

How Michigan Department of Education Made Intermediate School District/State Agency Determinations

Under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2020: Part B

Michigan Department of Education

Office of Special Education

June 2020



Table of Contents

How Michigan Department of Education Made Determinations	3
Introduction	3
2020 Part B Results Matrix	4
Results Elements.....	4
Scoring Using the Results Matrix.....	6
2020 Part B Compliance Matrix.....	9
Compliance Elements	9
Scoring Using the Compliance Matrix	9
2020 Determinations	12
Overall Determination Score	12
Determination Levels.....	12

How Michigan Department of Education Made Determinations

Introduction

In 2020, Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is using both results and compliance indicators in making a determination of the extent to which each Intermediate School District (ISD) is meeting the purposes and requirements under section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). The totality of the information pertaining to results and compliance elements about an ISD was considered in making the determinations. As in the past, MDE is using compliance data in making determinations of State Agencies (SA).

Information used as elements in the determination score included: rates of participation and proficiency of students with IEPs in Statewide assessments; students with IEPs who exited public education and graduated with a regular high school diploma; and who dropped out. Also included were data for Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2018 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for the ISDs; and other data related to State compliance with the *IDEA*. Below is a detailed description of how MDE evaluated data of ISDs using the Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Matrix. MDE is using determinations criteria closely aligned to those used by the U.S. Department of Education in making determinations for state departments of education.

The RDA Matrix consists of:

1. a **Results Matrix** that describes the scoring of Results Elements;
2. a **Compliance Matrix** that describes scoring based on SPP/APR Compliance Indicators and other Compliance Elements;
3. a **Results score** and **Compliance score**;
4. the **Overall Determination Score** of the ISD;
5. Differentiated Determination Level Based on ISDs Results and Compliance - score Performance.

The scoring of each of the above criteria is further explained below in the following sections:

- A. 2020 Part B Results Matrix with Results Elements and Scoring Criteria
- B. 2020 Part B Compliance Matrix with Compliance Elements and Scoring Criteria

- C. 2020 RDA Overall Determination Score and Determinations Levels for Differentiated Support around Meeting the Purpose and Requirements of IDEA

2020 Part B Results Matrix

Results Elements

In making each ISD's 2020 determination, MDE used a Results Matrix reflecting the following data:

1. The percentage of 4th grade students with IEPs participating in regular Statewide assessments in English Language Arts;
2. The percentage of 8th grade students with IEPs participating in regular Statewide assessments in English Language Arts;
3. The percentage of 4th grade students with IEPs scoring proficient in regular Statewide assessment in English Language Arts;
4. The percentage of 8th grade students with IEPs scoring proficient in regular Statewide assessment in English Language Arts;
5. The percentage of 4th grade students with IEPs participating in regular Statewide assessments in Math;
6. The percentage of 8th grade students with IEPs participating in regular Statewide assessments in Math;
7. The percentage of 4th grade students with IEPs scoring proficient in regular Statewide assessment in Math;
8. The percentage of 8th grade students with IEPs scoring proficient in regular Statewide assessment in Math;
9. The percentage of students with IEPs exiting school by graduating with a regular high school diploma; and
10. The percentage of students with IEPs exiting school by dropping out.

Each Results element is scored individually. While data are reported to the tenths place, there is no rounding in determining what score the ISD receives.

The Results Elements are defined as follows:

Percentage of students with IEPs Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments

The percentage of students with IEPs, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (Math and English/Language Arts), who participated in the regular Statewide assessments in SY 2018-2019 with and without accommodations. The numerator for this calculation for each grade and subject is the number of students with IEPs participating with and without accommodations on regular grade level Statewide assessments in SY 2018-2019. The denominator is the number of all students with IEPs, excluding those students whom had medical emergencies.

Percentage of students with IEPs Scoring Proficient on Regular Statewide Assessments in Math and English Language Arts

The percentage of students with IEPs, by grade (4 and 8) and subject (Math and English/Language Arts), who scored proficient in regular Statewide assessments in SY 2018-2019. The numerator for this calculation for each grade and subject is the number of students with IEPs who attended the same district for a full academic year and who scored proficient for grade level standards in the subject on regular Statewide assessment in SY 2018-2019. The denominator is the number of all students with IEPs who attended the same district for a full academic year and who completed a regular statewide assessment, excluding those students who had medical emergencies.

Percentage of students with IEPs Exiting School by Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma

The percentage of students with IEPs, ages 14 through 21, who exited school by graduating with a regular high school diploma. The numerator for this calculation is the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the exit reason category *graduated with a regular high school diploma*, the denominator is the total number of students ages 14 through 21 reported in the five exit from-both-special education-and-school categories (*graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died*). The result is then multiplied by 100. (Data source: *EDFacts* SY 2017-18.)

Percentage of students with IEPs Exiting School by Dropping Out

The percentage of students with IEPs, ages 14 through 21, who exited school by dropping out. The numerator for this calculation is the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the exit reason category *dropped out*, the denominator is the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under *IDEA* Part B, reported in the five exit from-both-special education-and-school categories (*graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died*). The result is then multiplied by 100. (Data source: *EDFacts* SY 2017-18.)

Scoring Using the Results Matrix

The Results Matrix produces a result score which is derived from dividing the total number of points possible (denominator) into actual points the ISD scored for each factor (numerator) and then multiplying by 100.

In the attached ISD specific 2020 Part B Results Matrix, an ISD received points as follows for the Results Elements:

- ISD participation rates on regular Statewide assessments were assigned scores of 2, 1, or 0 based on an analysis of the participation rates across all ISDs.
 - **Two points** when at least 90% of students with IEPs in an ISD participated in the regular Statewide assessment.
 - **One point** when the participation rate for students with IEPs was 80% to 89%.
 - **Zero points** when the participation rate for students with IEPs was less than 80%.
- ISD Statewide assessment proficiency scores were rank ordered.
 - **Two points** for the top tertile¹ of ISDs.
 - **One point** for the middle tertile of ISDs.
 - **Zero points** the bottom tertile of ISDs.

¹ The tertiles of a data set divide it into thirds or three equal parts.

- ISD data on the percentage of students with IEPs who exited school by graduating with a regular high school diploma were rank ordered.
 - **Two points** for the top tertile of ISDs.
 - **One point** for the middle tertile of ISDs.
 - **Zero points** the bottom tertile of ISDs.
- ISD data on the percentage of students with IEPs who exited school by dropping out were rank ordered.
 - **Two points** for the top tertile of ISDs.
 - **One point** for the middle tertile of ISDs.
 - **Zero points** the bottom tertile of ISDs.

Table 1: Scoring of Results Elements

Results Elements²	RDA Score = 0	RDA Score = 1	RDA Score = 2
Participation Rate of 4th grade students with IEPs on Regular Statewide assessments (ELA, Math-separately)	<80.0	80.0-89.9	≥90.0
Participation Rate of 8th grade students with IEPs on Regular Statewide assessments (ELA, Math-separately)	<80.0	80.0-89.9	≥90.0
Percentage of 4th grade students with IEPs scoring Proficient or above on Regular Statewide assessments of ELA	<23.0	23.0-27.9	≥28.0
Percentage of 8th grade students with IEPs scoring Proficient or above on Regular Statewide assessments of ELA	<27.0	27.0-32.9	≥33.0
Percentage of 4th grade students with IEPs scoring Proficient or above on Regular Statewide assessments of math	<19.0	19.0-23.9	≥24.0
Percentage of 8th grade students with IEPs scoring Proficient or above on Regular Statewide assessments of math	<13.0	13.0-17.9	≥18.0
Percentage of students with IEPs Exiting School by Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma	<58.0	58.0-67.9	≥68.0
Percentage of students with IEPs Exiting School by Dropping Out	≥30.0	29.9-21.1	≤21.0

² In the event an ISD does not have data for one or more of the Results Elements, the ISD’s Total Points Available for Results will decrease by the appropriate number of points.

2020 Part B Compliance Matrix

Compliance Elements

In making each ISD's/SA's 2020 determination, MDE used a Compliance Matrix, reflecting the following data:

1. The ISD's/SA's FFY 2018 data for IDEA Part B Compliance Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13;
2. The timeliness of data reported by the ISDs/SA's and their member districts through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) for School Year 2018-2019;
3. The ISD/SA Single Audit Findings from FFY 2018;
4. Longstanding Noncompliance: findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 or FFY 2016 still not corrected as of February 1st, 2020. Non-compliance elements scored include the IDEA Part B compliance indicators (4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13), as well as district complaints, audits, and Part B IDEA monitoring.

Scoring Using the Compliance Matrix

The Compliance Matrix indicates a score of 2, 1, or 0 for each of the compliance indicators in item one above and for each of the additional factors listed in items two through four above. The Compliance Matrix produces a compliance score which is derived from dividing the total number of points possible (denominator) into actual points the ISD/SA scored for each factor (numerator) and then multiplying by 100. While data are reported to the tenths place, no rounding was used in determining the score the ISD/SA receives.

The compliance indicators are based on percentages. Financial Audit Findings and Longstanding Non-Compliance are based the number of member districts within the ISD.

Table 2: Scoring of Compliance Elements

Compliance Elements ³	Compliance Score = 0	Compliance Score = 1	Compliance Score = 2
Compliance Indicator 4B: Percent of Districts with Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements	>10.0	5.1-10.0	≤5.0
Indicator 9: Percent of Districts with Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification	>10.0	5.1-10.0	≤5.0
Indicators 10: Percent of Districts with Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification	>10.0	5.1-10.0	≤5.0
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	<90.0	90.0-94.9	≥95.0
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	<90.0	90.0-94.9	≥95.0
Indicator 13 (ages 16-26): Secondary transition	<90.0	90.0-94.9	≥95.0
Timely Submission of Data: An ISD received points for Timely and Accurate ⁴ Member District Reported Data	<90.0	90.0-94.9	≥95.0

³ In the event an ISD/SA does not have data for one or more of the Compliance Elements, the ISD's/SA's Total Points Available for Compliance will decrease by the appropriate number of points.

⁴ Timeliness of data reported by the ISDs/SAs and their member districts through the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) for school year 2018-2019 for all three collections Fall, Spring and End of Year.

The remaining compliance elements were based on the number of member districts in the ISD. Below are the criteria for how these compliance indicators were scored:

Audit Findings

For the ISD 2020 Part B Compliance Matrix, an ISD/SA received points as follows based on the results of the Single Audit.

- **Two points** when no audited member districts in the ISD or the SA had an audit finding for FFY 2018
- **One point** when one or more audited member districts in the ISD or the SA had an audit finding for FFY 2018
- **Zero points** when audited member districts in the ISD or the SA had any audit finding for FFY 2018 that was repeated for two or more years; that is, for the same issue in FFY 2018 and the most recent previous audit in the last three FFY reporting cycles
- **N/A** when there were no member districts in the ISD or the SA that were in the audit cohort for FFY 2018⁵

Longstanding Noncompliance

An ISD/SA received points as follows for the Longstanding Noncompliance component (i.e., uncorrected noncompliance for more than one year and not yet corrected as of February 1st, 2020):

- **Two points** for ISDs/SAs, in which no member districts had any findings of noncompliance (i.e., one or more) identified from FFY 2017 and FFY 2016, or for ISDs/SAs with findings from these years and they were corrected/closed as of February 1st, 2020.
- **One point** for (a) ISDs/SAs with two or fewer findings of noncompliance from FFY 2017 among member districts were not corrected/closed by February 1st, 2020; and (b) ISDs/SAs in which one finding of noncompliance from FFY 2016 from a member district remained uncorrected as of February 1st, 2020.

⁵ In the event an ISD or the SA does not have member districts in the audit cohort, the ISD's Total Points Available for Compliance will decrease by the appropriate number of points.

- **Zero points** for (a) ISDs/SAs with three or more findings of noncompliance from FFY 2017 among member districts that remained uncorrected as of February 1st, 2020, regardless of the number of findings uncorrected from FFY 2016; or (b) for ISDs/SAs with two or more uncorrected findings remaining from FFY 2016, as of February 1st, 2020, regardless of the number of findings uncorrected from FFY 2017.

2020 Determinations

Overall Determination Score

To calculate the overall determination score for each ISD, the Results score and the Compliance score were weighted equally to make up 50% each of the overall score. The scores for Results and Compliance were each multiplied by .50 and added together to make the final, overall determination score. Across all ISDs, overall Determination scores ranged from 41.7 to 84.4 with the state average at 47.5 among all ISDs.

Determination Levels

The ISD's Determination uses the Differentiated Framework of Technical Assistance and Monitoring around the purpose and requirements of IDEA. The ISD's specific RDA Determination level is defined as follows:

Meets Requirements

An ISD's 2020 RDA Determination level is Meets Requirements when the Results score and the Compliance score meet or exceed the state average among all ISDs. This includes ISDs with Results scores equal to or greater than 47.5 and with Compliance scores equal to or greater than 77.4.

Needs Assistance

An ISD's 2020 RDA Determination level is Needs Assistance when one of either the Results score or the Compliance score is below the State average among all ISDs. This includes ISDs with either:

- Results scores below 47.5 and with Compliance scores equal to or greater than 77.4;

- Or Results scores equal to or greater than 47.5 and with Compliance scores below 77.4.

Needs Intervention

An ISD's 2020 RDA Determination level is Needs Intervention when both the Results score and the Compliance score are below the State average. This includes ISDs with Results scores below 47.5 and with Compliance scores below 77.4.

Needs Substantial Intervention

Michigan Department of Education did not make a determination of Needs Substantial Intervention for any ISD in 2020.

Meets Requirements for State Agencies

A state agency's 2020 Determination level is Meets Requirements when the Compliance score meets or exceeds the state average of 77.4.