



Michigan
Office of the Auditor General
REPORT SUMMARY

Performance Audit
Assistance to High Priority Schools
Office of School Improvement
Michigan Department of Education

Report Number:
313-0201-08

Released:
May 2010

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) identified 383 schools as high priority from the 2007-08 assessment tests. This consisted of 138 Title I schools and 245 non-Title I schools. From school year 2004-05 through school year 2008-09, MDE made Title I payments of \$67.6 million to local school districts, intermediate school districts, and the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators to assist Title I high priority schools meet adequate yearly progress (AYP).

Audit Objective:

To assess the effectiveness of MDE's efforts to assist high priority schools in making AYP.

Audit Conclusion:

We concluded that MDE was moderately effective in assisting high priority elementary and middle schools to make AYP, but its efforts were not effective in assisting high priority high schools. We noted one material condition (Finding 1) and one reportable condition (Finding 2).

Material Condition:

MDE did not sufficiently evaluate the impact of its support initiatives provided to high priority schools. In addition, MDE did not modify support initiatives that were not having a positive effect on high priority high schools. As a result, MDE could not determine the effectiveness of its support initiatives and did not modify its support initiatives developed to improve student academic achievement and to assist high priority schools in achieving AYP. (Finding 1)

Reportable Condition:

MDE did not award Regional Assistance Grants to its subrecipients in a timely manner. As a result of the MDE's delays in awarding grants, the subrecipient's ability to plan and use these funds to improve student achievement was negatively affected. (Finding 2)

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Audit Objective:

To assess the effectiveness of MDE's efforts to monitor its subrecipients that provided assistance to high priority schools.

Audit Conclusion:

We concluded that MDE was not effective in monitoring its subrecipients that provided assistance to high priority schools. We noted two material conditions (Findings 3 and 4) and one reportable condition (Finding 5).

Material Conditions:

MDE did not monitor its subrecipient that developed and implemented training and

support initiatives for high priority schools. As a result, MDE could not ensure that the subrecipient provided agreed-upon services to high priority schools or complied with State and federal program requirements. (Finding 3)

MDE did not sufficiently monitor its subrecipients' school improvement efforts at high priority schools. Without sufficient monitoring, MDE could not ensure that intermediate school districts and local school districts provided the approved school improvement services funded with Title I grants. (Finding 4)

Reportable Condition:

MDE did not comply with required State purchasing procedures for procuring professional and information technology services. As a result, MDE could not ensure that it obtained professional and information technology services from the most qualified vendor at the most competitive cost. (Finding 5)

Agency Response:

Our audit report contains 5 findings and 6 corresponding recommendations. MDE agrees with 4 findings and partially agrees with 1 finding.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

A copy of the full report can be obtained by calling 517.334.8050 or by visiting our Web site at: <http://audgen.michigan.gov>



Michigan Office of the Auditor General
201 N. Washington Square
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Thomas H. McTavish, C.P.A.
Auditor General

Scott M. Strong, C.P.A., C.I.A.
Deputy Auditor General