



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

May 30, 2006

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** State Board of Education

**FROM:** Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

**SUBJECT:** Approval of the Michigan Department of Education Procedures for Identifying Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores

The Higher Education Act (HEA), Title II, Section 208(a) requires all state education agencies to establish criteria to identify teacher preparation institutions that are not performing at a satisfactory level. Some states use only one factor—the passing rate on the state’s test for teacher certification.

The process for assigning performance scores to teacher preparation institutions was presented to and rejected by the State Board of Education (SBE) in July and September 2005. Board members did not accept the proposed score of 2.0 (out of 4.0) for satisfactory performance. They also wanted to add an exemplary performance category to the required categories of satisfactory, at-risk and low performing.

The Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) has led a workgroup in the re-development of a set of criteria to reflect the overall effectiveness of the teacher preparation institutions. The six criteria are listed below:

- Passing rate on the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC)
- Results of the program review process
- Percent of teacher candidates completing the program within 6 years
- Results of teacher candidate surveys of perceived readiness (begins in 2006-2007)
- Institution response to high need areas of teacher preparation (i.e., mathematics, science, and special education; and recruitment of culturally and ethnically diverse candidates)
- Teaching success rate (not in effect until 2008)

**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](http://www.michigan.gov/mde) • (517) 373-3324

The organizations with whom OPPS worked to develop the procedures and criteria are the Deans Council of the Presidents Council of State Universities of Michigan, the Michigan Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and Directors and Representatives of Teacher Education Programs. The scoring procedures and rubric were independently reviewed by Dr. Mark Jeness, Director of Science and Mathematics Program Improvement (SAMPI) at Western Michigan University's George G. Mallinson Institute for Science Education. Attachment A presents the criteria and scoring rubric for identifying performance categories of teacher preparation institutions.

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 May 30, 2006.

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

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will comply with the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II state requirements and the SBE expectations by identifying four (4) Title II categories of teacher preparation institutions:

Exemplary Performance Teacher Preparation

Satisfactory Performance Teacher Preparation

At-Risk Teacher Preparation

- Low-Performing Teacher Preparation

Following are the six criteria for placement of a teacher preparation institution into a Title II performance category through the State Board of Education authorized Periodic Review, which is currently being revised, 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)].

All Michigan teacher preparation institutions will remain in their current approval status for one year while the state Periodic Review/Program Approval process is being evaluated.

**PERFORMANCE SCORE RUBRIC:** Total points possible: 70

**1. Test pass rate (30 points):**

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 creates a summary score for the institution based upon its aggregate pass rate information on validated (subject to state audit) candidates.

MDE identifies four test pass rate categories to be used to allocate points:

- a. 90% or higher = 30 points
- b. 85-89.9% = 25 points
- c. 80-84.9% = 20 points
- d. 75-79.9% = 10 points

No points will be awarded to institutions that fail to meet the 75% test pass rate.

## **2. Program Review (10 points):**

As part of Periodic Review or an 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 points are awarded as follows:

- 95% or more programs approved = 10 points
- 90-94.9% programs approved = 8
- 85-89.9% programs approved = 6
- 80-84.9% programs approved = 4
- 75-79.9% programs approved = 3

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

## **3. Program Completion (10 points):**

The number of candidates who are recommended (or who are eligible for recommendation) by the institution for a teaching certificate within six years of entering the cohort, divided by the total number of candidates admitted into the teacher preparation cohort at or beyond the junior year of a baccalaureate program or at entrance into a post baccalaureate program. In each case, the cohort will be defined by the number who entered the program (e.g., using 2003 data as the denominator the six-year completion rate would be calculated in 2009).

This information would be calculated by the institution and subject to state audit. The points are awarded as follows:

- 90% = 10 points\*
- 80-89.9% = 8 points
- 70-79.9% = 6 points
- 60-69.9% = 4 points
- 50-59.9% = 2 points

\***Note:** the maximum point category is set only at 90% to acknowledge that institutions have a responsibility to identify candidates whose commitment 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 (10 points):**

10 points 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. Since the MDE expects institutions to assure that a large

proportion of their student teachers complete the survey, the response rate is built into the points awarded in this area.

- a. 80% or more candidate response rate with 80% or more efficacy = 10 points;
- b. 80% response rate with 70-79% efficacy = 8 points;
- c. less than 80% response rate with a minimum 60% efficacy = 5 points
- d. Less than 60% efficacy is 0.

Note: for 2006-07, it is anticipated that a factor will be added for use in this category, representing the overall evaluation of student teachers by their supervisors against Entry Level Standards, using a state rubric and reporting instrument.

**5. Institutional responsiveness to state need (10 points):**

Some institutions have a mission responsive to state need as shown in their emphasis on providing access to diverse students and/or their emphasis on preparation of teachers in high need areas such as mathematics, science, special education, or other areas that the MDE may identify in its Title II HEA formula.

**A. Diversity score (5 points):** The 2004-2005 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.

1. Any teacher preparation institution recommending 10% or more minority candidates in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort of individuals) adds 5 points to the score;
2. Any teacher preparation institution recommending 5 to 9% minority candidates in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort of individuals) adds 3 points to the score.

**B. Preparation of teachers in high need subject areas (5 points):**

Any institution recommending 10% or more candidates with content specialty (major or minor-based endorsement) in special education, mathematics, science (i.e., endorsement codes DX, DI, at either elementary or secondary levels), or specific science endorsements (chemistry, physics, biology, earth/space science) at the secondary level, or world languages in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort) adds 5 points to its score. *Other academic subject areas may be added to this list by the MDE based on statewide teacher shortages.*

**6. Teaching success rate (points to be determined):**

This longer term factor is expected to 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 70 is available in 2006. The total points will increase as other factors are implemented.

63 (90%) or higher = exemplary  
56 to 62 (80% to 89.9%) = satisfactory  
52.5 to 55 (75% to 79%) = at-risk status  
52.49 or below = low performing.

Institutions identified as low performing will have two years with an opportunity for technical assistance from the state to improve. Institutions that remain in the at-risk category for two consecutive years will be moved into the low performing category.

Appeals regarding an institution's performance status will be handled through the OPPS until such time as the Periodic Review Council is re-constituted as a result of a revised Periodic Review process.