



Selecting a Priority Area and Data Sources for the General Supervision System Grant (GSSG)

This document is intended to guide intermediate school district (ISD) Directors and personnel as they complete the GSSG application process for school year 2022-2023.

Priority Area Selection

The ISD may continue with the priority area from the previous year if that priority is an area which continues to warrant the attention and resources of the ISD. There is no expectation the ISD will select a new priority area if the data do not support the selection of a new priority area.

If the data indicates sufficient progress has been made on the previous priority area, and the ISD Director believes the ISD has the capacity to maintain the progress on the previous priority area and to begin work on a new priority area, then a new priority area may be selected. The ISD will be required to provide a justification for the selection of a new priority area. The justification must include the following:

- A review of the data which supports the ISD's belief that sufficient progress has been made on the previous priority area,
- A description of how the activities completed as part of the GSSG grant contributed to the improvements, and
- A description of how the ISD will sustain progress on that area.

The selection of a new priority area must be based on data which demonstrate the need for improvement.

Data Sources for the New Priority Area

In the past, Annual Performance Report (APR) Data has been used by many ISDs as the measurement of growth on their priority area. The data which were used may have been labeled in the GSSG application as APR data, Strand Report data, Indicator Data, or Determinations data. No matter the name, these data are all akin to summative assessments and are not very sensitive to change given that the data are only collected once a year and are often reported with a data lag. The ISD can use APR data to determine the need to select a priority, but APR data is not the data source the ISD will use to track progress. The APR data will not be accepted as a data source in the 2022-23 GSSG Application.

When the ISD is determining a priority area, the ISD is encouraged to use the Data Use and Action process to determine actionable causes, targeted improvement activities, and data points to measure the impact of the improvement activities. The Data Use and Action Process, available at [MDE: Introduction to Data Use & Action Process | Michigan Virtual](#) may be beneficial to ISDs engaging in this work. The Data Use and Action Process course walks users through an 8-step process covering review and analysis of data and use of the information to select strategies to reach your goals.

Several possible scenarios are presented below. These scenarios do not cover the full range of possibilities. They are intended to illustrate a possible set of data points which may be used to measure the impact of activities on a priority area.

Scenario 1: Priority Area - Graduation

Assuming an ISD has:

- reviewed their Determinations results
- decided that Graduation should be the next priority area for the 22-23 GSSG
- conducted a data dive to determine what are the root causes of the low graduation rates
- determined which of those root causes are actionable (i.e., on which causes can the ISD have an effect)
- selected strategies/actions to address those causes

The ISD must now determine how the strategies/actions will be measured. Those measurements should be used in the GSSG as priority area measures, not the ISD’s graduation rate (APR data). As an example, the table below shows three data points which an ISD may have determined to be appropriate given the strategies chosen to address their actionable root causes. This is only one example of many which may be used.

Priority Area Data Table – Example 1						
Data Source	2019-20 Data	2020-21 Data	2021-22 Data	1-year target (2022-23)	3-year target (2024-25)	How will improvement be measured?
PowerSchool attendance data and local student assistance team information	0.0%	1.4%	1.8%	10%	25%	Percent of high school students with an IEP at Alpha, Beta, and Charlie school districts who have missed 10% or more of instruction and for whom the district has implemented an intervention to address attendance
PowerSchool, SWIS data, and local student assistance team information	28%	21%	21.7%	40%	80%	Percent of students (gr7-12 across the ISD) with an IEP with 6 or more violations of the student code of conduct for whom the district has implemented a behavior intervention
PowerSchool	1.6%	2.1%	3.2%	5%	12%	Percent of students with an IEP who have a personal curriculum

Scenario 2: Priority Area - Educational Environments

Assuming an ISD has:

- reviewed their Determinations results
- decided that Educational Environments (6-21) should be the next priority area for the GSSG activity
- conducted a data dive to determine what are the root causes of the Educational Environments rates
- determined which of those root causes are actionable (i.e., on which causes can the ISD have an effect)
- selected strategies/actions to address those causes

The ISD must now determine how the strategies will be measured. Those measurements should be used in the GSSG as priority area measures, not the ISD’s Educational Environments rates (APR data). As an example, the table below shows two data points which an ISD may have determined to be appropriate given the strategies chosen to address their actionable root causes. This is only one example of many which may be used.

Priority Area Data Table – Example 2						
Data Source	2019-20 Data	2020-21 Data	2021-22 Data	1-year target (2022-23)	3-year target (2024-25)	How will improvement be measured?
District PD documentation	4%	4%	5%	10%	25%	Percent of general education teachers (K-5 ISD wide) who have attended CAST training
IEP Monitoring Data	0	0	0	40%	90%	Percent of IEPs which document thorough consideration of LRE for students reported in B-5 B and C