STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

August 10, 2010

REVISED

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman

SUBJECT: Receive the Report on the Academic Year 2008-09 Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores

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.

During the same period, Title II, Section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) has required that each state establish criteria and identify and assist teacher preparation institutions that are not performing at a satisfactory level. In order to receive funds under the HEA, states are required to have a procedure to identify and assist low-performing programs of teacher preparation within institutions of higher education. States must also provide the United States Department of Education (USED) a statement of its procedure along with annual lists of low-performing and at-risk teacher preparation institutions.

The Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) developed, and the State Board of Education (SBE) approved with amendments, a set of procedures that reflect the overall effectiveness of the preparation program, 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 for the program's mission that is responsive to the state's teacher preparation needs. Attachment A shows the performance score for each approved teacher preparation institution in the state, not including new institutions yet to receive probationary SBE approval. Attachment B is the formula used for identifying performance, as amended and approved by the SBE on October 9, 2007.

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 • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH

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

The MDE will report the institutions identified as at-risk or low-performing to the USED per HEA requirements. This report will also be shared with the SBE-appointed Professional Standards Commission for Teachers (PSCT) so its members can assist in technical assistance for improving at-risk and low-performing teacher preparation programs. The MDE plans for corrective action, support, and penalties were approved by the SBE on September 9, 2009. 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.

Based on the last three years of reports (Attachment C) the following changes are identified:

Moved from Satisfactory to Exemplary:

- Aquinas College
- Cornerstone
- University of Michigan-Flint
- Western Michigan University

Moved from Exemplary to Satisfactory:

- Michigan Technological University

Moved from Satisfactory to At-Risk:

- Adrian College

Moved from Satisfactory to Low-Performing:

- Olivet College

Remained At-Risk for a second year:

- Lake Superior State University (Currently in first year of corrective action)

Remained Low-Performing for the third year:

- University of Detroit Mercy (Currently in first year of corrective action)

Remained Low-Performing for the third year:

- Marygrove College (Currently in first year of corrective action)

Aggregate data at the level of the institution will be reported on the MDE website along with the currently public MTTC scores. Attachment D shows the status of institutions in corrective action during 2009-10. Marygrove College's comments on its teacher preparation institution performance improvement (Attachment E) are included.

For the 2009-10 academic year, teacher preparation institutions were expected to submit to the OPPS evidence of seeking and using feedback from principals regarding new teachers' preparation. No points are associated with this data during pilot years.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education receive the report on the 2008-09 Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores, as discussed in the Superintendent's revised memorandum dated August 10, 2010.

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores For Academic Year 2008-09																		
Institution / Category	**Overall Score**	**MTTC 30**		**Teacher Exit Surveys 5**			**Supervisor Surveys 5**			**Program Completion Rate 10**		**Program Review Status 10**		**Diversity 5**		**High Need Content * 5**		**Principal Feedback Rcvd.**
				Eff	Resp		Eff	Resp		(Cohort)								
		%	Points	%	%	Points	%	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	
EXEMPLARY																		
Andrews	**70**	90	**30**	92	100	**5**	100	89	**5**	90	**10**	100	**10**	41	**5**	52	**5**	Incomplete
Grand Valley	**68**	95	**30**	92	98	**5**	93	97	**5**	93	**10**	100	**10**	7	**3**	38	**5**	Yes
Hope	**68**	96	**30**	95	100	**5**	98	100	**5**	91	**10**	100	**10**	5	**3**	58	**5**	Yes
Madonna [1]	**68**	91	**30**	96	100	**5**	99	100	**5**	90	**10**	100	**10**	8	**3**	44	**5**	Yes
Oakland	**68**	90	**30**	95	100	**5**	95	100	**5**	93	**10**	100	**10**	5	**3**	49	**5**	Yes
Spring Arbor	**68**	92	**30**	95	100	**5**	93	100	**5**	90	**10**	100	**10**	5	**3**	41	**5**	Yes
UM-Ann Arbor	**68**	98	**30**	88	96	**5**	90	78	**9**	92	**10**	100	**10**	12	**5**	55	**5**	Yes
Cornerstone	**66**	91	**30**	91	99	**5**	98	100	**5**	89	**8**	100	**10**	7	**3**	38	**5**	Yes
Eastern	**66**	92	**30**	92	94	**5**	93	95	**5**	76	**6**	100	**10**	15	**5**	54	**5**	Yes
Michigan State	**66**	94	**30**	89	100	**5**	94	91	**5**	86	**8**	100	**10**	8	**3**	44	**5**	Yes
UM-Dearborn	**66**	91	**30**	93	100	**5**	98	96	**5**	71	**6**	100	**10**	20	**5**	66	**5**	Yes
Alma	**65**	92	**30**	92	100	**5**	100	100	**5**	93	**10**	98	**10**	2	**0**	51	**5**	Yes
Calvin	**65**	97	**30**	92	100	**5**	99	100	**5**	90	**10**	100	**10**	3	**0**	52	**5**	Yes
Central Michigan	**65**	91	**30**	88	100	**5**	94	91	**5**	91	**10**	100	**10**	2	**0**	41	**5**	Yes
Aquinas [2]	**64**	95	**30**	91	98	**5**	95	60	**3**	81	**8**	97	**10**	7	**3**	40	**5**	Yes
Ferris	**63**	87	**25**	91	100	**5**	93	100	**5**	84	**8**	94	**10**	52	**5**	36	**5**	Yes
Northern	**63**	93	**30**	94	99	**5**	99	63	**3**	93	**10**	100	**10**	2	**0**	89	**5**	Yes
Saginaw Valley	**63**	88	**25**	92	100	**5**	97	93	**5**	90	**10**	100	**10**	5	**3**	59	**5**	Yes
UM-Flint	**63**	86	**25**	86	100	**5**	94	95	**5**	87	**8**	100	**10**	10	**5**	100	**5**	Yes
Wayne State	**63**	87	**25**	95	96	**5**	96	86	**5**	83	**8**	100	**10**	25	**5**	40	**5**	Yes
Western Michigan	**63**	88	**25**	92	99	**5**	94	87	**5**	92	**10**	100	**10**	8	**3**	43	**5**	Yes
SATISFACTORY																		
Albion	**61**	99	**30**	88	100	**5**	99	100	**5**	88	**8**	100	**10**	5	**3**	18	**0**	Yes
Concordia [3]	**61**	94	**30**	94	96	**5**	95	100	**5**	77	**6**	100	**10**	0	**0**	38	**5**	Yes
Hillsdale	**60**	87	**25**	97	100	**5**	100	100	**5**	100	**10**	100	**10**	0	**0**	82	**5**	Yes
Siena Heights	**60**	85	**25**	97	100	**5**	96	86	**5**	91	**10**	100	**10**	17	**5**	17	**0**	Yes
Michigan Tech.	**58**	89	**25**	85	94	**5**	100	94	**5**	84	**8**	100	**10**	0	**0**	108	**5**	Yes
Rochester	**56**	97	**30**	97	100	**5**	99	100	**5**	72	**6**	100	**10**	0	**0**	30	**0**	No

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores For Academic Year 2008-09 (Cont.)																		
Institution / Category	**Overall Score**	**MTTC 30**		**Teacher Exit Surveys 5**			**Supervisor Surveys 5**			**Program Completion Rate 10**		**Program Review Status 10**		**Diversity 5**		**High Need Content * 5**		**Principal Feedback Rcvd.**
				Eff	Resp		Eff	Resp		(Cohort)								
		%	Points	%	%	Points	%	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	
AT-RISK																		
Adrian	**53**	81	**20**	90	100	**5**	100	100	**5**	93	**10**	100	**10**	6	**3**	30	**0**	Yes
LSSU	**53**	83	**20**	90	100	**5**	100	96	**5**	90	**10**	100	**10**	8	**3**	26	**0**	Yes
LOW-PERFORMING																		
UDMercy	**36**	78	**0**	91	100	**5**	95	100	**5**	76	**6**	100	**10**	54	**5**	39	**5**	Yes
Marygrove [4]	**34**	71	**0**	94	100	**5**	82	98	**5**	65	**4**	100	**10**	54	**5**	51	**5**	Yes
Olivet	**34**	79	**0**	96	100	**5**	94	100	**5**	71	**6**	100	**10**	6	**3**	45	**5**	Yes

[1] MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (Baker College)
[2] MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (Robert B. Miller College)
[3] MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (Finlandia University)
[4] MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (College for Creative Studies)

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 this 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 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 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.

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores Three Year Comparisons						
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	Points	Category	Points	Category	Points	Category
Adrian	**58**	Sat	**58**	Sat	**53**	AR
Albion	**58**	Sat	**61**	Sat	**61**	Sat
Alma	**63**	Ex	**65**	Ex	**65**	Ex
Andrews	**70**	Ex	**70**	Ex	**70**	Ex
Aquinas	**59**	Sat	**56**	Sat	**64**	Ex
Calvin	**65**	Ex	**65**	Ex	**65**	Ex
CMU	**63**	Ex	**68**	Ex	**65**	Ex
Concordia	**60**	Sat	**60**	Sat	**61**	Sat
Cornerstone	**59**	Sat	**58**	Sat	**66**	Ex
EMU	**64**	Ex	**65**	Ex	**66**	Ex
FSU	**61**	Sat	**68**	Ex	**63**	Ex
GVSU	**68**	Ex	**68**	Ex	**68**	Ex
Hillsdale	**65**	Ex	**60**	Sat	**60**	Sat
Hope	**65**	Ex	**68**	Ex	**68**	Ex
LSSU	**57**	Sat	**53**	AR	**53**	AR
Madonna	**66**	Ex	**66**	Ex	**68**	Ex
Marygrove	**36**	LP	**31**	LP	**34**	LP
MSU	**66**	Ex	**66**	Ex	**66**	Ex
MTU	**63**	Ex	**66**	Ex	**58**	Ex
NMU	**63**	Ex	**68**	Ex	**63**	Ex
Oakland	**65**	Ex	**68**	Ex	**68**	Ex
Olivet	**54**	AR	**61**	Sat	**34**	LP
Rochester	**59**	Sat	**58**	Sat	**56**	Sat
SVSU	**66**	Ex	**68**	Ex	**63**	Ex
Siena Heights	**59**	Sat	**56**	Sat	**60**	Sat
Spring Arbor	**63**	Ex	**63**	Ex	**68**	Ex
UDMercy	**32**	LP	**34**	LP	**36**	LP
UM-Ann Arbor	**64**	Ex	**63**	Ex	**68**	Ex
UM-Dearborn	**61**	Sat	**64**	Ex	**66**	Ex
UM-Flint	**58**	Sat	**61**	Sat	**63**	Ex
WSU	**68**	Ex	**68**	Ex	**63**	Ex
WMU	**56**	Sat	**58**	Sat	**63**	Ex

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

Teacher Preparation Institutions Corrective Action Status				
INSTITUTION	**Years in Corrective Action**	**Level**	*** Report Received**	**Institution Focus**
LSSU	1	1	4/30/10	High Needs Endorsements
Marygrove	1	2	4/30/10	MTTC Performance
UDMercy	1	2	4/28/10	MTTC Performance

- Due April 30, 2010

Marygrove College Comment on TPI Performance Improvement

Marygrove College scored the highest marks possible on all but two items of the TPI Performance Score (TPIPS) Report in 2008-2009. It also has improved significantly in the two remaining indicators, the three-year aggregate **MTTC Pass Rate** and the **Program Completion Rate,** compared to earlier years:

- Marygrove's MTTC annual Content Area Tests (CAT) pass rate for first time test takers improved to 80% in 2008-2009 from a 55% pass rate in 2007-2008, increasing the three-year 2006-2009 aggregate pass rate to 71%, up from 69% for 2005-2008.
- The Program Completion Rate, which comprises 17% of the TPIPS, doubled its points from last year from 2 to 4 points.

The increased (80%) **MTTC Pass Rate** resulted primarily from implementation of Marygrove's new process to verify only those students who have completed enough subject area coursework to take the MTTC's Content Area Tests. This plan ended the practice verifying testers who took these exams prior to completing their coursework to determine areas that required study.

The improvement in the **Program Completion Rate** resulted primarily from greater attention to administrative rules for determining cohort membership, ending a practice of accepting students into cohorts before they satisfied pre-requisites. This attention to rules will support even more accurate cohort identification in the future.

Since 2008, Marygrove College has increased resources for student academic support services and oversight of administrative processes. These additional resources have funded new personnel—Dean of Education (2008), new Institutional Researcher (2009), and new Program Compliance Officer and Student Services Specialist (2010), and additional administrative support (2009)—and have facilitated an improvement in cross-divisional communication between faculty and staff in the Education Department and Arts and Sciences Division.