



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING


RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

July 22, 2013

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Presentation on the 2011-2012 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score Report

Title II, Section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) requires that each state establish criteria and identify and assist teacher preparation institutions that are not performing at a satisfactory level. States must also report annually to the United States Department of Education (USED) a statement of their procedures, along with a list of low-performing and at-risk teacher preparation institutions.

On October 9, 2007, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved, with amendments, a set of procedures that reflect the overall effectiveness of preparation programs using multiple factors. Criteria within the procedures include weighted components from earlier reviews of institutional programs, the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) test scores, new teacher efficacy surveys, supervisor validation of new teachers' efficacy, program completion rates, and additional consideration that the program's mission is responsive to the state's teacher preparation needs. Attachment A shows the 2011-2012 performance score for each approved teacher preparation institution in the state, not including institutions yet to receive probationary SBE approval. Attachment B is the criteria and formula used for identifying performance.

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will report the institutions identified as at-risk or low-performing to the USED per the HEA requirements. Institutions identified as low-performing have two years to improve their performance before further state sanctions occur. Institutions identified as at-risk must progress to the satisfactory category within two years or move to the low-performing category, even if their calculated performance score would result in at-risk level. Institutions have two years from that date to remove at-risk or low-performing status without moving to the next lower level.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

JOHN C. AUSTIN – PRESIDENT • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH – VICE PRESIDENT  
DANIEL VARNER – SECRETARY • RICHARD ZEILE – TREASURER  
MICHELLE FECTEAU – NASBE DELEGATE • LUPE RAMOS-MONTIGNY  
KATHLEEN N. STRAUS • 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

Based on the last three years of reports from 2009-10 to 2011-12 (Attachment C) the following classifications are identified:

New first year in At-Risk:

- Baker College

Moved from Low-Performing to Satisfactory

- Adrian College (removed from corrective action)

Moved from Low-Performing to Satisfactory

- Lake Superior State University (still in corrective action)
- Olivet College (still in corrective action)

Moved from At-Risk to Exemplary

- Saginaw Valley State University (removed from corrective action)

Moved from At-Risk to Satisfactory

- Western Michigan University (removed from corrective action)

Moved from Satisfactory to At-Risk:

- Concordia University (corrective action level 1)
- Ferris State University (corrective action level 1)

Moved from Satisfactory to Low-Performing:

- Rochester College (corrective action level 2)
- University of Michigan-Flint (corrective action level 2)

Aggregate data at the level of the institution will be reported on the MDE website along with the public MTTC scores. Attachment D shows the corrective action status of institutions effective with this report. Attachment E is the explanation of the various levels of corrective action.

As requested by members of the SBE during the August 9, 2011, meeting Attachment F shows each institution's reporting of the number of candidates eligible for recommendation for a teaching certificate and the number of endorsements recommended in each high need content area.

Educator Preparation Institution Performance Scores for the 2011-12 Report																		
Institution / Category	Overall Score	MTTC		Teacher Exit Surveys			Supervisor Surveys			Program Completion Rate		Program Review Status		Diversity		High Need Content		Principal Feedback Rcvd.
		30		5			5			10		10		5		5		
		%	Points	Eff.	Resp.	Points	Eff.	Resp.	Points	%	Points	(Cohort)	%	Points	%	Points	%	
EXEMPLARY																		
Madonna	70	91	30	94	100	5	99	100	5	91	10	100	10	11	5	55	5	Y
Marygrove	70	92	30	91	100	5	86	100	5	92	10	100	10	86	5	40	5	Y
Andrews	68	90	30	89	94	5	94	100	5	87	8	100	10	57	5	71	5	Y
Calvin	68	94	30	93	100	5	99	95	5	90	10	100	10	5	3	67	5	Y
Grand Valley	68	93	30	93	97	5	95	99	5	91	10	100	10	7	3	53	5	Y
Hope <sup>1</sup>	68	94	30	96	100	5	99	100	5	90	10	100	10	5	3	52	5	Y
Michigan State	68	92	30	92	100	5	93	100	5	87	8	100	10	11	5	68	5	Y
U of M-Ann Arbor	68	95	30	88	99	5	94	91	5	92	10	100	10	9	3	62	5	Y
Cornerstone	66	91	30	94	100	5	95	100	5	87	8	100	10	5	3	67	5	Y
Northern	65	92	30	94	95	5	98	100	5	97	10	100	10	1	0	81	5	Y
Aquinas	64	92	30	94	100	5	100	82	5	76	6	100	10	7	3	40	5	Y
Michigan Tech.	64	92	30	91	100	5	94	100	5	74	6	100	10	6	3	180	5	Y
Alma	63	86	25	87	100	5	99	100	5	83	8	100	10	12	5	40	5	Y
Oakland	63	86	25	95	100	5	99	97	5	94	10	100	10	9	3	48	5	Y
Saginaw	63	86	25	92	100	5	97	100	5	90	10	100	10	6	3	53	5	Y
Spring Arbor	63	88	25	93	100	5	97	100	5	91	10	100	10	5	3	47	5	Y
U of D Mercy	63	87	25	94	100	5	97	100	5	87	8	100	10	62	5	65	5	Y
U of M-Dearborn	63	87	25	93	98	5	70	97	3	94	10	100	10	12	5	92	5	Y
Wayne	63	87	25	97	97	5	95	92	5	83	8	100	10	27	5	42	5	Y
SATISFACTORY																		
R B Miller	62	93	30	100	100	5	93	100	5	53	2	100	10	20	5	60	5	Y
Eastern	61	88	25	92	96	5	85	94	5	71	6	100	10	13	5	51	5	Y
Olivet	61	86	25	90	100	5	90	100	5	71	6	100	10	11	5	55	5	Y
Siena	61	87	25	96	79	3	98	100	5	81	8	100	10	22	5	52	5	Y
Adrian	60	86	25	95	100	5	94	100	5	91	10	100	10	11	5	20	0	Y
Albion <sup>2</sup>	60	90	30	96	100	5	91	100	5	92	10	100	10	0	0	25	0	Y
Central	60	89	25	89	100	5	96	98	5	91	10	100	10	4	0	47	5	Y
LSSU	59	94	30	87	91	5	98	100	5	69	4	100	10	3	0	48	5	Y
Western	58	84	20	94	100	5	97	88	5	90	10	100	10	7	3	51	5	Y

**Educator Preparation Institution Performance Scores for the 2011-12 Report (continued)**

Institution / Category	Overall Score	MTTC		Teacher Exit Surveys			Supervisor Surveys			Program Completion Rate		Program Review Status		Diversity		High Need Content		Principal Feedback Rcvd.
		30		5			5			10		10		5		5		
		%	Points	Eff.	Resp.	Points	Eff.	Resp.	Points	%	Points	(Cohort)	%	Points	%	Points	%	
AT-RISK																		
Baker	<b>55</b>	84	<b>20</b>	96	100	<b>5</b>	97	100	<b>5</b>	90	<b>10</b>	100	<b>10</b>	10	<b>5</b>	25	<b>0</b>	Y
Concordia	<b>55</b>	86	<b>25</b>	90	91	<b>5</b>	95	100	<b>5</b>	91	<b>10</b>	100	<b>10</b>	0	<b>0</b>	33	<b>0</b>	N
Ferris	<b>55</b>	84	<b>20</b>	94	100	<b>5</b>	97	88	<b>5</b>	90	<b>10</b>	100	<b>10</b>	4	<b>0</b>	51	<b>5</b>	Y
LOW-PERFORMING																		
U of M-Flint	<b>51</b>	81	<b>20</b>	89	82	<b>5</b>	97	57	<b>0</b>	83	<b>8</b>	100	<b>10</b>	7	<b>3</b>	55	<b>5</b>	Y
Rochester	<b>33</b>	72	<b>0</b>	97	86	<b>5</b>	97	100	<b>5</b>	83	<b>8</b>	100	<b>10</b>	14	<b>5</b>	14	<b>0</b>	Y

<sup>1</sup> MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (College of Creative Studies)

<sup>2</sup> MTTC score is different than 3 year cumulative report due to appeal adjustment.

## **Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores for Meeting Higher Education Act Title II Classification Requirement**

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) complies with the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II state requirements and the State Board of Education (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

The following six criteria will be used for placement of a teacher preparation institution into a Title II performance category as identified above.

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

The MDE identifies four test pass rate categories to be used to allocate points (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

- a. 90% or higher = 30 points
- b. 85 - 89% = 25 points
- c. 80 - 84% = 20 points
- d. Below 80% = 0 points

## **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 (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

- 95% or more programs approved = 10 points
- 90 - 94% programs approved = 8
- 85 - 89% programs approved = 6
- 80 - 84% programs approved = 4
- 75 - 79% programs approved = 3

\*Periodic review priorities as determined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction will be added to these criteria.

\*\*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 a 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 during a specified academic year. In each case, a cohort will be defined by the number who entered the program (e.g., using 2003-2004 academic year data as the denominator, the six-year completion rate would be calculated based on recommendations during 2008-2009 academic year).

This information is calculated by the institution and subject to state audit. The points are awarded as follows (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

- 90% = 10 points\*
- 80 - 89% = 8 points
- 70 - 79% = 6 points
- 60 - 69% = 4 points
- 50 - 59% = 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 is 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, both academic and interpersonal, needed for success in the specific program.

**4. Survey of candidates and supervisors (10 points):**

A. Survey of candidates: (5 points)

The score will depend on the aggregate results of the survey of candidates completing student teaching regarding their perceived readiness (efficacy) in each of the seven Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT) areas. Since response rate is important to validity of results, 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 as indicated in the following table (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

Student Teachers Response rate:	80-100% Efficacy	70-79% Efficacy	60-69% Efficacy	Below 60% Efficacy
80-100%	5	4	3	0
60-79%	3	2	1	0
Below 60%	0	0	0	0

B. Survey of supervisors: (5 points)

Beginning in 2006-07, institutions are also required to have supervisors of student teachers complete a short survey on the same readiness areas for each student teacher supervised. Validation of the student teachers' perceived efficacy with the perceptions of supervisors makes a stronger case for the institution's impact on teacher readiness. The following table indicates the points awarded for different response rates and efficacy levels (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number).

Supervisors Response Rate:	80-100% Efficacy	70-79% Efficacy	60-69% Efficacy	Below 60% Efficacy
80-100%	5	4	3	0
60-79%	3	2	1	0
Below 60%	0	0	0	0

## **5. Institutional responsiveness to state needs (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 Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicates that less than 10% of Michigan's teaching force is represented by ethnic minorities. Ethnic minority categories are Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American and Pacific Islander, and multi-racial, as used in other higher education national data.

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

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

Any institution recommending 35% 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) will receive 5 points. Other academic subject areas may be added to this list in the future by the MDE based on statewide teacher shortages.

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

This longer term factor is expected to be identified during 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 may change to reflect this new information.



**Overall score:** A range of 0 to 70 points is currently awarded. The total points will increase as other factors are implemented (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number).

63 (90%) or higher = exemplary  
56 to 62 (80% to 89%) = satisfactory  
52 to 55 (75% to 79%) = at-risk status  
Below 52 = low-performing

Institutions identified as low-performing will have two years with an opportunity for technical assistance from the state to improve before penalties are imposed. 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 Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS). The proposed Michigan Teacher Preparation Research Collaborative will be requested to review this document to determine if further revisions are needed.

<b>Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score Three Year Comparisons</b>						
	<b>2009-10</b>		<b>2010-11</b>		<b>2011-12</b>	
	<b>Points</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Category</b>
<b>Adrian</b>	<b>35</b>	LP	<b>33</b>	LP	<b>60</b>	Sat
<b>Albion</b>	<b>70</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>60</b>	Sat
<b>Alma</b>	<b>53</b>	AR	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>Andrews</b>	<b>70</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>Aquinas</b>	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>64</b>	Ex
<b>Baker</b>	<b>N/A</b>		<b>N/A</b>		<b>55</b>	AR
<b>Calvin</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>Central Michigan</b>	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>61</b>	Sat	<b>60</b>	Sat
<b>Concordia</b>	<b>56</b>	Sat	<b>59</b>	Sat	<b>55</b>	AR
<b>Cornerstone</b>	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex
<b>Eastern Michigan</b>	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>61</b>	Sat	<b>61</b>	Sat
<b>Ferris State</b>	<b>60</b>	Sat	<b>60</b>	Sat	<b>55</b>	AR
<b>Grand Valley</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>Hope</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>70</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>Lake Superior</b>	<b>33</b>	LP	<b>34</b>	LP	<b>59</b>	Sat
<b>Madonna</b>	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>70</b>	Ex
<b>Marygrove</b>	<b>60</b>	Sat	<b>60</b>	Sat	<b>70</b>	Ex
<b>Michigan State</b>	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>Michigan Technological</b>	<b>56</b>	Sat	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>64</b>	Ex
<b>Northern</b>	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>65</b>	Ex
<b>Oakland</b>	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>Olivet</b>	<b>34</b>	LP	<b>32</b>	LP	<b>61</b>	Sat
<b>Robert B Miller</b>	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>62</b>	Sat
<b>Rochester</b>	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>56</b>	Sat	<b>33</b>	LP
<b>Saginaw Valley</b>	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>55</b>	AR	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>Siena Heights</b>	<b>60</b>	Sat	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>61</b>	Sat
<b>Spring Arbor</b>	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>UDMercy</b>	<b>54</b>	AR	<b>56</b>	Sat	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>U of M-Ann Arbor</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>70</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>U of M-Dearborn</b>	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>U of M-Flint</b>	<b>61</b>	Sat	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>51</b>	LP
<b>Wayne State</b>	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>Western Michigan</b>	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>53</b>	AR	<b>58</b>	Sat

AR = At-Risk  
Ex = Exemplary  
Sat = Satisfactory  
LP = Low-Performing

<b>Educator Preparation Institutions Corrective Action Status</b>				
<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>Years in Corrective Action</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>* Report Received</b>	<b>Institution Focus</b>
<b>Adrian</b>	3	2	N/R	High Needs and MTTC Scores
<b>Baker</b>	0	1	N/A	High Needs and MTTC Scores
<b>Concordia</b>	0	1	N/A	High Needs, Diversity, and MTTC Scores
<b>Ferris State</b>	0	1	N/A	Diversity and MTTC Scores
<b>Lake Superior State University</b>	4	3	4/30/13	Program Completion, and MTTC Scores
<b>Olivet</b>	3	3	4/30/13	Program Completion, Diversity, and MTTC Scores
<b>Rochester</b>	0	2	N/A	Program Completion, High Needs, and MTTC Scores
<b>Saginaw Valley</b>	1	1	N/R	Diversity and MTTC Scores
<b>UM-Flint</b>	0	1	N/A	Supervisor Surveys, Program Completion, Diversity, and MTTC Scores
<b>Western Michigan University</b>	1	1	N/R	High Needs, Diversity, and MTTC Scores

\* Due April 30, 2013

N/A = The institution has just entered into corrective action status, as such a report is not required until next year's report.

N/R = The institution is moving out of corrective action, as such the report is not required.

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
CORRECTIVE ACTION STEPS for AT-RISK AND LOW-PERFORMING  
EDUCATOR PREPARATION INSTITUTIONS  
Effective with the August 2012 Performance Score Report**

**Level 1 Corrective Action: At-Risk status in the first two years of such designation, are required to:**

- Notify students admitted to the educator preparation program in writing of the status of the institution and possible impact on their educational endeavor. The institution must submit a copy of the written notification to the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) within 30 days of notification of its corrective action status.
- Complete a needs assessment and educator preparation plan of improvement using the MDE's templates, within six months of announcement of at-risk status designation. Failure to submit the needs assessment and corrective action plan in a timely manner will place the institution in jeopardy of moving to Level 3 Corrective Action.
- Implement improvement plan after review and approval by the MDE.
- Report actions and progress in writing to the MDE at the conclusion of every six months of at-risk status.
- Use available technical assistance by MDE staff and Michigan Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE), Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Michigan (AICUM), and/or other external consultants.
- Withdraw, after one academic year of less than satisfactory status, from serving as a mentor to any higher education institution seeking State Board of Education (SBE) approval to offer educator preparation; this includes informing the MDE and mentee institution in writing.
- Acknowledge ineligibility to apply for Higher Education Act Title II subpart A(3) grants; however, existing grants may be continued.
- Move to satisfactory within two years or move to low-performing status and Level 2 Corrective Action.

**Level 2 Corrective Action: Low-Performing status or At-Risk status (after two years at Level 1) are required to do all required activities in Level 1 plus:**

- Notify the institution's national accrediting agency in writing of its status as part of a regular annual update to the agency and provide a copy of the notification to the MDE.
- Work with a qualified external consultant to execute the improvement plan and provide the MDE with information about the consultant's qualifications.
- Develop an agreement to work with a Michigan mentor institution, in satisfactory or better standing, to function as model for structural and process improvement and to recommend educator candidates and others for certification if the need to do so occurs.
- Withdraw new programs being reviewed for initial educator preparation approval. Approved programs being reviewed for alignment to new SBE standards may continue in the review process.
- Attain satisfactory status within two years (if low-performing and Level 2 Corrective Action was the initial performance designation), otherwise move

to Level 3 Corrective Action; or

- Attain satisfactory status within one year at Level 2 Corrective Action (if at-risk and Level 1 Corrective Action was the initial performance designation), otherwise move to Level 3 Corrective Action.

**Level 3 Corrective Action: Institutions beginning their third year in Low-Performing status or those institutions in initial status as At-Risk now beginning second year in Low-Performing status are required to do all required activities in Levels 1 and 2 Corrective Action plus:**

- Immediately stop admission to all specialty programs with Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) test scores below 80 percent pass rate. The institution will not be eligible to apply for approval of such programs for a period of 5 years. Programs that have cumulative MTTC scores below 80 percent in Level 3 Corrective Action will not be included in the ensuing educator preparation institution performance score unless the State Superintendent (SS) has granted the educator preparation institution (EPI) an appeal to continue to offer such programs.
- Provide any requested information to the Committee of Scholars appointed by the SS that will advise the Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) senior staff on the conditions under which the institution's approval could be maintained for educator preparation or recommend a phase-out timeline if the institution's approval is rescinded. The OPPS senior staff will then make a recommendation to the SS on the continued operation or a phase-out timeline for closure of an EPI in Level 3 Corrective Action.
- Comply with the SS authority to either continue an institution's approval status for recommending educator candidates to the MDE based on the SS's determination that the institution has documented significant improvement since its original at-risk or low-performing designation or rescind the institution's approval for recommending educator candidates to the MDE.
- Assist educator preparation students to complete educator preparation at other Michigan approved institutions if the SS rescinds the institutions approval, including, but not limited to:
  - Notifying students of the timeline by which the educator preparation program will phase out at the institution.
  - Completing necessary paperwork for cost-free transfer of records, course work, and field experiences to a new Michigan institution.
  - Completing necessary paperwork for cost-free transfer of financial aid to an approved institution.
  - A Michigan EPI may appeal specific activities as identified in the Level 3 Corrective Action required activities to the SS. The decision of the SS on the appeal is final.

**Level 4 Corrective Action: Institutions beginning their fourth year in Low-Performing status or those institutions in initial status as At-Risk now beginning third year in Low-Performing status are required to:**

- Immediately begin a phase-out timeline for the closure of the institution's educator preparation program.
  - A Michigan EPI may appeal this required activity to the SS. The decision of the SS is final.

2011-12 High Need Endorsement Reporting								
Institution	Number of Candidates Eligible for Recommendation	High Need Endorsements					Total High Need Endorsements	High Need Endorsement Percentage *
		Special Education	Mathematics	Science		World Language, ESL, and Bilingual		
				Integrated	Single			
Adrian College	35		4	1	1	1	7	20%
Albion College	24		3	2	1	6	24	25%
Alma College	43		11	1	2	3	17	40%
Andrews University	14		1	3	3	3	10	71%
Aquinas College	128	20	10	1	1	19	51	40%
Baker College	110		25		3		28	25%
Calvin College	113	17	18	15	4	22	76	67%
Central Michigan University	559	76	80	70	17	21	264	47%
Concordia University	9		2			1	3	33%
Cornerstone University	66	7	6	4	12	1	65	67%
Eastern Michigan University	810	148	116	71	49	33	417	51%
Ferris State University	127	18	27	7	12	1	65	51%
Grand Valley State University	519	64	77	46	52	36	275	53%
Hope College	114	27	13	3	8	8	59	52%
Lake Superior State University	29		9	5			14	48%
Madonna University	128	48	11	5	5	2	71	55%
Marygrove College	35	6	6		2		14	40%
Michigan State University	530	63	93	34	64	108	362	68%
Michigan Technological University	10		8	1	9		18	180%
Northern Michigan University	145	24	32	35	19	7	117	81%
Oakland University	456	50	87	31	18	25	221	48%
Olivet College	38	9	5	5	2		21	55%
Robert B. Miller College	5	2		1			3	60%
Rochester College	7		1				1	14%
Saginaw Valley State University	387	106	50	19	18	11	204	53%
Siena Heights University	23	6	4	1	1		12	52%
Spring Arbor University	102	19	11	8	7	3	48	47%
University of Detroit Mercy	34	10	6	3	3		22	65%
University of Michigan	205		60	14	29	25	128	62%
University of Michigan-Dearborn	126	8	52	37	9	10	116	92%
University of Michigan-Flint	132	21	21	10	11	9	72	55%
Wayne State University	474	65	43	25	22	43	198	42%
Western Michigan University	522	95	78	11	47	22	253	48%

\* Percentages greater than 100% occur when eligible candidates hold more than one high needs endorsement.