, 1st-8th Grade						
	Mathematics			Reading		
Grade	Fall	Spring	Diff	Fall	Spring	Diff
First	15	2	-13	10	2	-8
Second	32	8	-24	33	12	-21
Third	40	14	-26	40	20	-20
Fourth	40	17	-23	36	20	-16
Fifth	37	19	-18	49	32	-17
Sixth	48	29	-19	58	44	-14
Seventh	50	35	-15	58	44	-14
Eighth	55	42	-13	56	43	-13

Source: Curriculum Associates, Implementation & Data Review, End-of-Year 2018-2019, All Active Michigan Accounts. Prepared for MDE and shared with EPIC to assist with this report.

RENAISSANCE LEARNING: STAR 360

Renaissance Learning’s recommendation was to use their existing Star 360 benchmark for students performing below grade-level expectations. Renaissance Learning refers to this classification as the “intervention” or “at-risk” level, and students with percentile ranks 24 or below are placed in this level. This cut score is the same across all assessments and all grade levels (Renaissance Learning, 2021a,b). Note, the Star

Mathematics assessment is only normed for students in 1st-12th grade, and any kindergartener who completes this assessment is not provided with a percentile rank or any other norm-referenced results. Thus, we cannot report the number or percent of kindergarteners who completed the Star Mathematics assessment and scored “significantly behind grade level.”

Seven percent of Michigan districts (64 total) elected to use the Star 360 benchmark assessments during the 2020-21 school year, and our analytic sample for these districts represents 4% of all Michigan K-8 students. White and Hispanic or Latino/a/x students are overrepresented among this group, and students who are Black, economically disadvantaged, and eligible for special education or English learner services are underrepresented, compared to the full population of Michigan K-8 students.

Table 4.5 shows that nearly 42,000 Michigan students had valid Star mathematics test scores in both the fall and spring semesters, while almost 50,000 students were included in the Star reading and early literacy sample. Of these students, slightly less than a third (10,490 and 15,327 students in mathematics and reading/early literacy, respectively) had a percentile rank 24 or below in mathematics and reading/early literacy during the fall testing period, decreasing to 23% and 26% in the spring semester.

Similar to the interpretation of results using NWEA's universal screening benchmarks for grades K-1, we can also use the percentile rank cut-off for the Star 360 assessments (24) as a point of reference to determine whether Michigan students were more or less likely to be classified in Renaissance Learning's “intervention” or “at-risk” performance level, compared to other students in the same grade level before COVID.

In the fall, 25% and 31% of students had scores within the “intervention” category (and therefore percentile ranks of 24 or below) on the Star Mathematics and Reading or Early Literacy assessments, respectively, while 23% and 26% scored within this range in the spring semester. These percentages indicate that Michigan students were slightly more likely to perform below grade-level in mathematics at the start of the school relative to students in Renaissance Learning's pre-COVID norming sample, and less likely to perform below grade-level at the end of the school year. In reading or early literacy, Michigan students both started and ended the year slightly more likely to perform below grade-level compared to the norming sample.

TABLE 4.5. Number and Percentage of Students “Significantly Behind Grade Level” on Renaissance Learning’s Star 360 Assessments

Grade	All Students	Fall		Spring		Diff. (pp)
		N	%	N	%	
Mathematics						
All	41,594	10,490	25.2	9,384	22.6	-2.7
Kindergarten	--	--	--	--	--	--
First	4,140	652	15.7	478	11.5	-4.2
Second	5,224	1,485	28.4	891	17.1	-11.4
Third	5,393	1,172	21.7	1,116	20.7	-1.0
Fourth	5,447	1,281	23.5	1,094	20.1	-3.4
Fifth	5,582	1,434	25.7	1,285	23.0	-2.7
Sixth	5,279	1,527	28.9	1,628	30.8	1.9
Seventh	5,356	1,562	29.2	1,448	27.0	-2.1
Eighth	5,173	1,377	26.6	1,444	27.9	1.3
Reading						
All	49,791	15,327	30.8	13,022	26.2	-4.6
Kindergarten	4,497	1,077	23.9	752	16.7	-7.2
First	4,602	1,373	29.8	785	17.1	-12.8
Second	5,607	1,954	34.8	1,237	22.1	-12.8
Third	5,883	1,835	31.2	1,298	22.1	-9.1
Fourth	5,992	1,581	26.4	1,250	20.9	-5.5
Fifth	5,999	1,744	29.1	1,632	27.2	-1.9
Sixth	5,589	1,900	34.0	1,917	34.3	0.3
Seventh	5,850	1,902	32.5	1,954	33.4	0.9
Eighth	5,772	1,961	34.0	2,197	38.1	4.1

Notes: A student was included in the Star Mathematics or Reading/Early Literacy analytic samples if they completed a benchmark assessment in the same subject and grade level in both the fall and spring semesters. Students could only be included if the same district administered their fall and spring assessments. Grade-specific, Renaissance Learning cut scores for all four Star 360 proficiency levels in mathematics and reading/early literacy can be found in Table A.1 in the Appendix. The lowest proficiency level identifies assessment scores considered “intervention” or “at risk,” and this cut score was used as a proxy for “significantly behind grade level.” The Star Mathematics assessment is only normed for students in 1st-12th grade, and any kindergartener who completes this assessment is not provided with a percentile rank or any other norm-referenced results. We cannot report the number or percent of kindergarteners who completed the Star Mathematics assessment and scored “significantly behind grade level” (Renaissance Learning, 2021a, b). Source: School districts submitted assessment data directly to MDH. These data were provided to EPIC through a collaboration between EPIC, MEDC, and MDE.

Similar to the results for i-Ready, we once again find differences by grade level for students completing a Star 360 assessment. However, the most significant disparities are observed in the spring testing outcomes. Compared to the pre-COVID norming

sample, Michigan students in 1st-4th grade were less likely to score within the “intervention” level in mathematics and reading/early literacy at the end of the 2020-21 school year. Conversely, 27-31% and 33-38% of tested students in 6th-8th grades scored within the “intervention” level in mathematics and reading, respectively. Thus, students in each of these higher grade levels were more likely to score below the “significantly below grade levels” thresholds for each Star 360 assessment than students in the pre-COVID norming sample.

DRC: SMARTER BALANCED INTERIM ASSESSMENTS AND MDE BENCHMARK ASSESSMENTS

Finally, DRC recommended that we use the lowest of the four achievement level categories established for the 3rd-8th grade Smarter Balanced ICA assessments (Level 1: “Did not meet standard”) as a proxy for “significantly behind grade level” (DRC, 2021). DRC established a new set of “significantly behind grade level” cut scores for each early grade level and subject of MDE’s K-2 benchmark assessments for the purpose of this report, as there were no existing performance level categories or thresholds that could be used as proxies.

Tables 4.6 and 4.7 provide results from our analyses of DRC and MDE benchmark assessment scores, respectively. As a reminder, only 3% of Michigan districts representing fewer than 1% of Michigan students are included in our analytic sample for this assessment provider. Ninety percent of students who took the DRC or MDE benchmark assessment in both semesters are White, compared to only 65% of the population of Michigan K-8 students. Conversely, students in the analytic sample are less likely to be economically disadvantaged or eligible for special education or English learner services, relative to all Michigan K-8 students.

Table 4.6 shows that almost 3,500 students had valid DRC mathematics or ELA test scores in both the fall and spring semesters. Of these students, 1,503 (44%) scored within the “did not meet standard” level on the mathematics assessment in the fall semester, while 890 students (26%) scored within this range in the spring. For ELA, a significantly smaller percentage of students scored at the “did not meet standard” level on both the fall (28%, or 905 students) and spring (18.5%, 603 students) assessments. Similar to the results for previous assessment vendors, the 18 and 9 percentage point decreases in the number of students scoring in the lowest proficiency level on DRC’s mathematics and ELA assessments imply that at least some of the students who were

in the lowest level in the fall advanced to a higher level by the time they were tested in the spring.

Grade-specific trends in the number and percentage of students scoring “did not meet standard” varied by subject; students in earlier grade levels were more likely to have ELA scores in the lowest proficiency level compared to students in later grade levels, however, there were no consistent patterns across grade levels for mathematics.

TABLE 4.6. Number and Percentage of Students “Significantly Behind Grade Level” on DRC’s Interim Assessments						
Grade	All Students	Fall SBGL	%	Spring SBGL	%	Diff. (pp)
Mathematics						
All	3,422	1,503	43.9	890	26.0	-17.9
Third	527	336	63.8	159	30.2	-33.6
Fourth	588	285	48.5	138	23.5	-25.0
Fifth	561	194	34.6	106	18.9	-15.7
Sixth	587	252	42.9	131	22.3	-20.6
Seventh	599	187	31.2	150	25.0	-6.2
Eighth	560	249	44.5	206	36.8	-7.7
ELA						
All	3,226	905	28.1	603	18.7	-9.4
Third	479	239	49.9	132	27.6	-22.3
Fourth	528	251	47.5	159	30.1	-17.4
Fifth	510	122	23.9	71	13.9	-10.0
Sixth	598	102	17.1	67	11.2	-5.9
Seventh	578	109	18.9	81	14.0	-4.9
Eighth	533	82	15.4	93	17.4	2.0

Notes: A student was included in the ICA Mathematics or ELA analytic samples if they completed a benchmark assessment in the same subject and grade level in both the fall and spring semesters. Students could only be included if the same district administered their fall and spring assessments. Grade-specific, DRC cut scores for all four ICA proficiency levels in mathematics and ELA can be found in Table A.1 in the Appendix. The lowest proficiency level identifies students who “did not meet standard” and this cut score was used as a proxy for “significantly behind grade level” (DRC, 2021). Source: School districts submitted assessment data directly to MDH. These data were provided to EPIC through a collaboration between EPIC, MEDC, and MDE.

Lastly, very few students scored below the “significantly behind grade level” cut scores for the K-2 assessments in either subject in the fall. Virtually no students were considered “significantly behind grade level” in the spring based on the score thresholds established for these assessments.

TABLE 4.7. Number and Percent of Students “Significantly Behind Grade Level” in MDE’s K-2 Benchmark Assessments						
Grade	All Students	Fall SBGL	Fall %	Spring SBGL	Spring %	Diff. (pp)
Numeracy						
All	3,660	96	2.6	3	0.1	-2.5
Kindergarten	1,515	55	3.6	0	0.0	-3.6
First	1,084	11	1.0	1	0.1	-0.9
Second	1,061	30	2.8	2	0.2	-2.6
Early Literacy						
All	2,960	27	0.9	0	0	-0.9
Kindergarten	1,107	14	1.3	0	0.0	-1.3
First	948	7	0.7	0	0.0	-0.7
Second	905	6	0.7	0	0.0	-0.7

Notes: A student was included in the MDE K-2 Numeracy or Early Literacy analytic samples if they completed a benchmark assessment in the same subject and grade level in both the fall and spring semesters. Students could only be included if the same district administered their fall and spring assessments. Grade-specific, MDE K-2 cut scores for the lowest proficiency level in numeracy and early literacy can be found in Table A.1 in the Appendix. DRC established a new set of “significantly behind grade level” cut scores for each early grade level and subject of MDE’s K-2 benchmark assessments for the purpose of this report, as there were no existing performance level categories or thresholds that could be used as proxies. Source: School districts submitted assessment data directly to MDH. These data were provided to EPIC through a collaboration between EPIC, MEDC, and MDE.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

This is the first state-wide assessment of Michigan students’ progress toward learning goals during the 2020-21 school year affected by the pandemic. The data in this report give rise to several takeaways that will be important to consider as we enter the new school year.

- It is clear that students across the state missed critical opportunities to learn during the 2020-21 school year. This was reflected in their performance on benchmark assessments; regardless of assessment vendor, subject, or grade level, a substantial set of students scored “significantly behind grade level” on both the fall and spring assessments.
- Across all subjects and grades, Michigan students appeared not to make normal progress towards learning goals as measured and defined by all four

approved assessment vendors. While learning as measured by the benchmark assessments did occur over the 2020-21 school year, the rate of learning appeared to be slower than in a typical pre-pandemic school year.

- The NWEA MAP Growth assessment—the test the majority of Michigan school districts used—suggests that a greater proportion of students would score at the “not proficient” level on the end-of-year M-STEP than in the most recent year of full M-STEP administration. This is particularly true in mathematics. Although students’ fall MAP Growth scores indicated that they were on-track to reaching similar proficiency rates to the last M-STEP administration, this was no longer true in the spring.
- Results from the i-Ready and Smarter Balanced ICA assessments show that many of the students who were behind at the beginning of the year made progress toward grade-level standards by the end of the year. However, progress was likely slower than would be expected in a typical, pre-pandemic year.
- The students who participated in comparable benchmark assessments in both the fall and spring are more likely to be White and less likely to be economically disadvantaged or eligible for special education or English learner services, compared to the overall population of K-8 students in Michigan. Recent studies consistently show larger, negative effects of the pandemic on student achievement and achievement growth for the same student groups that are underrepresented in our analysis. Moreover, many of the reasons why a student would not participate in testing (e.g., insufficient access to technology, absence from school) may also negatively affect student learning. Given these differences, the results discussed in this report likely overestimate student performance and learning growth during the 2020-21 school year.

Section Five:

Future Research

Given the timing of data receipt and other methodological considerations outlined in Section Three, this report is necessarily a limited first step to gaining an understanding of the degree to which Michigan public school students progressed and learned during the 2020-21 school year. In particular, in this report we are able to provide only basic descriptive data about the number and proportion of students by grade level, testing period, and benchmark assessment vendor who scored significantly behind grade level for the 627 districts that provided the MDH with sufficient data to make these determinations. To augment the work presented here and provide greater insights into student progress during the pandemic, EPIC—in partnership with MDE, CEPI, and MEDC—is expecting to release a series of additional reports over the next two years.

Our next report, which will be released in spring 2022, will focus on identifying the specific groups of students whose learning trajectories were most affected during the COVID-19 pandemic. The analysis will use both benchmark and spring 2021 M-STEP assessment data to examine:

1. average learning gains across the state and specific breakdowns by student subgroup (e.g., race/ethnicity, economically disadvantaged status, disability and English learner status, urbanicity, etc.);
2. potential differences across districts that offered benchmark assessments from different vendors;
3. differences between students who were and were not tested in one or both fall and spring assessment windows during the 2020-21 school year; and
4. differential learning gains for districts using various instructional modalities (i.e., remote, in-person, or hybrid instruction) for all or a subset of the 2020-21 school year.

The third interim report will be released at the beginning of the 2022-23 school year and will provide an analysis of “best practice districts”—those districts that exhibited the largest increases in learning outcomes during the 2020-21 school year. This report

will identify examples of districts within each instructional modality that were effective at meeting educational goals and attainment overall and for various student subgroups. These districts will provide the basis for the analysis we will undertake for our subsequent report, which will be released by the beginning of the 2023-24 school year. For this analysis, we will gather and examine qualitative data from the identified “best practice districts” to highlight specific practices and programs that may have contributed to their success during the 2020-21 school year and potentially inform instruction in future years.

References

- Amplify Education. (2021). COVID-19 means more students not learning to read. *Amplify Education Research Brief*.
- Azevedo, J. P., Hasan, A., Goldemberg, D., Geven, K., & Iqbal, S. A. (2021). Simulating the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on schooling and learning outcomes: A set of global estimates. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 36(1), 1-40.
- Baisley, M. E., Benjamin, N. A., Burnham, B., Danielson, K., Draughn, D., Eversman, K. A., Hernandez, R. A., Kamau, N. M., Mancini, V., Miller-Kamara, G., Munger, M., Nelson, S., Nickelsen, J., Ortiz-Crespin, J., Osuji, A., Paro-Strother, D., Radke, K., Scofield, M., & Urevig-Grilz, M. (2020). *Disrupted learning, COVID-19, and public education in Minnesota*. Educator Policy Innovation Center. <https://www.educationminnesota.org/EDMN/media/edmn-files/advocacy/EPIC/EPIC-Disrupted-Learning-Report.pdf>.
- Barnum, M. (2021, February 24). This year's state test results will be tough to make sense of, experts warn. *Chalkbeat*. <https://www.chalkbeat.org/2021/2/24/22299804/schools-testing-covid-results-accuracy>.
- Belsha, K. (2021, August 7). Lack of in-person instruction pushed public school enrollment down, new research finds. *Chalkbeat*. <https://www.chalkbeat.org/2021/8/7/22613546/research-remote-instruction-school-enrollment-declines>.
- Cavitt, M. (2021, July 12). Oakland County sees historic drop in public school enrollment during pandemic. *The Oakland Press*. <https://www.theoaklandpress.com/2021/07/12/top-l-enrollment-0711>.
- Center for Educational Performance and Information. (2019). *Grades 3-8 state testing performance, M-STEP performance level, all grades and all students* (2018-19). <https://www.mischooldata.org/grades-3-8-state-testing-includes-psat-data-performance/> (Accessed August 18, 2021).
- Chen, L. K., Dorn, E., Sarakatsannis, J., & Wiesinger, A. (2021). *Teacher survey: Learning loss is global—and significant*. McKinsey & Co. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-and-social-sector/our->

insights/teacher-survey-learning-loss-is-global-and-significant?cid=other-eml-alt-mip-mck&hdpid=1a57cf47-eae2-400f-b9f0-fd8edddbbfb6&hctky=12238167&hlkid=b53175decdec48bbb6888bd21b5a168b.

Cummings, A., Kilbride, T., Turner, M., Zhu, Q., & Strunk, K. (2020). How did Michigan educators respond to the suspension of face-to-face instruction due to COVID-19. *Education Policy Innovation Collaborative*.

Curriculum Associates. (2018, March). i-Ready Assessments technical manual: March 2018. *Curriculum Associates Research Report No. RR 2018-47*. North Billerica, MA: Author.

Curriculum Associates. (2020a). i-Ready diagnostic: Linking study with Michigan student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) and the Preliminary SAT. *PSAT 8/9*.

Curriculum Associates. (2020b). *i-Ready transparency statement*.
https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Curriculum_Associates_-_Transparency_Statement_704469_7.pdf.

Curriculum Associates (2020c, October). Understanding student needs: Early results from fall assessments. *Curriculum Associates Research Brief*.
<https://www.curriculumassociates.com/-/media/mainsite/files/i-ready/i-ready-diagnostic-results-understanding-student-needs-paper-2020.pdf>

Curriculum Associates (2021, June). Academic achievement at the end of the 2020-2021 school year: Insights after more than a year of disrupted teaching and learning. *Curriculum Associates Research Brief*.
<https://www.curriculumassociates.com/-/media/mainsite/files/i-ready/i-ready-understanding-student-needs-paper-spring-results-2021.pdf>.

Data Recognition Corporation. (2020). *Data Recognition Transparency Statement*.
https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Data_Recognition_Corporation_-_Transparency_Statement_704486_7.pdf.

Data Recognition Corporation. (2021, April). *Smarter Balanced: Interpretive Guide for English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics Assessments*.
<https://portal.smarterbalanced.org/library/en/reporting-system-interpretive-guide.pdf>.

Dhillon, S. E. (2021, June 21). What are we missing? The impact of COVID-19 on educational data quality and availability. *Education Analytics*.
<https://www.edanalytics.org/blog/impact-of-covid-19-on-educational-data-quality-and-availability>

Dorn, E., Hancock, B., Sarakatsannis, J., & Viruleg, E. (2020a, December 8). COVID-19 and learning loss—disparities grow and students need help. *McKinsey & Company*.

- Dorn, E., Hancock, B., Sarakatsannis, J., & Viruleg, E. (2020b). COVID-19 and student learning in the United States: The hurt could last a lifetime. *McKinsey & Company*.
- Fensterwald, J. (2020, November 30). Early data on learning loss show big drop in math, but not reading skills. *EdSource*. <https://edsource.org/2020/early-data-on-learning-loss-show-big-drop-in-math-but-not-reading-skills/644416>
- Ferren, M. (2021, July 6). *Remote learning and school reopenings: What worked and what didn't*. Center for American Progress. <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2021/07/06/501221/remote-learning-school-reopenings-worked-didnt/>
- Francom, G. M., Lee, S. J., & Pinkney, H. (2021, June 26). Technologies, challenges and needs of K-12 teachers in the transition to distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *TechTrends*, 65(4), 589–601. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-021-00625-5>
- Hamilton, L. S., Kaufman, J. H., & Diliberti, M. K. (2020). *Teaching and leading through a pandemic: Key findings from the American Educator Panels spring 2020 COVID-19 surveys*. Rand Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA168-2.html
- He, W., & Meyer, J. (2021, March 12). *MAP Growth universal screening benchmarks: Establishing MAP Growth as an effective universal screener*. NWEA. https://www.nwea.org/content/uploads/2021/05/MAP-Growth-Universal-Screening-Benchmarks-2021-03-12_NWEA_report.pdf.
- Hopkins, B., Kilbride, T., & Strunk, K. (2021, May). Instructional delivery under Michigan districts' extended COVID-19 learning plans – May update. *Education Policy Innovation Collaborative*. <https://epicedpolicy.org/ecol-reports/>.
- Hopkins, B., Turner, M., Lovitz, M., Kilbride, T., & Strunk, K. (2021) A look inside Michigan classrooms: Educators' perceptions of COVID-19 and K-12 school in the fall of 2020. *Education Policy Innovation Collaborative*. https://epicedpolicy.org/fall-2020-covid-19-survey_policy_brief/.
- Kogan, V., & Lavertu, S. (2021, January 27). *The COVID-19 pandemic and student achievement on Ohio's third-grade English language arts assessment*. http://glenn.osu.edu/educational-governance/reports/reports-attributes/ODE_ThirdGradeELA_KL_1-27-2021.pdf

- Kuhfeld, M., Soland, J., Tarasawa, B., Johnson, A., Ruzek, E., & Liu, J. (2020). Projecting the potential impact of COVID-19 school closures on academic achievement. *Educational Researcher*, 49(8), 549-565.
- Kuhfield, M., & Tarasawa, B. (2020). The COVID-19 slide: What summer learning loss can tell us about the potential impact of school closures on student academic achievement. Brief. *NWEA*.
- Levin, K. (2021, March 18). Michigan lost 62,000 students this fall. Black enrollment fell 5%. *Detroit Free Press*.
<https://www.freep.com/story/news/education/2021/03/17/michigan-public-schools-enrollment-decline/4730513001/>
- Lewis, K., Kuhfeld, M., Ruzek, E., & McEachin, A., (2021, July). *Learning during COVID-19: Reading and math achievement in the 2020-21 school year. Research brief*. NWEA.. <https://www.nwea.org/content/uploads/2021/07/Learning-during-COVID-19-Reading-and-math-achievement-in-the-2020-2021-school-year.research-brief.pdf>.
- Mahnken, K. (2021, June 28). *New federal data confirms pandemic's blow to K-12 enrollment, with drop of 1.5 million students; Pre-K experiences 22 percent decline*. <https://www.the74million.org/article/public-school-enrollment-down-3-percent-worst-century/>.
- Michigan Department of Education. (2020a, September). *Interpretive guide to early literacy and mathematics reports*. State of Michigan.
[https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/19-20 Interpretive Guide to Early Literacy and Mathematics Reports 662553 7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/19-20%20Interpretive%20Guide%20to%20Early%20Literacy%20and%20Mathematics%20Reports%20662553%207.pdf).
- Michigan Department of Education. (2020b). *Michigan early literacy and mathematics: What it is, what it means, what it offers*. State of Michigan.
[https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Early Literacy and Mathematics Benchmark Assessment What it Is What it Means and What it Offers 605069 7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Early_Literacy_and_Mathematics_Benchmark_Assessment_What_it_Is_What_it_Means_and_What_it_Offers_605069_7.pdf).
- Michigan Department of Education. (2020c, September). *Test administration manual (TAM)*. State of Michigan.
[https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Early Literacy and Mathematics TAM 663326 7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Early_Literacy_and_Mathematics_TAM_663326_7.pdf).
- Michigan Public Act 147 of 2020, MCL 388.1621f (2020)
- Michigan Public Act 148 of 2020, MCL 388.1701 (2020)

Michigan Public Act 149 of 2020, MCL 388.1606 (2020)

NWEA. (n.d.). *Test descriptions summary*. MAP.

https://teach.mapnwea.org/impl/maphelp/Content/AboutMAP/Summary_TestTypes.htm.

NWEA. (2020a, December). *Linking study report: Predicting performance on the Michigan state assessment system in grades 3–8 based on NWEA MAP Growth scores*. NWEA. https://www.nwea.org/content/uploads/2016/12/MI-MAP-Growth-Linking-Study-Report_NWEA_2020-12-22.pdf

NWEA. (2020b, October). *MAP Growth and MAP Reading Fluency*.

https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/MAP_Suite_NWEA_one-pager_704500_7.pdf.

NWEA. (2020c). *NWEA transparency statement*.

https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/NWEA_-_Transparency_Template_704490_7.pdf.

Pendharkar, E. (2021, July 17). More than 1 million students didn't enroll during the pandemic. Will they come back? *Education Week*.

<https://www.edweek.org/leadership/more-than-1-million-students-didnt-enroll-during-the-pandemic-will-they-come-back/2021/06>.

Pier, L., Hough, H. J., Christian, M., Bookman, N., Wilkenfeld, B., & Miller, R. (2021, January 25). COVID-19 and the educational equity crisis. *PACE*.

<https://edpolicyinca.org/newsroom/covid-19-and-educational-equity-crisis>

Pitluck, C., & Jacques, C. (2021, July). Persistent challenges and promising practices: District leader reflections on schooling during COVID-19. Research Brief. AIR. *National Survey of Public Education's Response to COVID-19*.

<https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/2021-08/research-brief-covid-survey-persistent-challenges-july-2021rev.pdf>.

Renaissance Learning. (2020a, September). *Optimize learning with Star 360 assessments*.

https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Renaissance_Brochure_Star_704503_7.pdf.

Renaissance Learning. (2020b). *Renaissance transparency statement*.

https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Renaissance_-_Transparency_Statement_704502_7.pdf.

Renaissance Learning. (2021a). *Renaissance: Star assessments for math technical manual*.

Renaissance Learning. (2021b). *Renaissance: Star assessments for reading technical manual*.

Sass, T., & Goldring, T. (2021, May). Student achievement growth during the COVID-19 pandemic: Insights from metro-Atlanta school districts. *Georgia Policy Labs, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University*. <https://gpl.gsu.edu/download/student-achievement-growth-during-the-covid-19-pandemic-report/?ind=1620902643226&filename=Achievement%20Growth%20During%20COVID-19%20Report%2020210512%20FINAL.pdf&wpdmdl=2105&refresh=609e93df82b691621005279>

Sawchuk, S. (2021, July 14). "Extreme" chronic absenteeism? Pandemic school attendance data is bleak, but incomplete. *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/technology/extreme-chronic-absenteeism-pandemic-school-attendance-data-is-bleak-but-incomplete/2021/07>

The Hunt Institute. (2021, April 29). Missing students & the equity implications for student growth data. *The Intersection*. <https://hunt-institute.org/resources/2021/04/missing-students-the-equity-implications-for-student-growth-data/>.

West, M. R. & Lake R. (2021a, July). How much have students missed academically because of the pandemic? A review of evidence to date. *Center on Reinventing Public Education*. <https://www.crpe.org/publications/how-much-have-students-missed-academically-because-pandemic-review-evidence-date>.

West, M. R. & Lake, R. (2021b, August). How has the pandemic affected students' social-emotional well-being? A review of the evidence to date. *Center on Reinventing Public Education*. <https://www.crpe.org/publications/how-has-pandemic-affected-students-social-emotional-well-being-review-evidence-date>.

Appendix

TABLE A 1. "Significantly Behind Grade Level" Definitions and Cut Scores						
		Categorization scheme used	"Significantly behind grade level" group	Cut score type	Reading cut score	Math cut score
<i>MAP Growth</i>	K-1	Universal screening	Intensive Intervention	Percentile	30	30
	2	Projected M-STEP	Not Proficient	Scale score	163, 177	167, 182
	3	Projected M-STEP	Not Proficient	Scale score	178, 190	181, 194
	4	Projected M-STEP	Not Proficient	Scale score	190, 199	189, 200
	5	Projected M-STEP	Not Proficient	Scale score	197, 204	202, 212
	6	Projected M-STEP	Not Proficient	Scale score	202, 208	206, 214
	7	Projected M-STEP	Not Proficient	Scale score	206, 211	213, 219
	8	Projected M-STEP	Not Proficient	Scale score	207, 212	214, 220
<i>i-Ready</i>	K	Grade placement	Emerging K	Scale score	361	361
	1	Grade placement	Emerging K	Scale score	346	346
	2	Grade placement	K or below	Scale score	418	386
	3	Grade placement	1 or below	Scale score	473	412
	4	Grade placement	2 or below	Scale score	495	433
	5	Grade placement	3 or below	Scale score	541	449
	6	Grade placement	4 or below	Scale score	565	464
	7	Grade placement	5 or below	Scale score	582	479
	8	Grade placement	6 or below	Scale score	593	492
<i>Star</i>	K-8	Grade-level norms	At-risk/Intervention	Percentile	24	24
<i>K-2s</i>	K	Content expectation	Far below grade level	Scale score	443	447
	1	Content expectation	Far below grade level	Scale score	440	446
	2	Content expectation	Far below grade level	Scale score	438	448
<i>ICA</i>	3	Achievement level	Did not meet standard	Scale score	2366	2380
	4	Achievement level	Did not meet standard	Scale score	2415	2410
	5	Achievement level	Did not meet standard	Scale score	2441	2454
	6	Achievement level	Did not meet standard	Scale score	2456	2472
	7	Achievement level	Did not meet standard	Scale score	2478	2483
	8	Achievement level	Did not meet standard	Scale score	2486	2503

Notes: Definitions and cut scores were selected based on recommendations from each assessment provider. Students whose scale scores or percentile ranks and less than or equal to the specified cut scores are classified as "significantly behind grade level." The "Reading cut score" and "Math cut score" columns each contain two numbers for the 2nd-8th grade MAP Growth assessments. These represent the cut scores for the fall and spring testing periods, respectively. Cut scores for all other assessments are the same in the fall and spring.

TABLE A.2. Analytic Sample, Inclusion Status, and Vendor Coverage by District, All Michigan K-8 Districts*Districts are classified based on the data submitted to MDH and provided to EPIC by 3pm on August 16th, 2021.*

District Code	District Name	Analytic Sample	Inclusion Status	Provider 1	Provider 2
1010	Alcona Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
2010	AuTrain-Onota Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
2020	Burt Township School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
2070	Munising Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
2080	Superior Central School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	NWEA
3000	Allegan Area Educational Service Agency	No	Narrative survey response only		
3010	Plainwell Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
3020	Otsego Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
3030	Allegan Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
3040	Wayland Union Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
3050	Fennville Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
3060	Martin Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
3070	Hopkins Public Schools	No	Provided data, but insufficient for inclusion in analysis		
3080	Saugatuck Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	DRC
3100	Hamilton Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
3440	Glenn Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
3900	Innocademy Allegan Campus	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
3902	Outlook Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
4000	Alpena-Montmorency-Alcona ESD	No	Narrative survey response only		

4010	Alpena Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
5010	Alba Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
5035	Central Lake Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	NWEA
5040	Bellaire Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
5060	Elk Rapids Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
5065	Ellsworth Community School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
5070	Mancelona Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
6020	Au Gres-Sims School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
6050	Standish-Sterling Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
7010	Arvon Township School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
7020	Baraga Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
7040	L'Anse Area Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
8000	Barry ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
8010	Delton Kellogg Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
8030	Hastings Area School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
8050	Thornapple Kellogg School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
9000	Bay-Arenac ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
9010	Bay City School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
9030	Bangor Township Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
9050	Essexville-Hampton Public Schools	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
9090	Pinconning Area Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
9902	State Street Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

9903	Bay City Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
10015	Benzie County Central Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
10025	Frankfort-Elberta Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11000	Berrien RESA	No	Narrative survey response only		
11010	Benton Harbor Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11020	St. Joseph Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11030	Lakeshore School District (Berrien)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11033	River Valley School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
11200	New Buffalo Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11210	Brandywine Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11240	Berrien Springs Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11250	Eau Claire Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11300	Niles Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11310	Buchanan Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11320	Watervliet School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11330	Coloma Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11340	Bridgman Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
11670	Hagar Township S/D #6	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11830	Sodus Township S/D #5	No	Narrative survey response only		
11901	Countryside Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11903	Benton Harbor Charter School Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
11904	Mildred C. Wells Preparatory Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

12000	Branch ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
12010	Coldwater Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
12020	Bronson Community School District	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
12040	Quincy Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
12901	Pansophia Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13000	Calhoun Intermediate School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
13020	Battle Creek Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13050	Athens Area Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
13070	Harper Creek Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13080	Homer Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13090	Lakeview Sch. District (Calhoun)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13095	Mar Lee School District	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
13110	Marshall Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
13120	Pennfield Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13130	Tekonsha Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
13135	Union City Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13900	Battle Creek Montessori Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13901	Arbor Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13902	Endeavor Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
13903	Marshall Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
14000	Heritage Southwest Intermediate School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
14010	Cassopolis Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

14020	Dowagiac Union School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
14030	Edwardsburg Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
14050	Marcellus Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
15000	Charlevoix-Emmet ISD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
15010	Beaver Island Community School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
15020	Boyne City Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
15030	Boyne Falls Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
15050	Charlevoix Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
15060	East Jordan Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
15901	Concord Academy - Boyne	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
15902	Charlevoix Montessori Academy for the Arts	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
16000	Cheb-Otsego-Presque Isle ESD	No	Narrative survey response only		
16015	Cheboygan Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
16050	Inland Lakes Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
16070	Mackinaw City Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
16100	Wolverine Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
17000	Eastern Upper Peninsula ISD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
17010	Sault Ste. Marie Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
17050	DeTour Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
17090	Pickford Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
17110	Rudyard Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
17140	Brimley Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

17160	Whitefish Township Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
17900	Lake Superior Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
17901	Joseph K. Lumsden Bahweting Anishnabe Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
17902	Ojibwe Charter School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
17903	DeTour Arts and Technology Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
18000	Clare-Gladwin Regional Education Service District	No	Narrative survey response only		
18010	Clare Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
18020	Farwell Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
18060	Harrison Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
19000	Clinton County RESA	No	Narrative survey response only		
19010	DeWitt Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
19070	Fowler Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
19100	Bath Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
19120	Ovid-Elsie Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
19125	Pewamo-Westphalia Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
19140	St. Johns Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
19900	Michigan International Prep School	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
20015	Crawford AuSable Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
21000	Delta-Schoolcraft ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
21010	Escanaba Area Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
21025	Gladstone Area Schools	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
21060	Rapid River Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	DRC

21065	Big Bay De Noc School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
21090	Bark River-Harris School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
21135	Mid Peninsula School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
22000	Dickinson-Iron ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
22010	Iron Mountain Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
22025	Norway-Vulcan Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	NWEA
22030	Breitung Township School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
22045	North Dickinson County Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	NWEA
23000	Eaton RESA	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
23010	Bellevue Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
23030	Charlotte Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
23050	Eaton Rapids Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
23060	Grand Ledge Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
23065	Maple Valley Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
23080	Olivet Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
23090	Pottersville Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
23490	Oneida Township S/D #3	No	District did not plan to report		
23900	LifeTech Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
23901	Island City Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
24020	Harbor Springs School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
24030	Alanson Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
24040	Pellston Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

24070	Public Schools of Petoskey	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
24901	Concord Academy - Petoskey	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25000	Genesee ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
25010	Flint, School District of the City of	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25030	Grand Blanc Community Schools	Yes	Provided own aggregate	Renaissance Learning	
25040	Mt. Morris Consolidated Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
25050	Goodrich Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
25060	Bendle Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
25070	Genesee School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
25080	Carman-Ainsworth Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25100	Fenton Area Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25110	Kearsley Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
25120	Flushing Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25130	Atherton Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25140	Davison Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25150	Clio Area School District	Yes	Provided own aggregate	Renaissance Learning	
25180	Swartz Creek Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
25200	Lake Fenton Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25210	Westwood Heights Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25230	Bentley Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25240	Beecher Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	NWEA
25250	Linden Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

25260	Montrose Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
25280	LakeVille Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
25900	Genesee STEM Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25902	Woodland Park Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
25903	Grand Blanc Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25904	Northridge Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25905	International Academy of Flint	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25907	Linden Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25909	Burton Glen Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25910	Richfield Public School Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25911	Madison Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25912	The New Standard Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25914	Greater Heights Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25915	WAY Academy - Flint	No	Narrative survey response only		
25916	Eagle's Nest Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
25919	Flint Cultural Center Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
26010	Beaverton Schools	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
26040	Gladwin Community Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
27000	Gogebic-Ontonagon ISD	No	District did not plan to report		
27010	Bessemer Area School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
27020	Ironwood Area Schools of Gogebic County	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
27070	Wakefield-Marenisco School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	

27080	Watersmeet Township School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
28000	Northwest Education Services	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
28010	Traverse City Area Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
28035	Buckley Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
28090	Kingsley Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
28900	Old Mission Peninsula School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
28901	Woodland School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
28902	Grand Traverse Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
28904	The Greenspire School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
29000	Gratiot-Isabella RESD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
29010	Alma Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
29020	Ashley Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
29040	Breckenridge Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
29050	Fulton Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
29060	Ithaca Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
29100	St. Louis Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
30000	Hillsdale ISD	No	District did not plan to report		
30010	Camden-Frontier School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
30020	Hillsdale Community Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
30030	Jonesville Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
30040	Litchfield Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
30050	North Adams-Jerome Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
30060	Pittsford Area Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		

30070	Reading Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
30080	Waldron Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
30901	Hillsdale Preparatory School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
30902	Will Carleton Charter School Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
31000	Copper Country ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
31010	Hancock Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
31020	Adams Township School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
31030	Public Schools of Calumet, Laurium & Keweenaw	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
31050	Chassell Township School District	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
31070	Elm River Township School District	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
31100	Dollar Bay-Tamarack City Area K-12 School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
31110	Houghton-Portage Township School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
31130	Lake Linden-Hubbell School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
31140	Stanton Township Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
32000	Huron ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
32010	Bad Axe Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
32030	Caseville Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
32040	Church School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
32050	Elkton-Pigeon-Bay Port Laker Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
32060	Harbor Beach Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
32080	North Huron School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	

32090	Owendale-Gagetown Area School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
32170	Ubly Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
32260	Colfax Township S/D #1F	No	Narrative survey response only		
32610	Sigel Township S/D #3F	No	Narrative survey response only		
32620	Sigel Township S/D #4F	No	Narrative survey response only		
32650	Verona Township S/D #1F	No	Narrative survey response only		
33000	Ingham ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
33010	East Lansing School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
33020	Lansing Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33040	Dansville Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
33060	Haslett Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33070	Holt Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33100	Leslie Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
33130	Mason Public Schools (Ingham)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33170	Okemos Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
33200	Stockbridge Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33215	Waverly Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33220	Webberville Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33230	Williamston Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33901	Cole Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33904	Mid-Michigan Leadership Academy	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
33906	White Pine Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		

33909	Windemere Park Charter Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
33910	Lansing Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33911	Michigan Connections Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
33914	Great Lakes Learning Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
34000	Ionia ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
34010	Ionia Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
34080	Belding Area School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
34090	Lakewood Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
34110	Portland Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
34120	Saranac Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
34140	Berlin Township S/D #3	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
34340	Easton Township S/D #6	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
34360	Ionia Township S/D #2	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
35000	Iosco RESA	No	Narrative survey response only		
35010	Oscoda Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
35020	Hale Area Schools	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
35030	Tawas Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
35040	Whittemore-Prescott Area Schools	No	District did not plan to report		
35902	Alternative Educational Academy of Iosco County	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
36015	Forest Park School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
36025	West Iron County Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

37010	Mt. Pleasant City School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
37040	Beal City Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
37060	Shepherd Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
37900	Flextech High School Shepherd	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
37901	Renaissance Public School Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
38000	Jackson ISD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
38010	Western School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
38020	Vandercook Lake Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
38040	Columbia School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
38050	Grass Lake Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
38080	Concord Community Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
38090	East Jackson Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
38100	Hanover-Horton School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
38120	Michigan Center School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
38130	Napoleon Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
38140	Northwest Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
38150	Springport Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
38170	Jackson Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
38900	Jackson Preparatory & Early College	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
38901	Da Vinci Institute	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
38902	Paragon Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
38904	Francis Street Primary School	No	Narrative survey response only		
39000	Kalamazoo RESA	No	District did not plan to report		

39010	Kalamazoo Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39020	Climax-Scotts Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39030	Comstock Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	NWEA
39050	Galesburg-Augusta Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39065	Gull Lake Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39130	Parchment School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	NWEA
39140	Portage Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39160	Schoolcraft Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39170	Vicksburg Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	DRC
39903	Oakland Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39905	Paramount Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39906	Youth Advancement Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39907	Forest Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
39909	Augusta Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
40020	Forest Area Community Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
40040	Kalkaska Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
40060	Excelsior Township S/D #1	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41000	Kent ISD	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
41010	Grand Rapids Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41020	Godwin Heights Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
41025	Northview Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
41026	Wyoming Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

41040	Byron Center Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41050	Caledonia Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41070	Cedar Springs Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
41080	Comstock Park Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41090	East Grand Rapids Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41110	Forest Hills Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41120	Godfrey-Lee Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41130	Grandville Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41140	Kelloggsville Public Schools	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
41145	Kenowa Hills Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
41150	Kent City Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41160	Kentwood Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
41170	Lowell Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41210	Rockford Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41240	Sparta Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41901	New Branches Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41904	West MI Academy of Environmental Science	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41905	Excel Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41908	Byron Center Charter School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41909	Vista Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41910	Vanguard Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41911	Flat River Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

41914	Knapp Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41915	Walker Charter Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
41916	Cross Creek Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41917	William C. Abney Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41918	Creative Technologies Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41919	Ridge Park Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41920	Chandler Woods Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41921	Grand Rapids Child Discovery Center	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
41922	Lighthouse Academy	No	Provided data, but insufficient for inclusion in analysis		
41925	Michigan Virtual Charter Academy	No	Provided data, but insufficient for inclusion in analysis		
41926	Hope Academy of West Michigan	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41928	River City Scholars Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
41931	Michigan Preparatory Virtual School	No	District did not plan to report		
42030	Grant Township S/D #2	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
43040	Baldwin Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
44000	Lapeer ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
44010	Lapeer Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
44020	Almont Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
44050	Dryden Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
44060	Imlay City Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
44090	North Branch Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
44901	Chatfield School	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		

45010	Glen Lake Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
45020	Leland Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	Renaissance Learning
45040	Northport Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
45050	Suttons Bay Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
45901	Leelanau Montessori Public School Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
46000	Lenawee ISD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
46010	Adrian Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
46020	Addison Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
46040	Blissfield Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
46050	Britton Deerfield Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
46060	Clinton Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
46080	Hudson Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
46090	Madison School District (Lenawee)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
46100	Morenci Area Schools	No	Data could not be included due to technical issue		
46110	Onsted Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
46130	Sand Creek Community Schools	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
46140	Tecumseh Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
47000	Livingston ESA	No	District did not plan to report		
47010	Brighton Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
47030	Fowlerville Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
47060	Hartland Consolidated Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
47070	Howell Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

47080	Pinckney Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
47900	Light of the World Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
47901	Kensington Woods Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
47902	Charyl Stockwell Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
48040	Tahquamenon Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
49010	St. Ignace Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
49020	Bois Blanc Pines School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
49040	Les Cheneaux Community Schools	No	District did not plan to report		
49055	Engadine Consolidated Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
49070	Moran Township School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	Renaissance Learning
49110	Mackinac Island Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
49901	Three Lakes Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
50000	Macomb ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
50010	Center Line Public Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50020	Eastpointe Community Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50030	Roseville Community Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50040	Anchor Bay School District	No	Provided own aggregate		
50050	Armada Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
50070	Clintondale Community Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50080	Chippewa Valley Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50090	Fitzgerald Public Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50100	Fraser Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		

50120	Lake Shore Public Schools (Macomb)	No	Provided own aggregate		
50130	Lakeview Public Schools (Macomb)	No	Provided own aggregate		
50140	L'Anse Creuse Public Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50160	Mount Clemens Community School District	No	Provided own aggregate		
50170	New Haven Community Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50180	Richmond Community Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50190	Romeo Community Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50200	South Lake Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50210	Utica Community Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50220	Van Dyke Public Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50230	Warren Consolidated Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50240	Warren Woods Public Schools	No	Provided own aggregate		
50902	Conner Creek Academy East	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
50903	Huron Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
50905	Arts Academy in the Woods	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
50906	Merritt Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
50908	Mt. Clemens Montessori Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
50909	Prevail Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
50911	Academy of Warren	No	Narrative survey response only		
50912	Reach Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
50913	Noor International Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
50914	Macomb Montessori Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

50918	Center Line Preparatory Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
51000	Manistee ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
51020	Bear Lake Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
51045	Kaleva Norman Dickson School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
51060	Onkama Consolidated Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
51070	Manistee Area Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
51903	Casman Alternative Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
51905	Michigan Great Lakes Virtual Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
52000	Marquette-Alger RESA	No	Provided data, but insufficient for inclusion in analysis		
52015	NICE Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
52040	Gwinns Area Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
52090	Negaunee Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
52100	Powell Township Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
52110	Republic-Michigamme Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
52160	Wells Township School District	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
52170	Marquette Area Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
52180	Ishpeming Public School District No. 1	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
52901	North Star Montessori Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
53000	West Shore Educational Service District	No	Narrative survey response only		
53010	Mason County Central Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
53020	Mason County Eastern Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
53040	Ludington Area School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

53901	Gateway To Success Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
54000	Mecosta-Osceola ISD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
54010	Big Rapids Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	Renaissance Learning
54025	Chippewa Hills School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
54040	Morley Stanwood Community Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
54901	Crossroads Charter Academy	No	District did not plan to report		
55000	Menominee ISD	No	District did not plan to report		
55010	Carney-Nadeau Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
55100	Menominee Area Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
55115	North Central Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
55120	Stephenson Area Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
55900	Uplift Michigan Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
55901	Nah Tah Wahsh Public School Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
56000	Midland County Educational Service Agency	No	Narrative survey response only		
56010	Midland Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
56020	Bullock Creek School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
56030	Coleman Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
56050	Meridian Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
57020	Lake City Area School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
57030	McBain Rural Agricultural Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
58000	Monroe ISD	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
58010	Monroe Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	

58020	Airport Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
58030	Bedford Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
58050	Dundee Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
58070	Ida Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
58080	Jefferson Schools (Monroe)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
58090	Mason Consolidated Schools (Monroe)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
58100	Summerfield Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
58110	Whiteford Agricultural School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
58901	New Bedford Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
58902	Triumph Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
59000	Montcalm Area ISD	No	District did not plan to report		
59020	Carson City-Crystal Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
59045	Montabella Community Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
59070	Greenville Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
59080	Tri County Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
59090	Lakeview Community Schools (Montcalm)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
59125	Central Montcalm Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
59150	Vestaburg Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
60010	Atlanta Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
60020	Hillman Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
61000	Muskegon Area ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
61010	Muskegon, Public Schools of the City of	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
61060	Mona Shores Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	

61065	Oakridge Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
61080	Fruitport Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
61120	Holton Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
61180	Montague Area Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
61190	Orchard View Schools	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
61210	Ravenna Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
61220	Reeths-Puffer Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
61230	North Muskegon Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
61240	Whitehall District Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
61900	Muskegon Montessori Academy for Environmental Change	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
61902	Timberland Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
61904	Three Oaks Public School Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
61905	Muskegon Heights Public School Academy System	No	District did not plan to report		
62000	Newaygo County RESA	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
62040	Fremont Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
62050	Grant Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
62060	Hesperia Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
62070	Newaygo Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
62090	White Cloud Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
62470	Big Jackson School District	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
63000	Oakland Schools	No	District did not plan to report		

63010	Birmingham Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63020	Ferndale Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63030	Pontiac City School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
63040	Royal Oak Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63050	Berkley School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63060	Southfield Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
63070	Avondale School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63080	Bloomfield Hills Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
63090	Clarenceville School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63100	Novi Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	Curriculum Associates
63110	Oxford Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63130	Hazel Park, School District of the City of	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
63140	Madison District Public Schools	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
63150	Troy School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
63160	West Bloomfield School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63180	Brandon School District in the Counties of Oakland and Lapeer	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63190	Clarkston Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	Curriculum Associates
63200	Farmington Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63210	Holly Area School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
63220	Huron Valley Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63230	Lake Orion Community Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
63240	South Lyon Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

63250	Oak Park, School District of the City of	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63260	Rochester Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
63270	Clawson Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
63280	Lamphere Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63290	Walled Lake Consolidated Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
63300	Waterford School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63900	Oakland County Academy of Media & Technology	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
63901	AGBU Alex-Marie Manoogian School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63906	Pontiac Academy for Excellence	No	Narrative survey response only		
63907	Great Lakes Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63909	Oakside Scholars Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63910	Dr. Joseph F. Pollack Academic Center of Excellence	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63911	Holly Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63912	Oakland International Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63913	Walton Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63914	Advanced Technology Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63915	Arts and Technology Academy of Pontiac	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63917	Bradford Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63918	Laurus Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63921	Crescent Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	NWEA
63922	Great Oaks Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

63923	Four Corners Montessori Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63924	Michigan Mathematics and Science Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63926	Faxon Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
63928	Momentum Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63929	Waterford Montessori Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
63934	Kingsbury Country Day School	No	Narrative survey response only		
63938	Keys Grace Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
63939	Lighthouse Connections Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
64040	Hart Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
64070	Pentwater Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
64080	Shelby Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
64090	Walkerville Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
65045	West Branch-Rose City Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
65900	Alternative Educational Academy of Ogemaw County	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
66045	Ewen-Trout Creek Consolidated School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
66050	Ontonagon Area School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
67020	Evart Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
67050	Marion Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
67055	Pine River Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
67060	Reed City Area Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
68010	Mio-AuSable Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

68030	Fairview Area School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
69020	Gaylord Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
69030	Johannesburg-Lewiston Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	DRC
69040	Vanderbilt Area Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
70000	Ottawa Area ISD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
70010	Grand Haven Area Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
70020	Holland City School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
70040	Allendale Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
70070	West Ottawa Public School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
70120	Coopersville Area Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
70175	Jenison Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
70190	Hudsonville Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
70300	Spring Lake Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
70350	Zeeland Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
70901	Walden Green Montessori	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
70902	West MI Academy of Arts and Academics	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
70904	Black River Public School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
70905	Vanderbilt Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
70906	Eagle Crest Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
70908	Innocademy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
70909	ICademy Global	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
71050	Onaway Area Community School District	No	Narrative survey response only		

71060	Posen Consolidated School District No. 9	No	Narrative survey response only		
71080	Rogers City Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
72000	C.O.O.R. ISD	No	District did not plan to report		
72010	Roscommon Area Public Schools	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
72020	Houghton Lake Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
72901	Charlton Heston Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73000	Saginaw ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
73010	Saginaw, School District of the City of	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73030	Carrollton Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
73040	Saginaw Township Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73110	Chesaning Union Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73170	Birch Run Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73180	Bridgeport-Spaulding Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73190	Frankenmuth School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73200	Freeland Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	NWEA
73210	Hemlock Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73230	Merrill Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	NWEA
73240	St. Charles Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73255	Swan Valley School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73901	The Woodley Leadership Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73908	Saginaw Preparatory Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73909	Francis Reh PSA	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

73910	North Saginaw Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
73912	International Academy of Saginaw	No	Narrative survey response only		
74000	St. Clair County RESA	No	Narrative survey response only		
74010	Port Huron Area School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
74030	Algonac Community School District	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
74040	Capac Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
74050	East China School District	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
74100	Marysville Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
74120	Memphis Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
74130	Yale Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
74900	East Shore Leadership Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
74903	Landmark Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
74911	St. Clair County Intervention Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
74912	Virtual Learning Academy of St. Clair County	No	District did not plan to report		
75000	St. Joseph County ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
75010	Sturgis Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
75020	Burr Oak Community School District	No	Provided data, but insufficient for inclusion in analysis		
75030	Centreville Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
75040	Colon Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
75050	Constantine Public School District	No	Narrative survey response only		
75060	Mendon Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

75070	White Pigeon Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
75080	Three Rivers Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
75100	Nottawa Community School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
76000	Sanilac ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
76060	Brown City Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
76070	Carsonville-Port Sanilac School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
76080	Croswell-Lexington Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	Renaissance Learning
76090	Deckerville Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
76140	Marlette Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
76180	Peck Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
76210	Sandusky Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
77010	Manistique Area Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
78000	Shiawassee Regional ESD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
78020	Byron Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
78030	Durand Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
78040	Laingsburg Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
78060	Morrice Area Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
78070	New Lothrop Area Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
78080	Perry Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
78100	Corunna Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
78110	Owosso Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
79000	Tuscola ISD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

79010	Akron-Fairgrove Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
79020	Caro Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
79030	Cass City Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
79080	Kingston Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
79090	Mayville Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
79100	Millington Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
79110	Reese Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
79145	Unionville-Sebewaing Area S.D.	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
79150	Vassar Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
80000	Van Buren ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
80010	South Haven Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
80020	Bangor Public Schools (Van Buren)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
80040	Covert Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
80050	Decatur Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
80090	Bloomington Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
80110	Gobles Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
80120	Hartford Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
80130	Lawrence Public Schools	No	Narrative survey response only		
80140	Lawton Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	DRC	
80150	Mattawan Consolidated School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
80160	Paw Paw Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
80240	Bangor Township S/D #8	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		

80900	Michigan Online School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
81000	Washtenaw ISD	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81010	Ann Arbor Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81020	Ypsilanti Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81040	Chelsea School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81050	Dexter Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81070	Lincoln Consolidated School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81080	Manchester Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81100	Milan Area Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81120	Saline Area Schools	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
81140	Whitmore Lake Public School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81900	Global Tech Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81901	Honey Creek Community School	No	Narrative survey response only		
81902	Central Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
81904	Ann Arbor Learning Community	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
81905	South Arbor Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81906	Fortis Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81908	Multicultural Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
81910	East Arbor Charter Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
81912	South Pointe Scholars Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
81913	Livingston Classical Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82015	Detroit Public Schools Community District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	

82020	Allen Park Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82030	Dearborn City School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82040	Dearborn Heights School District #7	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
82045	Melvindale-North Allen Park Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	NWEA
82050	Garden City Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82055	Grosse Pointe Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82060	Hamtramck, School District of the City of	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
82090	Lincoln Park, School District of the City of	No	Narrative survey response only		
82095	Livonia Public Schools School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
82100	Plymouth-Canton Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82110	Redford Union Schools, District No. 1	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82120	River Rouge, School District of the City of	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82130	Romulus Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82140	South Redford School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82150	Taylor School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
82155	Trenton Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	Curriculum Associates
82160	Wayne-Westland Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82170	Wyandotte, School District of the City of	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82180	Flat Rock Community Schools	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
82230	Crestwood School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82240	Westwood Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82250	Ecorse Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	

82290	Gibraltar School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82300	Grosse Ile Township Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82320	Harper Woods, The School District of the City of	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82340	Huron School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82365	Woodhaven-Brownstown School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Renaissance Learning	
82390	Northville Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82400	Riverview Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82405	Southgate Community School District	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82430	Van Buren Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82700	Detroit Achievement Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82701	University Preparatory Science and Math (PSAD)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82702	University Preparatory Academy (PSAD)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82703	University Preparatory Art & Design	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82704	Detroit Public Safety Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82705	Branch Line School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82706	The James and Grace Lee Boggs School	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82710	WAY Michigan	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82713	New Paradigm College Prep	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82717	Achieve Charter Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
82718	Quest Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82719	Washington-Parks Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	

82722	Detroit Leadership Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82723	Legacy Charter Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
82724	University Yes Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82725	Global Heights Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82727	Regent Park Scholars Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82729	South Canton Scholars Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82730	American International Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82735	New Paradigm Glazer-Loving Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82737	Pathways Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82739	Detroit Innovation Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82742	Madison-Carver Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
82743	Plymouth Scholars Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82744	Escuela Avancemos	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82745	Caniff Liberty Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82746	W-A-Y Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
82747	MacDowell Preparatory Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82748	Rutherford Winans Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82749	Highland Park Public School Academy System	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
82751	Michigan Educational Choice Center	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82752	Capstone Academy Charter School (SDA)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82754	Tipton Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82757	Grand River Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

82760	Cornerstone Jefferson-Douglass Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
82762	Inkster Preparatory Academy	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
82763	Distinctive College Prep.	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82765	Pembroke Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82766	Westfield Charter Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
82767	Ivywood Classical Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82770	Sigma Academy for Leadership and Early Middle College	No	Narrative survey response only		
82772	Fostering Leadership Academy	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
82904	Plymouth Educational Center Charter School	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82910	Martin Luther King, Jr. Education Center Academy	No	District did not plan to report		
82915	Eaton Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82916	River Heights Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82918	Cesar Chavez Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82919	Commonwealth Community Development Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82921	Academy for Business and Technology	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82923	Chandler Park Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82924	Marvin L. Winans Academy of Performing Arts	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82925	Detroit Community Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82928	The Dearborn Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
82929	Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82930	Dove Academy of Detroit	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

82933	Barack Obama Leadership Academy	No	District did not plan to report		
82937	George Crockett Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82938	Summit Academy North	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82940	Voyageur Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82941	Star International Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82942	Hope Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
82943	Weston Preparatory Academy	No	District did not sign agreement with MDH		
82945	Detroit Edison Public School Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82947	David Ellis Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82950	Universal Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82953	Detroit Service Learning Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82956	Old Redford Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82957	Hope of Detroit Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82958	Joy Preparatory Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82959	West Village Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82963	George Washington Carver Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82967	Metro Charter Academy	No	Narrative survey response only		
82968	Canton Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82969	Creative Montessori Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82970	Warrendale Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82973	Trillium Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82974	Detroit Merit Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	

82975	Riverside Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82976	Keystone Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82977	Hamtramck Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82979	Detroit Enterprise Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82981	American Montessori Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82982	Universal Learning Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82983	Bridge Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82985	Detroit Premier Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82986	Hanley International Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82987	Frontier International Academy	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82994	David Ellis Academy West	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		
82995	Taylor Exemplar Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82996	Clara B. Ford Academy (SDA)	No	District did not plan to report		
82997	Flagship Charter Academy	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
82998	ACE Academy (SDA)	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
83000	Wexford-Missaukee ISD	No	Narrative survey response only		
83010	Cadillac Area Public Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
83060	Manton Consolidated Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	NWEA	
83070	Mesick Consolidated Schools	Yes	Provided sufficient data through MDH	Curriculum Associates	
83900	Highpoint Virtual Academy of Michigan	No	District signed agreement but did not provide data to MDH		

REPORT NOTES

¹ For second 2nd graders, if their phonics content area score exceeds a predetermined level (i.e., greater than 421), they are permitted to skip the remaining 12 questions focusing on phonological awareness. For these students, the length of the overall assessment is reduced from 72-81 to 60-69 items.

² Similar to the 2nd-grade i-Ready Reading Diagnostic, the overall length of the test provided to 3rd-8th-grade students depends on student performance throughout the assessment. Students with an overall score above 511 after completing the first three sections of the assessment are not required to complete the phonics or high-frequency sections. This reduces the length of the assessment to 54-63 total questions. Students with an overall score below 511 after completing the three sections must complete the phonics section. Obtaining a score above 421 on the phonics sections allows students to skip the high-frequency words section, reducing the overall length of their test to 66-75 questions. Finally, students with an overall score below 511 after completing the three sections, and a phonics score below 421, must complete the full assessment (78-87 total questions).

³ Renaissance Learning also offers interim assessments that are shorter in length compared to the summative assessments (only 24 questions) and these diagnostics can be administered throughout the school year.

⁴ A linking study correlates scores between two unique assessments that use different scoring systems. In other words, linking helps to translate or equate scores across assessments. For example, NWEA linked scores from specific iterations of the MAP Growth and M-STEP assessments using an equipercentile linking method, where pairs of scores across the two assessments were equated based on the percentile rank both scores share.

⁵ “Norming” is the process of determining what constitutes “typical performance” on a specific assessment. A “norming sample” refers to a group of test-takers who are representative of the population for whom the test is intended. Assessment data from this group of test-takers is used to establish “norms” for the intended population of test-takers.

⁶ In total, 2,392 and 2,356 students are included more than once in the mathematics and reading analytic samples, respectively. These groups represent 0.6% and 0.8% of each respective sample.

⁷ Eight of these districts are ISDs, which typically only operate a small number of specialized schools and programs; another two are virtual-only charter schools.