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Research Questions

EPIC’s Year 2 Evaluation of the Partnership Model Asks Four Main Questions:

01 How did the COVID-19 pandemic affect Partnership schools and districts?

02 How did student outcomes differ in Partnership relative to near-selected schools during the 2019-20 school year?

03 How have Partnership schools and districts experienced shifts in enrollment, funding, and attendance in the 2019-20 school year?

04 How have accountability, culture and climate, and human capital been affected by Partnership and the COVID-19 pandemic?
Research Question #1:

How did the COVID-19 pandemic affect Partnership schools and districts?
COVID-19 in Partnership Communities

Partnership Communities had Higher Test Positivity Rates and More Cases and Deaths Than the Rest of the State

Note: Line graph shows seven-day rolling averages of county test positivity rates applied to school districts, weighted by student enrollment, from April 1, 2020 through June 14, 2021. Figures at right represent weighted district average cumulative rates as of June 14, 2021. Source: MDHHS.
COVID-19 in Partnership Communities

High Rates of Community Transmission Reverberated into the Homes of Students in Partnership Districts

Note: Bars provide estimated range of students experiencing each health-related challenge based on responses to the question, “In this school year, approximately what proportion of your students have experienced each of the following as a result of COVID-19?” Response options were <10%, 10-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76-90%, and >90%. This question was asked to teachers only. To create estimated ranges, we assign the minimum value of the selected response option as the lower bound and the maximum value as the upper bound. We then take the weighted mean of the lower and upper bounds, respectively. Source: Partnership teacher survey.
**Student Experiences With COVID-19**

Teachers Report that Socioeconomic Challenges Became More Resonant for Families in Partnership Districts

**Teachers’ Reports of Students’ COVID-Related Challenges**

Note: Teachers were asked, “To what extent have each of the following been a challenge for your students this school year?” Response options were “not a challenge,” “a minimal challenge,” “a moderate challenge,” “a major challenge,” and “the greatest challenge.” Bar heights provide the percent of teachers across Partnership districts who reported that each item was either a major challenge or the greatest challenge. Source: Partnership teacher survey.
Teachers Believe that Students Have Experienced Emotional Trauma Related to the Pandemic

Note: Teachers were asked, “To what extent have each of the following been a challenge for your students this school year?” Response options were “not a challenge,” “a minimal challenge,” “a moderate challenge,” “a major challenge,” and “the greatest challenge.” Bar heights provide the percent of teachers across Partnership districts who reported that each item was either a major challenge or the greatest challenge. Range at right provides response to question asking teachers to estimate the proportion of their students who experienced socioemotional trauma as a result of COVID-19? Response options were <10%, 10-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76-90%, and >90%. To create the estimated range, we assign the minimum value of the selected response option as the lower bound and the maximum value as the upper bound. We then take the weighted mean of the lower and upper bounds, respectively. Source: Partnership teacher survey.
COVID-19 and Schooling in Partnership Schools and Districts

Partnership Districts Relied Heavily on Remote Instruction Throughout the 2020-21 School Year

Note: Marker heights represent the share of Partnership districts that reported plans to operate in a given modality in each month. Fully in-person option means districts have an option for students to attend in-person for all days. Hybrid classifies districts without a fully in-person option that have any students attending a hybrid model. Fully remote identifies districts in which all students attend remotely. Figures exclude virtual districts that were remote prior to the pandemic. Source: Reconfirmed Extended COVID-19 Learning Plans (ECOL).
Resource Constraints Were Evident For Students and Educators

Teachers Reported That They Lacked the Information and Resources Needed to Educate Students

Percent of Teachers Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed That They...

- Had Data and Information to Adequately Target Instruction: 38.2%
- Had Resources to Adequately Serve Students: 36.5%
- Were Able to Educate as Well as in Prior Years: 21.7%

Note: Teachers were asked “To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?” regarding their students’ access to resources related to schooling during the pandemic. Response options were “strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “neither agree nor disagree,” “agree,” or “strongly agree.” Bar heights represent the percent of teachers who agreed or strongly agreed with each statement. Source: Partnership teacher survey.
Educators Reported That Students Did Not Make Desired Academic Gains

Educators Estimated that Their Students Started Behind and Would End the School Year Without Meeting Content Standards

Note: Principals and elementary teachers were asked about each subject area; secondary teachers were asked about the subject area of their primary teaching assignment. Bar heights represent the percent of educators who agreed or strongly agreed that their students began on track with content standards in each subject and would end the school year proficient in content standards for each subject. Responses are pooled across principals and elementary and secondary teachers. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Research Question #2:

How did student outcomes differ in Partnership relative to near-selected schools during the 2019-20 school year?
Partnership and Graduation Rate

Cohort 1 Progress on Graduation Rates Retreated in the First Year of the Pandemic

Note: Markers represent coefficient estimates on interaction between Partnership and year indicators in event study models, with the identification year (2016-17 for Cohort 1 and 2017-18 for Cohort 2) as the omitted reference year. Dotted lines with shaded regions represent 95% confidence intervals. Source: Administrative data from MDE and CEPI.
Partnership and Student Mobility

Students in Partnership Schools Were Less Likely Than Students in Comparison Schools to Leave their Schools in 2019-20

Students in Partnership schools left their districts at similar rates to their peers in comparison schools, but less often than in prior years.
Partnership and Student Mobility

Though Less Likely to Leave their Schools, Students in Partnership Schools Were More Likely to Leave MI Public Education in 2019-20

Note: Markers represent coefficient estimates on interaction between Partnership and year indicators in event study models, with the identification year (2016-17 for Cohort 1 and 2017-18 for Cohort 2) as the omitted reference year. Dotted lines with shaded regions represent 95% confidence intervals. Source: Administrative data from MDE and CEPI.
Partnership and Student Achievement

Prior to the Pandemic, the Lowest Achieving Students in Both Cohorts Made the Strongest Achievement Gains

Math - Cohort 1

Math - Cohort 2

Note: Markers represent coefficient estimates on interaction between Partnership and year indicators in event study models, with the identification year (2016-17 for Cohort 1 and 2017-18 for Cohort 2) as the omitted reference year. Source: Administrative data from MDE and CEPI.
Research Question #3:

How have Partnership schools and districts experienced shifts in enrollment, funding, and attendance in the 2019-20 school year?
Student Enrollment Changes During the Pandemic

Declines were Starkest in Partnership Elementary Schools

Note: Figures represent share of total enrollment in 2013-14 in the listed grade band for the year. A value above 100 indicates that enrollment is higher than in 2013-14, while a value below 100 indicates that enrollment is lower. Treatment is assigned as ever treat (e.g., a school that was in Cohort 1 but exited would be counted as Cohort 1 across all years). Sample restricted to 3,154 schools that were open for all eight years of the period from 2013-14 through 2020-21. Source: Administrative data from MDE and CEPI.
Student Absenteeism in Partnership Districts

Absenteeism Was Pervasive in 2020-21, With Partnership Schools Experiencing Even Higher Rates Than Other Schools in Their Districts

Note: Bars provide estimated range of daily student absenteeism in February 2021 based on responses to the question, “Think about student absences over the last month. Approximately what percentage of your students were absent from school (for all or part of the day) each day?” Response options were <10%, 10-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76-90%, and >90%. To create estimated ranges, we assign the minimum value of the selected response option as the lower bound and the maximum value as the upper bound. We then take the weighted mean of the lower and upper bounds, respectively, across all respondents in a category (e.g., teachers in Partnership schools). Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Student Absenteeism in Partnership Districts

Most Teachers Reported that Educating Students Who Do Not Consistently Attend Class Was the Greatest Classroom Challenge in 2020-21

Note: Teachers were asked, "To what extent have each of the following been challenges for you in the classroom this school year?" Response options were "not a challenge," "a minimal challenge," "a moderate challenge," "a major challenge," and "the greatest challenge." Bar heights provide the mean response on a 1–5 scale, with 1 representing "not a challenge" and 5 representing "the greatest challenge." Figures to the right provide the percent of teachers who reported that "Educating students who do not consistently attend class" was the greatest challenge. Source: Partnership teacher survey.
Student Absenteeism in Partnership Districts

Educators Responded by Redoubling School Focus on Attendance

Note: Teachers and principals were asked, “In the [current] school year, to what extent are each of the following areas a focus in your school?” Bar heights provide means of teacher (left panel) and principal (right panel) responses to the response item “Student attendance interventions.”
Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Research Question #4:

How have accountability, culture and climate, and human capital been affected by Partnership and the COVID-19 pandemic?
Accountability

“It's a new frontier, new horizon, new situation we're in right now. I thought about that. I'm like, ‘We're scheduled to go through our review in the fall. How do you account for some of the things that we're dealing with?’ At the end of the day, we still have to have our students grow and achieve...”

–Hurricanes Charter Leader
Educator Views of Partnership

Partnership continued to shift from a high-stakes accountability policy to a supportive capacity-building intervention

“I just think the term ‘partnership,’ it has allowed us, when you talk about the evolution, it starts off on a positive note as opposed to starting off with a School Improvement Grant or it's a turnaround.”

–Lightning Charter Leader

“It’s given us resources and communications with the [state] Department of Education, not only through our liaison, but through when we did have the face-to-face kinds of meetings that [PAL] held. We were able to do workshops together and focus on areas. It’s increased our... participation and relationship with [ISD]. It’s been very supportive and good for us.”

–Oiliers District Leader
Educator Views of Partnership

Principals Reported Positive Views of Partnership; Those in Partnership Schools and Charters Reported Particularly Positive Perceptions

Note: Principals were asked about the extent to which they agreed with items related to the RGA process in their school. Response options were “strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “neither agree nor disagree,” “agree,” or “strongly agree.” Bars show the percent of principals who agreed or strongly agreed. Source: Partnership principal survey.
Educator Views of Partnership

Educators Reported Positive Perceptions of Their Improvement Goals, But Were Less Confident That They Had the Resources They Needed to Achieve Those Goals

Note: Teachers and principals were asked the extent to which they agreed with a series of statements about their school or district’s improvement goals. Response options were “strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “neither agree nor disagree,” “agree,” or “strongly agree.” Bars show the percent of educators who agreed or strongly agreed. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Accountability During the Pandemic

Educators Continued to Monitor Goals, Though Monitoring was Muddled by the Pandemic

Note: Teachers and principals were asked, “To what extent do you agree with the following statements?” Response options were “strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “neither agree nor disagree,” “agree,” or “strongly agree.” Bars show the percent of educators who agreed or strongly agreed. Percentages at right show the share of educators who agreed or strongly agreed that their school was monitoring goals. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Climate and Culture

“Our teachers— they've been through it. When I say they've been through it, it's been brutally challenging for them. You have teachers who chose a profession because they love being with kids and the interaction with the kids is a part of what keeps them motivated and thriving and energized. They've relied on each other a lot, right? They're a close staff.”

–Oilers District Leader
Climate and Culture in Partnership Districts

Educators Reported Positive Perceptions of Many Elements of Climate and Culture

Note: Educators were asked the extent to which they agreed with each statement related to climate and culture. Response options were “strongly agree,” “agree,” “neither agree nor disagree,” “disagree,” and “strongly disagree.” Percentages represent the share of educators in Partnership districts who agreed or strongly agreed. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Climate and Culture in Partnership Districts

Educators Reported Challenges Related to Parent Engagement—and Responded by Amplifying School Focus on Parent and Community Engagement

“We have to focus on engagement because it’s very easy for us to lose contact with our families. The school, the admin team, they’ve done a phenomenal job... We really had to think out of the box in order to keep our families engaged... I think that’s where we are right now... all those things I think are helpful with keeping engagement because if you don’t have the students there, you certainly can’t teach them.”

–Rangers Charter Leader

Note: Educators were asked to indicate the extent to which lack parent engagement was a hindrance to achieving improvement goals. Response options were “not a hindrance,” “a slight hindrance,” “a moderate hindrance,” “a great hindrance,” or “the greatest hindrance.” Percentages reflect the share of educators selecting “a great hindrance” or “the greatest hindrance” in each year of the survey. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
“If I was a teacher, I wouldn’t leave my school and try another school in the middle of a pandemic, but I think [turnover’s] been a problem. It’s been getting worse every year anyway, so it’s kind of hard to say.”

–Rangers Charter Leader
Teacher Turnover in Partnership Schools

Partnership Schools and Districts Did Not Experience More Overall Turnover Than in Prior Years, But Partnership School Teachers Were More Likely to Exit the Profession in 2019-20

**Cohort 2** teachers were 3.6 percentage points **less likely** to leave their schools than in the Partnership identification year.

**Cohort 1** teachers were 4.4 percentage points **more likely** to leave Michigan public education than comparison school teachers.

Teachers in both cohorts were **more likely** to leave Michigan public education than in the identification year:

- **Cohort 1**: 8.4 percentage points more likely
- **Cohort 2**: 4.9 percentage points more likely
Teacher and Principal Turnover in Partnership Schools and Districts

Educators Largely Reported Plans to Stay in Their Current Positions

Note: Educators were asked, “Which of the following best describes your plans for next school year?” Percentages provide the share of teachers and principals reporting each plan. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Teacher and Principal Turnover in Partnership Schools and Districts

Malleable Factors Such as Leadership and Culture and Climate Were Most Salient to Educator Decisions to Stay

Note: Teachers were asked the extent to which a variety of items factored into their plans to stay in their current positions in the 2021-22 school year. Response options were “not a factor,” “a minor factor,” “a moderate factor,” “a major factor,” or “a primary factor.” Percentages represent the weighted share of respondents reporting the item was a “major” or “primary factor.” Bars present top two items for intended stayers in Partnership schools. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Teachers Reported Growing Job Satisfaction Over the Course of the Pandemic, While Principal Job Satisfaction Tapered Off

Note: Educators were asked to rate their agreement with statements that they were satisfied with their job, satisfied with their district, and felt supported by administration during the COVID-19 pandemic. Percentages represent weighted share of teachers and principals, respectively, who responded that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.

Educators felt supported by administration during COVID-19 pandemic:

- **58%** Partnership Teachers
- **55%** Non-Partnership Teachers
- **57%** Partnership Principals
- **52%** Non-Partnership Principals

Note: Educators were asked to rate their agreement with statements that they were satisfied with their job, satisfied with their district, and felt supported by administration during the COVID-19 pandemic. Percentages represent weighted share of teachers and principals, respectively, who responded that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Teacher Recruitment

Principals Reported That Malleable In-School Factors Were Somewhat Positive While Fixed Out-of-School Factors Remained Challenges in Hiring

Note: Principals were asked to rate the extent to which each factor impacted hiring. Response options were 1 “very negatively impacts,” 2 “somewhat negatively impacts,” 3 “does not impact,” 4 “somewhat positively impacts,” and 5 “very positively impacts.” Bars represent weighted mean response across all principal respondents in Partnership districts. Bars are sorted within category in order of positive to negative impact. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
School Leadership

School Leadership Continued to be a Bright Spot in Partnership Districts

Note: Teachers were asked how effectively their principal or school leader performed each of the above. Response options were “not at all effectively,” “slightly effectively,” “somewhat effectively,” “very effectively,” and “extremely effectively.” Bars represent the share of teachers in Partnership districts selecting “very” or “extremely” effective on a given item. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
School Leadership

Perceptions of Principal Effectiveness Were Highest in Partnership Schools and Continued to Climb Over Each Year of the Intervention

Note: Marker heights represent mean percentiles of Cohort 1, Cohort 2, and non-Partnership school teacher responses to items related to principal effectiveness. The 50th percentile represents the average for all teachers across each of the three survey waves. Source: Partnership teacher and principal surveys.
Key Takeaways: COVID-19; Mobility

• The pandemic undercut opportunity to learn in Partnership districts

• Progress toward improving graduation rates in Cohort 1 appears to have stalled during the pandemic

• Students in low-performing schools across the state moved to new schools and districts at lower rates than previous years but left public education at higher rates

• The share of teachers leaving their schools and districts dipped slightly while the share of teachers leaving public education altogether ticked upward
  - Leaving was highest among early career and Black teachers
Key Takeaways: Accountability, Leadership, and Climate

- Partnership continued its evolution from a sanctions-based accountability policy to a supportive capacity-building intervention—though schools continued to monitor accountability goals during the pandemic.

- School leadership continued to be a bright spot in Partnership districts, and especially in Partnership schools.

- School climate and culture appeared to improve over time on average, but student motivation and parent engagement declined.
  - Cohort 1 educators in particular reported continued improvements in climate and culture.
Policy Implications

01 State and local policymakers will need to focus on accelerating learning in the 2021-22 school year and beyond

02 Students in Partnership districts will need supports beyond academics

03 Continued funding will be critical to help Partnership and other low-performing schools and districts meet the academic and socioemotional needs of students

04 There needs to be increased efforts to recruit and retain teachers—especially Black teachers—in Partnership and other low-performing schools and districts
Supplemental Slides
## Data and Methods

EPIC’s multi-method evaluation relies on several sources of data to address the research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Data (MDE and CEPI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person level</td>
<td>Student administrative records (Analytic N=1,132,033 student-years)</td>
<td>Regression-based analyses (event studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educator administrative records (Analytic N=50,601 educator-years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization level</td>
<td>District revenue (5,805 district-years)</td>
<td>Descriptive analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School enrollment (27,853 school-years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Data (collected by EPIC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys of Educators in Partnership</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Factor analyses and descriptive analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>fall 2018 N=2,718; 38% RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall 2019 N=3,324; 49% RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spring 2021 N=2,342; 39% RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall 2018 N=81; 29% RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall 2019 N=88; 38% RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spring 2021 N=116; 47% RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data and Methods

EPIC’s multi-method evaluation relies on several sources of data to address the research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COVID-19 Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case, death, and positivity rates</td>
<td>County-level COVID-19 cases and deaths per 100,000 population, test positivity rates (MDDHS) (N=83 counties)</td>
<td>Descriptive analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional modality plans</td>
<td>District monthly plans to educate students (Reconfirmed Extended COVID-19 Learning Plans [ECOL]) (N=799-814 districts per month)</td>
<td>Descriptive analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Interviews with Partnership district leaders | LEA/Charter leader interviews  
N=19; 70% RR | Descriptive and thematic coding |
COVID-19 in Partnership Communities

Partnership Communities Had Higher Confirmed Case Rates For 2 of 3 Peaks and Slightly More Confirmed Cases Overall

Cases per 100,000 as of June 14, 2021

Partnership: 9,049
Non-Partnership: 8,630
COVID-19 in Partnership Communities

Partnership Communities Experienced More COVID-Related Deaths

Deaths per 100,000 as of June 14, 2021

- Partnership: 244
- Non-Partnership: 191
COVID-19 Challenges are most Pronounced in Cohort 1 Schools

Cohort 1 schools are among the most disadvantaged in the state and experienced even more salient challenges related to COVID-19 than other Partnership schools.
Resource Constraints Were Evident For Students and Educators

While Partnership Leaders Worked to Provide Resources to Close the Digital Divide, Students Still Grappled With Resource Constraints
Resource Constraints Were Evident For Students and Educators

Educators Made Extraordinary Efforts to Support Students but Reported Challenges Related to Remote Instruction

“We had been identified in [county] as one of those Internet deserts. We have put a lot of money and time into figuring out how to navigate this. We bought over 100 Verizon Wi-Fi devices for our families. We’ve done some professional development for families and students on how to use those and how to use the Chromebooks. ...You run into families who don’t know how to use computers.”

–Devils District Leader

“These kids need more food. They need warmer clothes. If we’re going to give them tablets which was awesome, they need to work consistently. These kids are parenting younger siblings and in noisy homes with no space to learn, and then they’re expected to just make things work normally. Nothing is normal. Everyone is traumatized and scared.”

–Partnership District Teacher
The Pandemic Introduced and in Some Cases Intensified Challenges For Partnership Educators

![Bar Chart: Instructional Challenges and Student-Teacher Relations]

- Communicating with Families: 63.6%
- Providing Students with Disabilities with Appropriate Instruction: 62.6%
- Maintaining Instructional Continuity Across Modalities: 61.4%
- Access to Supplementary Materials Needed to Support the Curriculum: 59.0%
- Online Class Management: 43.9%
- In-Person Classroom Management: 21.6%
- Establishing Emotional Connections With Students: 56.5%
- Building Trust With Students: 46.1%
Resource Constraints Were Evident For Students and Educators

Resource Constraints Were Especially Prevalent in Traditional Public Schools
Challenges were Especially Prevalent for Students with Special Needs

• Our district is doing a great deal to assist our students and families during the pandemic. They are offering a variety of ways for students to participate in school, delivering food and work packets to homes in addition to providing computers and hotspots. The problem is that this does not work for many of the SXI (Severely Multiply Impaired) students. Many of them can't use a keyboard or click or drag with a mouse because of their impairments. Their immune systems are weak and they have several underlying conditions so their parents prefer for them to stay home.

–Teacher
The Pandemic Introduced and in some cases intensified challenges for Partnership Educators

These Challenges Were Especially Prevalent in Traditional Public Schools
Student Enrollment Changes During the Pandemic

Principals in Partnership Schools Reported more Turbulent Enrollment Trends
School funding in Partnership and non-Partnership Districts

Partnership Districts Rely More Heavily on State and Federal Dollars, Which Are Tied to Student Enrollment
Partnership and Student Achievement

While There Was No Effect of Partnership on Cohort 2 on Average, the Lowest Achieving Students Made Gains
A Shifting Understanding of Accountability
Partnership Continued its Evolution Away from a High-Stakes Accountability Policy to a Supportive Capacity-Building Intervention
Educator Views of Partnership

Partnership continued to shift from a high-stakes accountability policy to a supportive capacity-building intervention

“I just think the term ‘partnership,’ it has allowed us, when you talk about the evolution, it starts off on a positive note as opposed to starting off with a School Improvement Grant or it's a turnaround.”

–Lightning Charter Leader

“It’s given us resources and communications with the [state] Department of Education, not only through our liaison, but through when we did have the face-to-face kinds of meetings that [PAL] held. We were able to do workshops together and focus on areas. It’s increased our... participation and relationship with [ISD]. It’s been very supportive and good for us.”

–Oilers District Leader
Accountability during the pandemic

Concerns about School and Personal Accountability for Pandemic Learning were Salient
Accountability during the pandemic

Uncertainties Loomed About How Learning Would be Measured Pervaded 2020-21 School Year—Especially Among TPS Teachers

![Graph showing uncertainty about learning measurement]

- Percent Who Reported Major or Primary Concern About How Learning Will be Measured
- Teachers
  - All Schools: 71.9%
  - TPS/Charter Schools: 72.3%
  - TPS: 64.8%
  - Charter: 68.1%
- Principals
  - All Schools: 76.9%
  - TPS/Charter Schools: 77.5%
  - TPS: 77.5%
Climate and Culture in Partnership Districts

Perceptions of Climate and Culture Ticked Upward During the Pandemic, with Especially Evident Increases in Cohort 1 Schools
Climate and Culture in Partnership Districts

While Perceptions of Climate and Culture Became More Positive Overall in 2020-21, Educators Reported That Students Were Less Enthusiastic to Learn

Students Are Enthusiastic to Learn

Student Motivation is a Hindrance to School Improvement

Percent Who Agree That Students are Enthusiastic to Learn

Percent Reporting Student Motivation as Great or Greatest Hindrance

- Teachers
- Principals

2018-19 2019-20 2020-21

2018-19 2019-20 2020-21
School and District Turnover in Partnership Schools

Teachers in Partnership Schools Were Similarly Likely to Leave Their Schools and Districts as Those in Comparison Schools in 2020-21
Exiting the Teaching Profession

Cohort 1 Teachers Were More Likely to Exit the Profession Than Those in Comparison Schools in 2020-21
Turnover in Partnership Schools

But Cohort 2 Teachers in Particular Were Less Likely to Leave Their Schools Than in Prior Years but Teachers in Both Cohorts Were More Likely to Leave MI Public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leave School</th>
<th>Leave District</th>
<th>Leave Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.084***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>-0.036+</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.049***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cells provide the linear combination of the coefficient on 2019-20 and 2019-20 x Partnership and the associated standard error. Estimates reflect the estimated deviation from the omitted reference year (2016-17 for Cohort 1 and 2017-18 for Cohort 2). + p<.1, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001
Exiting the Teaching Profession

Exits Were Especially Prevalent Among Black and Early Career Teachers

[Bar chart showing estimated change in probability of leaving teaching for White and Black teachers in Cohort 1 and Cohort 2, with bars for Partnership and Comparison groups.]
Teacher and Principal Turnover in Partnership Schools and Districts

Educators Largely Reported Plans to Stay in Their Current Positions

### Educator Plans, by School Year (2019-20 •vs• 2020-21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Partnership</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same School</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different School</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different District</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Education or Retire</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same School</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different School</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different District</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Education or Retire</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educator Job Satisfaction

While Educators Felt Supported on Average, There Was Also Evidence of Demoralization and Burnout

Educator Perceptions that Teacher Demoralization Was a Great Hindrance to School Improvement
Teacher Recruitment

In Partnership Schools, Malleable In-School Factors Became More Positive Over Time While Out-of-School Factors Remained More Negative Than in Non-Partnership Schools
Teacher Absenteeism and Substitute Availability

Partnership Districts Grappled with High Teacher Absenteeism and Struggled to Find Qualified Subs

Estimated Teacher Absenteeism Each Day

Availability of Substitutes
Teacher Absenteeism and Substitute Availability

Despite Shallow Substitute Pool, Educators Largely Did Not Perceive Sub Availability and Quality as Hindrances to School Improvement