

# 2021 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report Manual

## Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2021 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2017 through the July 2020 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

## Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey (SURV) Component Score

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2021 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were gathered through two collections, the Fall/Winter collection (November 2019 to January 2020) and the Spring/Summer collection (April 2020 to July 2020).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

## Teacher Effectiveness Labels (EFF) Component Score

At the end of each academic year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.0 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.8 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.3 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth 0 points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

## Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE's priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into tiers based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

<b>Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels</b>	<b>Weight for Goal 1</b>	<b>Weight for Goal 2</b>	<b>Weight for Goal 3</b>
1% to 10%	70	30	0
11% to 20%	63	27	10
21% to 30%	56	24	20
31% or more	50	20	30

## Performance Category

Following the recommendations of the January 2016 expert panel, a cut score of 84.5 was set on the scale for the overall performance score, reflecting the minimum overall score an EPI needed to be considered satisfactory. MDE leadership set this cut score from looking at a consensus of our panel judges.

In order to assign the resultant performance category, the cut score of 84.5 is now used as the first decision in determining how an EPI progresses along the track of categories and resultant corrective actions. A diagram for the progressive corrective action system is included below.

It is important to note that whether or not an EPI has met the cut score for adequate performance each year will lead to an EPI being assigned a new phase, or step, in the corrective action system. This phase will then determine the EPI's reported performance category and thus the corrective action requirements expected for the next year. Institutions who earn an overall score equal to or higher than the cut score will improve by one phase increment, lowering their phase number toward zero (improving their performance category status). Conversely, EPIs who fail to meet the cut score will have their phase number raised by one phase increment toward six (worsening their performance category status). A phase number of 0 or 1 results in a reported category of "Satisfactory;" a phase number of 2 or 3 results in a reported category of "At Risk;" and a phase number of 4 through 6 results in a reported category of "Low Performing".

# EPI PERFORMANCE CORRECTIVE ACTION SYSTEM

## THE PURPOSES OF CORRECTIVE ACTION

1. To identify areas of improvement within teacher preparation programs at each EPI
2. To increase responsibility among EPIs to resolve areas of improvement
3. To include MDE and outside experts in the process of fostering improvement regarding the preparation of teacher candidates, at both the program level and the institutional level

