



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

July 25, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman

SUBJECT: Approval of the MDE Procedures for Identifying Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores

The Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) in the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has, since 2000, initiated several changes in the procedures for reviewing and approving teacher preparation programs, in order to assure that the state's programs continue to advance in quality, and produce stronger evidence of positive student outcomes. These initiatives have created new information needs for MDE and for the colleges of education, to identify and collect valid indications of successful outcomes.

During the same period, Title II, Section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) has required that each state establish criteria, identify, and assist teacher preparation institutions that are not performing at a satisfactory level. While working to develop improved review procedures for the state, OPPS also has been developing a set of criteria that would reflect the overall effectiveness of the institution in a well-rounded way, not relying on one single factor, such as candidates' performance on the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC).

For the response to the HEA requirements, MDE is proposing to use criteria that include weighted components from the Periodic Review of institutional programs, MTTC scores, candidate readiness surveys, program completion rates, and additional consideration for the program's mission that is responsive to the state's teacher preparation needs. Attached (Attachment A) is the plan for identifying such performance.

The procedures for determining performance scores for teacher preparation institutions have been explored with the Deans Council of the Presidents Council of State Universities of Michigan, Michigan Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and Directors and Representatives of Teacher Education Programs.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

The MDE will be in compliance with Title II state requirements by identifying three categories of teacher preparation institutions: satisfactory performance, at risk, and low-performing. As well, the proposed multidimensional plan is consistent with long-term OPPS efforts to enhance professional preparation of Michigan teachers.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the Michigan Department of Education procedures for identifying teacher preparation institution performance scores, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 25, 2005.

**Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores to be used in
Response to H.E.A. Title II Classification Requirements:**

MDE will comply with the HEA Title II state requirements by identifying three (3) Title II categories of teacher preparation institutions:

- Satisfactory Performance Teacher Preparation
- At-Risk Teacher Preparation
- Low-Performing Teacher Preparation

Following are six criteria for placement of a teacher preparation institution into a Title II performance category through State Board of Education authorized Periodic Review or through an equivalent United States Department of Education recognized national teacher preparation accreditation process [i.e., the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) or the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)]:

Assumption: entering 2005, all Michigan teacher preparation institutions are put into an "approved" status until outcomes evidence suggests some problems. Hence, no specific weight is attached to unit approval and no national accrediting decision regarding a unit prior to 2005 is used to determine Title II status.

1. Program Review: weight = 40%

As part of Periodic Review or equivalent accreditation process, a determination is made as to the status of each endorsement program. Full approval = 1, approval suspended by the state (or equivalent accrediting body) = 0*. These scores are totaled and divided by the total number of programs so classified, to determine the percent of programs approved (this is done to avoid penalizing institutions of any particular size or number of programs). The possible range of scores is thus 0 through 100%. The following schedule applies:

>95% = 16 points

90-94.9 = 14

85-89.9 = 12

80-84.9 = 10

75-79.9 = 8

70-74.9 = 6

65-69.9 = 4

60-64.9 = 2

< 60% = 0 (This means that less than 60% of an institution's discipline specialty programs were approved.)

*Note: a program withdrawn by the institution is not involved in the calculation of percent approved.

2. **Test pass rate** category: weight = 50% (until the survey of student teaching completers is available, at which time test passing weight drops to 25%--that is, the weight of this factor is cut in half).

Test pass rate shall be the three-year aggregate of all specialty content areas, for individuals validated by the institution as ready for the content test (note: **not** program completers).

MDE identifies five test pass rate categories to be used as benchmarks:

- a. >85% pass rate yields 20 points;
- b. 80-84.9% pass rate yields 15 points;
- c. 75 to 79.9% pass rate yields 10 points;
- d. 70 to 74.9% pass rate yields 5 points;
- e. <70% rate pass rate yields 0 points.

MDE creates a summary score for the institution based upon its aggregate pass rate information on validated (subject to state audit) candidates: The possible range of scores is thus 0 through 20 points.

3. **Yield percentage is 10% of the score:** the number of candidates who were recommended (or who were eligible for recommendation) by the institution for a teaching certificate within six years of entering the cohort, divided by the number of candidates admitted into the teacher preparation cohort at or beyond the junior year of a baccalaureate program or at entrance into a postbaccalaureate program. In each case, the cohort will be defined by the number who entered the program (e.g., with 2003 as the denominator; by 2009, the six-year completion rate can be calculated).

This information would be calculated by the institution and subject to state audit. The possible range is 0 to 4 points:

- 90% and above yield = 4 points*
- 80-89.9% yield = 3 points
- 70-79.9% yield = 2 points
- 60-69.9% yield = 1 points
- < 60% yield = 0 points

Sample:

For current use in 2005, the 2004-05 completion rate of those who entered the program during the 1998-99 academic year:

- a. admitted exactly 1,000 students during 1998-1999;
- b. find/construct a list of those 1,000 names;
- c. check student record system to find out what happened to each of those individuals "by the end of June 2005;"
- d. determine from those 1,000, the number who were "recommended by the institution" between 1998-99 and the end of June 2005.
If that's "750," divide 750 by 1,000 and get a score of 75%. This equals 2 points on the scale for yield.

* **Note:** the maximum point category is set only at 90% to acknowledge that institutions have a responsibility to identify candidates whose disposition or

classroom performance are not suitable for the profession, even if academic qualifications that led to program admission are strong. However, over time, it is expected that institutional admission criteria would increasingly reflect institutional experiences of the qualifications needed for success in the specific program.

4. Survey of candidates: As soon as available (possibly 2005-2006), 25% of the score will depend on the aggregate results of the survey of candidates completing student teaching regarding their perceived readiness in each of the seven Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT) and content endorsement areas (and will reduce the weight of test-pass rate to 25%).

- a. aggregate 80% or more efficacy and 80% or more response rate yields 10 points;
- b. 80% response rate and 70-79% efficacy yields 8 points;
- c. less than 80% response rate cannot yield more than 5 points;
- d. less than 70% efficacy cannot yield more than 5 points.

5. Added points for mission responsive to state need: Mission responsive to state need refers to academic or demographic teacher shortages identified in the state, such as science, special education, or underrepresented ethnic minority teachers. The 2003-2004 Register of Education Personnel (REP) indicates that less than 10% of Michigan's teaching force is represented by ethnic minorities. Ethnic minority categories are consistent with the U.S. Census definition.

- a. any teacher preparation institution recommending 10% or more minority candidates in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort of individuals) adds 8 points to the score;
- b. any teacher preparation institution recommending 5 to 9% minority candidates in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort of individuals) adds 4 points to the score;
- c. any institution recommending 10% or more candidates with content specialty (major or minor-based endorsement) in special education and/or any science area (i.e., endorsement codes DX, DI, or any D sub-area) in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort) adds 5 points to its score.

6. Teaching success rate: This longer term factor will be added by 2008. Teaching success rate is the number of new teachers from the institution evaluated as satisfactory or better divided by the total number of all who were placed in Michigan in that focus year and for whom a rating was received, with a minimum of 85% for "Satisfactory" programs. This indicator will be implemented over time; as more systematic information becomes available on new teachers from the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) and from institutional follow up, the formula will change to reflect this new information.

Overall score: A range of 0 to 40 is expected and will be divided by 10, to create a grade of 0.0 to 4.0, corresponding to normal student grading. It is possible for an institution to exceed 4.0 if it achieves in all categories and also meets the criteria the state recognizes as high needs, as noted in #5 above.

- A score of 2.2 or higher is satisfactory; 0-2.19 for one year indicates at-risk; below 1.5 for two consecutive years is low performing.
- No institution will be identified as low performing until it has had at least **two** full years of warning as at-risk and an opportunity for technical assistance from the state.

Appeals will be handled through Michigan's State Board of Education appointed Periodic Review Council as reorganized during 2005-2006.