



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING

RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

July 28, 2014

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Presentation of the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score Report

Title II, Section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) requires that each state establish criteria to 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.

In the spring of 2012, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) created a cross-departmental committee to focus on educator effectiveness in order to improve the systems impacting educator preparation and to ensure that the state's programs continue to advance in quality. A subcommittee was formed to focus specifically on the development of a revised 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score. The subcommittee focused on the MDE and State Board of Education (SBE) priorities to guide the work. The subcommittee developed focus group teams, comprised of EPI representatives, to provide verbal feedback on all facets of the score, the metrics used for assessing the EPIs and the overall goals and weighing of the score components. Additionally, score elements were presented online and via webinar with the opportunity to provide written feedback.

The EPI Performance Score Goals for 2014 are:

Goal #1: Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.

Goal #2: Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrate continuous improvement related to the MDE-specific priorities.

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 • (517) 373-3324

Goal #3: Ensure that program graduates meet standards for teacher effectiveness.

The 2014 EPI Performance Score utilized two types of survey data (candidates and candidate supervisors), the educator effectiveness evaluations submitted for teachers in their first three years of the profession, and three-year content specific, aggregate Michigan Test for Teacher Certification data.

Appendix A is the 2014 EPI Performance Score Technical Manual that describes the criteria and formula used for identifying performance. Appendix B includes the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score Reports for each approved educator preparation institution in the state, not including institutions yet to receive probationary SBE approval. Appendix C is the 2014 EPI Performance Corrective Action System which displays the new progressive corrective action process that is applied to low-performing and at-risk performance. Appendix D is the 2014 EPI Historical Performance Category Status that identifies the corrective action status of each institution, including those that are at-risk or low-performing.

The MDE will report the institutions identified as at-risk or low-performing to the USED per the HEA requirements.

Attachments

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI)
Performance Score

Technical Manual

A Guide To Component and Overall Score Calculation

table of contents

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	3 - 4
COMPONENT SCORE CALCULATION	5 - 9
Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Passing Percentages	5
Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Surveys	6
Effectiveness Labels Scoring Methodology	7
OVERALL SCORE CALCULATION	10 - 12
MAY 2014 REFERENT PANEL	13 - 18
Overview	13
Performance Levels Descriptors	14
Process and Methodology	16
CONCLUSION	19
APPENDIX	20 - 55
Appendix A: 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Surveys	20
Appendix B: Referent Group Panel Agenda	38
Appendix C: Referent Group Panel Results	40
Appendix D: Evaluation Form Feedback	50

background & overview

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW ON THE REVISED EDUCATOR PREPARATION INSTITUTION (EPI) PERFORMANCE SCORE

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 the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) test scores, new teacher efficacy surveys, supervisor validation of new teachers' efficacy, program completion rates, and an additional consideration regarding the program's mission to be responsive to the state's teacher preparation needs.¹

In the spring of 2012, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) created a cross-departmental committee to focus on educator effectiveness in order to improve the systems impacting educator preparation and to ensure the state's programs continue to advance in quality. A sub-committee was formed to focus specifically on the development of a revised Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score. The sub-committee utilized the MDE and the SBE's priorities to focus the work. The team examined the entire score, as well as the metrics used for assessing the EPIs.

The sub-committee developed three primary goals to provide greater focus for EPIs and align the score more closely to MDE priorities. In the "Overall Score Calculation" section of this document, these goals are listed, which include seven measureable sub-elements

or factors that are tightly aligned to the newly approved Michigan Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (MI-INTASC) standards.² The three goals, with their components, are as follows:

Goal #1: Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.

- A. Exposure to and Demonstration of Content Knowledge and Content-Specific Pedagogy
 - 1. Subject-Area Content
 - 2. High-Quality Learning Experiences
 - 3. Critical Thinking
 - 4. Connection to Real World Problems and Local and Global Issues
- B. Exposure to and Demonstration of General Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills
 - 1. Technology
 - 2. Special Populations
 - 3. Learning Environments
 - 4. Effective Use of Data

Goal #2: Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrate continuous improvement related to Michigan Department Education (MDE)-specific priorities.

- 1. Candidate Diversity (recruit, support, and retain underrepresented students)
- 2. Commitment to Clinical Preparation
- 3. State Evaluation System (flexible options in evaluation design)
- 4. Placement Rates in "shortage" areas (including support and advising of candidates in relation to "shortage" areas)

¹ Source: MDE Annual Educator Performance Institution Score Report, July 22, 2013.

² Source: Memorandum from Superintendent Flanagan, Presentation of the Revised 2014 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score, July 22, 2013.

background & overview

Goal #3: Ensure that program graduates meet standards for teacher effectiveness.

1. Demonstrate General Effectiveness
2. Placement Rates

When these goals and their components were clarified, the instrumentation used to gather data along the various goal components was also clarified. The table that appears in the “Overall Score Calculation” section of this document has been updated to show, in more detail, which goal component matches which instrumentation sources. The three instruments used for the 2014 EPI Performance Score are the following:

1. Percentages of teacher candidates who pass the content-based tests under The Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) system over the last three years;
2. Satisfaction and perception data from surveys administered to teacher candidates and candidate supervisors, twice annually; and
3. Point scores attributed to the latest three years’ worth of teacher effectiveness ratings within the last five calendar years for graduates from each EPI employed in Michigan public schools.

In each of these instruments, an “index score” was earned on a scale out of 100 possible points. The 100-point scale was used to simplify understanding the component scores, and to aid in a conversion to a weighted calculation across goal components. The “Overall Score Calculation” section of this document explains this in more detail.

Each year, the MDE reports the institutions identified as At Risk or Low Performing to the USED per the HEA requirements. Beginning with the 2014 score, the MDE has implemented a progressive corrective action system. In general, institutions identified as Low Performing have two years to improve their performance before 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 before moving to a new level of corrective action.³ (Since this system is being newly introduced this year, some “grandfathering” of levels occurred.)

As a note, in future years, the MDE anticipates the possible contribution of other sources of data, such as surveys that ask new teachers for their perspectives on their preparing EPIs after a year of experience, surveys for cooperating teachers (or “mentor teachers”) of teacher candidates, and measures for EPI response to teacher shortage areas. These additional data sources would be intended to enhance the calculation of annual EPI performance score, after they have been validated and piloted before inclusion in an operational score.

³ Source: MDE Annual Educator Performance Institution Score Report, July 22, 2013

component score calculation

MICHIGAN TEST FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION (MTTC) PASSING PERCENTAGES

State law in Michigan⁴ mandates a testing program as part of Michigan's teacher certification requirements. In June 1991, the MDE awarded National Evaluation Systems (now known as the Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson, or ES) a contract to develop and administer the testing program. The purpose of the tests is to ensure that each certified teacher has the level of content knowledge needed to perform effectively the job of a qualified Michigan educator. The tests are not the only basis on which prospective teachers are evaluated in Michigan, nor are the knowledge and skills covered by the tests the only types of knowledge and skills, or the only professional and personal qualifications, those teachers must have. The tests represent one prerequisite for obtaining a teaching certificate in Michigan.

The MTTC program includes both a Professional Readiness Examination (PRE) and content/subject-area assessments. The PRE has three subtests: reading, mathematics, and writing. By Michigan law, candidates must pass the PRE before a teacher candidate may be enrolled in student teaching. Some of Michigan's EPIs require passing of the PRE prior to admitting candidates to the EPI's teacher preparation program. Once a teacher candidate has completed an EPI's program (or nears completion) the candidate takes the MTTC content/subject area test that corresponds to their area(s) of preparation (major, minor, and/or endorsement program). By Michigan law, content/subject-area tests must be passed before the candidate's certificate is endorsed with the corresponding subject and grade level. Because the PRE is a gateway measure into student teaching and/or program admission, the results of the PRE are not appropriate to include in the EPI performance score. Only those scores obtained at or near the end of a candidate's experience are included.

MTTC content/subject-area passing percentages contribute to the overall EPI Performance Scores because the efficacy of the preparatory program can be evidenced, in part, by how students perform on

their content/subject-area assessments at the conclusion (or near-conclusion) of their programs. As the MTTC content/subject-area assessments are aligned to specific Michigan State Board of Education-approved teaching standards related to content and subject area, they provide a measure of how well the teacher was prepared by the EPI overall, not just in the education department or college before taking the test.

For that reason, the EPI Performance Score uses a three-year aggregate, or combined passing percentage, of all MTTC content/subject-area tests administered to eligible candidates from each EPI. Eligible candidates are those candidates verified by EPIs as candidates from the EPI. MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the "cumulative" or "best attempt" of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, which are administered in paper-based format four times per year; candidates can retake a content/subject-area MTTC an unlimited number of times if they have an initial failing result. To calculate the aggregate passing percentage, the number of "best attempt" passing results during a three-year period is divided by the total number of registrations over the same period, by test. Multiple attempts made by a teacher candidate on a given MTTC test during the three-year period are counted as one registration. For the calculation of the 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used.

For content/subject area tests that had less than 10 test-takers at a given EPI, the MDE aggregated all such programs into their own category, "Small Programs." This category was treated as its own content/subject area test for the purposes of performing the three-year aggregate passing percentage calculations.

Programs that had been closed at an EPI during the three-year period from August 2010 to July 2013 were not included into the component score calculations for these EPIs.

⁴ Section 1531 of Public Act 451 (1976), as amended by Public Act 267 (1986), Public Act 282 (1992), and Public Act 289 (1995).

component score calculation

TEACHER CANDIDATE AND CANDIDATE SUPERVISOR SURVEYS

As another component of the EPI Performance Score, perception data are gathered in two windows during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) and candidate supervisors (CSs). Response data from these two sets of surveys aids in the measurement of the efficacy of teacher preparation programs, with questions aligned to policy goals and the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers (PSMTs).

Two survey windows are programmed per academic year to allow for flexibility in gathering data from teachers graduating from programs in different semesters. For the 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span, in a window running from late 2012 to the end of January of 2013; and the Spring/Summer time span, in a window running from April of 2013 to the end of July 2013.

The audience for the TC surveys is teacher candidates who are finishing up their directed student teaching for their preparation program and are within the last two weeks of that period. The CS surveys are for EPI faculty who directly supervise the placement and directed student teaching of teacher candidates and have regular contact with them throughout that period. The two survey sets include similar questions for each audience, with wording changes to reflect the nature of each audience: teacher candidates report direct perceptions of their actual preparation, while candidate supervisors report indirect evidence of preparation through observations of candidate behaviors.

While questions on the 2012-2013 surveys were aligned with the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers (PSMTs), the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has since adopted new policy goals, and the Michigan Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (MI-InTASC) standards were also adopted. Accordingly, a crosswalk exercise between the PSMT and the MI-InTASC standards was conducted to identify the information from the existing

survey available for inclusion in the 2014 EPI score calculations. Surveys are being revised to be based fully on MI-InTASC, and will be used for subsequent EPI score calculations. The analyses of the crosswalk concluded that the following information, as gathered by section on the 2013-2013 surveys, was available for inclusion for the 2014 EPI Score calculations:

- Demographic information, including identification number
- Age and race information
- Major areas of specialization
- Perception questions with 4-point Likert scales across six categories
 - 1) Have teacher candidates been prepared to design high-quality learning experiences?
 - 2) Have teacher candidates been prepared to deliver instruction relevant to real-world problems, and local and global issues?
 - 3) Have teacher candidates been prepared in the use of educational technology to maximize student learning?
 - 4) Have teacher candidates been prepared to address the needs of special populations?
 - 5) Have teacher candidates been prepared to organize learning environments?
 - 6) Have teacher candidates been prepared on the effective use of assessments and student data?

Among the category areas listed immediately above, four were common across the 2012-2013 TC and CS surveys (categories 3 through 6, above), allowing aggregation of these results between the two survey types, and a resultant contribution of their scores to the 2014 EPI Performance Score. In the case of the other two response categories, these responses also were deemed usable for contribution to the 2014 EPI Performance Score, but their only source is the TC surveys, as the CS surveys did not include questions on these topic areas. (For the survey designs that will

component score calculation

contribute to the 2015 EPI score, these categories now exactly correspond between TC and CS surveys. A seventh category, “Have teacher candidates been prepared in applying critical thinking in their content area(s)?” has been added.)

Each category area described above has a different number of items that contribute to a total for that category area. Numerical responses to these items are aggregated, or combined, to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. Base response percentage rates are also calculated to validate that a threshold response has been reached. “Efficacy” is 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). An Efficacy rating is thus generated as an average from the overall rates on the TC and CS survey.

The 2012-2013 TC and CS Surveys are included with this document as Appendix A, page 20. A cross-reference table has also been included to show which survey items contributed to which category for the purposes of component score calculation and contribution to the overall calculation across the three EPI Performance Score goals.

EFFECTIVENESS LABELS SCORING METHODOLOGY

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP), a statewide database that collects fields of data about teachers and other staff who are employed in Michigan’s public K–12 schools. The data collected include information about teacher assignment, certification validity and expiration, work site, and full-time status, among other details. Michigan’s legislation mandates the annual evaluation of teachers and the assignment of teacher effectiveness labels, indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” and “Ineffective”

according to several factors, including student academic growth on statewide assessments.

The teacher effectiveness ratings became one source of data that contribute to the annual EPI Performance Score because the preparation that teachers receive at their college or university program directly impacts their effectiveness to deliver content within a strong pedagogical framework. It is also included as EPIs need to prepare their candidates for successful annual evaluations, and a measure of those candidates success in early annual evaluations can be reasonably considered to be a reflection of the preparation afforded by the EPI program. As research confirms,⁵ student growth in their academic performance is tied to teacher effectiveness. Accordingly, it was decided that the teacher effectiveness labels would be collected and a point attribution methodology would be applied to the ratings of teachers who received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs, and that those point attributions would form one of the component scores for their annual performance score.

To compute this component score on teacher effectiveness for the annual EPI Performance Score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings on teachers in their first three years of experience. These data came from the most recent version of the June 2013 Michigan Online Educator Certification System (MOECS) database, correlated to appearances in the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) database over a five-year period. MOECS uses certification data from each EPI, as well as roster data sent to MDE from personnel data administrators at school districts. The REP contains data on full-time equivalency (FTE) and effectiveness ratings. Teachers are assigned years of experience based on their career FTE. With these two data sources, reliable patterns of teacher effectiveness could be attributed to the EPI that originally recommended certification. Information on this process can be found in Table 1.

5 Kemp, L., & Hall, A. H. (1992). *Impact of effective teaching research on student achievement and teacher performance: Equity and access implications for quality education*. Jackson, MS: Jackson State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 360)

component score calculation

Each EPI was assigned a grid with rows representing each of the different effectiveness ratings (“Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” and “Ineffective”) and the columns representing teachers in their first, second, or third year of experience. All teachers in their first three years of experience were assigned to a particular cell in this grid. Some EPIs did not have teachers with certain effectiveness ratings; these EPIs had the corresponding row(s) left blank. Some EPIs did not have teachers in their second or third year of experience; these EPIs had the corresponding column(s) left blank.

MDE then computed the percent of teachers in each effectiveness category within a particular EPI and within a particular year of experience. For example, consider an EPI with 10 teachers in their first year of experience, three of whom were Highly Effective, five Effective, one Minimally Effective, and one Ineffective. Regardless of the number of teachers from this EPI in their second or third year of experience, its first-year percentages would be 30 percent Highly Effective, 50 percent Effective, 10 percent Minimally Effective, and 10 percent Ineffective. This process was done separately for all EPIs and for each year of experience.

Next, the MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. Highly Effective teacher ratings were assigned 1.00 points, Effective teacher ratings were assigned 0.80 points, Minimally Effective teacher ratings were assigned 0.30 points, and Ineffective teacher ratings were assigned zero points. This point scale is shown in Table 2. There are several reasons for this particular point scale. First, moving from Minimally Effective to Effective is valued more highly than moving from Ineffective to Minimally Effective. Moving teachers towards effectiveness should be rewarded, no matter whether teachers are near or far from effectiveness. However, it is important to incentivize the training of Effective teachers; while Minimally Effective teachers are preferable to Ineffective teachers, Effective teachers are greatly preferred to either.

Second, there is an even smaller difference between Effective and Highly Effective teachers. While Highly

Effective teachers may have a large impact on their students, MDE’s priority is first and foremost to guarantee an effective education for all students in Michigan. This point system balances rewarding the Highly Effective rating with the need to incentivize overall effectiveness.

Finally, it should be noted that the Effective rating was not assigned a full 1.00 score because teachers, even when considered effective, can and should strive to improve their teaching practices through professional development, collaboration with other teachers (e.g., professional learning communities), reflection and refinement of their practice, extending their skills through continuing education, and a host of other options. As a result, 0.80 was selected as a fair threshold to show that while an Effective rating is certainly a positive one, there is no immediate “ceiling” that would otherwise defeat an argument toward continuous improvement. The percent of teachers in each effectiveness category is therefore multiplied by the corresponding point value.

The point values within each column are then added together to give a score for each year. In the example above, our hypothetical EPI would have a score of 73 for this year. They are awarded 30 points from having 30 percent Highly Effective teachers in their first year of experience, 40 points from having 50 percent Effective teachers, 3 points from having 10 percent Minimally Effective teachers, and 0 points from having 10 percent Ineffective teachers. Doing this for all three years produces three scores on a zero-to-100 scale.

MDE then computes a weighted sum of these three-year scores. Factors outside EPIs’ control may account for differing amounts of teachers’ performance over time, so an unweighted average would not apply here. As teachers in their first year may face a steep learning curve, performance in this year receives a slightly lower weight of 0.3. Teachers in their third year of experience may have learned significantly from their experience rather than from their EPI, so performance in this year receives a still lower weight of 0.2. Performance in the second year of experience receives

component score calculation

the remaining 0.5. In cases where an EPI has no teachers in a particular year of experience, these weights were scaled proportionately to add up to one. Information on each of these possible scenarios is contained in Table 3. Weighting each year's score by the corresponding value and adding the three years together will therefore produce a single score.

Scores may thus be interpreted fairly intuitively. An EPI that produces only Highly Effective teachers (regardless of how many years of experience those teachers have) will have a score of 100. An EPI with all effective teachers will have a score of 80. An EPI that produces only Minimally Effective teachers will have a score of 30. An EPI that produces only Ineffective teachers will have a score of zero.

Table 1: FTE AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Full-Time Equivalency	Completed Years of Experience
0-0.19	0
0.20-1.19	1
1.20-2.19	2
2.20+	3+

Table 2: POINT VALUES BY EFFECTIVENESS LABEL

Effectiveness Label	Point Value
Highly Effective	1.00
Effective	0.80
Minimally Effective	0.30
Ineffective	0.00

Table 3: Missing Year Scenarios

Scenario	Year 1 Data	Year 2 Data	Year 3 Data	Year 1 Weight	Year 2 Weight	Year 3 Weight
1	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.3000	0.5000	0.2000
2	Yes	Yes	No	0.3750	0.6250	–
3	Yes	No	Yes	0.6000	–	0.4000
4	No	Yes	Yes	–	0.7143	0.2857
5	Yes	No	No	1.0000	–	–
6	No	Yes	No	–	1.0000	–
7	No	No	Yes	–	–	1.0000

Note: Scenarios 4, 6, and 7 were not observed in our data, but are presented here for completeness's sake.

overall score calculation summary

To review thus far, the 2014 EPI Performance Score has three component sub-scores:

- the MTTC aggregate passing percentages for a three-year period,
- the combined efficacy percentages from teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys, and
- the point attributions for teacher effectiveness labels gathered from Michigan public schools during the most recent three-year period within the five years following initial certifications.

Each of these three sub-scores can be expressed as an “index” score out of 100 points possible, such as a single percentage or a total percentage including the three sub-scores.

In October of 2013, when revisions to the existing EPI Performance Score were presented, MDE leadership reviewed three underlying goals of the score. Each goal was assigned a score “weighting” relative to the goal’s significance within the overall score itself.

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.

Each of the sub-scores contributes to at least one of the three goals. Accordingly, each sub-score has a percentage weight that shows its relative significance within the overall EPI score. The three component sub-scores are thus multiplied by their relative weights and by the EPI score element to contribute to an overall point total for goals 1, 2, and 3.

Table 5 (next page) shows the contribution of the two sub-scores (MTTC performance and surveys) included in Goal 1. Table 6 shows the same pattern, but for Goal 2. Finally, Table 7 shows the contribution of one sub-score (three-year teacher effectiveness percentage) to Goal 3. In each of the three “Goal” columns, an organizing, sequential code is shown; the “Weight” column is the relative weight of the sub-score to the goal itself (thus, within a goal the relative weights add up to 100 percent); the “Type” is the measurement tool upon which the data is based; and the description is a category marker that appears in the instrumentation itself, or a note that further explains the “Type.”

By multiplying the component “index” or percentage scores by each relative weight, a total point score for each goal is reached; this total point score is then multiplied by the overall goal weight. These three numbers are totaled, and a final overall EPI Performance Score is derived.

When reporting educator effectiveness data for calculation as a component score, some EPIs were found to have too few teachers (across the two educator effectiveness data collection points) to serve as an accurate representation of the quality of their training. Goal 3 is measured exclusively by the point values attributed to educator effectiveness labels.

Thus, in order to compute overall goal weight, a variable goal-weighting program was developed for four “bins” of EPIs, with each “bin” corresponding to the percentage of teachers who had completed a program and been assigned effectiveness labels over the three-year period (this data was captured from the MOECS system and annual Title II reports made to USED). The proposed weightings are shown on Table 4.

overall score calculation summary

Table 4: VARYING PERCENTAGE WEIGHTS FOR OVERALL SCORE CALCULATION

Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3
1% – 10%	70	30	0
11% – 20%	63	27	10
21% – 30%	56	24	20
31%+	50	20	30

Thus, as the percentage n-sizes of program completers who had educator effectiveness labels decreases by intervals of 10, Goal 3 is weighted by 10 fewer percentage points, with the remaining points redistributed proportionally between the other two goals, when calculating the overall EPI Performance Score.

Table 5: BREAKDOWN OF CONTRIBUTING COMPONENTS TO GOAL 1

Combined Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Surveys (efficacy percentages averaged from six of seven categories)

Goal	Weight	Type	Description
1.A.2	5	Likert Response Values	High-Quality Learning Experiences
1.A.3	0	Likert Response Values	Critical Thinking [not available for 2014 EPI score]
1.A.4	5	Likert Response Values	Connection to Real-World Problems and Issues
1.B.1	5	Likert Response Values	Use of Educational Technology
1.B.2	5	Likert Response Values	Response to Needs of Students of Special Populations
1.B.3	5	Likert Response Values	Organizing the Learning Environment
1.B.4	5	Likert Response Values	Use of Student Data
<i>Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification</i>			
Goal	Weight	Type	Description
1.A.1	70	Aggregate Pass Percentage	Content-Based Test Results over Rolling Three Years

overall score calculation

Table 6: BREAKDOWN OF CONTRIBUTING COMPONENTS TO GOAL 2

Combined Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Surveys (efficacy percentages from one of four categories)

Goal	Weight	Type	Description
2.1	0	Likert Response Values	Candidate Diversity [not a survey category]
2.2	100	Likert Response Values	Clinical Preparation
2.3	0	Likert Response Values	State Evaluation System [not a survey category]
2.4	0	Likert Response Values	Shortage Areas and Advising [not a survey category]

Table 7: BREAKDOWN OF CONTRIBUTING COMPONENTS TO GOAL 3

Point Score Totals Attributed to Teacher Effectiveness Percentages for EPI Program Graduates, for most recent three-years of full time teaching experience within five years of initial certification

Goal	Weight	Type	Description
3.1	100	Aggregate Score Totals	Point Score Totals from Last Three Effectiveness Labels Gathered from Five-Year Window
3.2	0	Aggregate Score Totals	Placement Rates [not collected for 2014 EPI score]

Note: as mentioned in the “Background and Overview” chapter of this manual, the MDE anticipates the possible contribution of other sources of data for piloting in 2015 or later; the measures marked with an asterisk indicate those under consideration.

may 2014 referent panel

OVERVIEW

On May 13 and May 14, 2014, a referent panel was convened for the purposes of determining cut scores on the overall score that would provide three categories of performance among Michigan's EPIs. These categories of performance are proscribed by the federal Higher Education Act and describe the delivery of teacher preparation programs to teacher candidates at each of Michigan's 33 EPIs. These categories are "Low Performing," "At Risk of Low Performing," and "Satisfactory."

In order to recruit panelists to serve as judges during the two-day event, the MDE followed a two-part method, one part aimed at recruiting a number of faculty or administrators from Michigan colleges and universities, and another part aimed at recruiting a representative sample of K–12 educators. This was done in order to ensure that the judges involved in the referent panel process were all stakeholders in the outcome of the findings from the referent panel; the EPI faculty members are employed by institutions that would eventually receive a performance category label, and the K–12 educators are educators who all graduated from the same group of EPIs that would receive a performance category label.

In order to recruit a representative sample of faculty or administration staff from Michigan EPIs, a simple categorization matrix was established to describe EPIs that fit into four resultant categories: Large Public, Small Public, Large Private, and Small Private. The criteria for "Large Public" was established as a Michigan public college or university that has 500 or more teaching program completers over a three-year period; "Small Public" was established as any teaching program with fewer than 500 completers over the same period. "Large Private" was defined as any independent or parochial institution of higher education that had a three-year program completer volume of 100 or greater; "Small Private" was defined as the same type of EPI that had less than 100 program completers per three-year period.

From this categorization matrix, representatives from five EPIs per category were invited to be part of the referent panel, and from among these five per category, one representative was chosen from each of four main geographical areas: the western side of the state, the eastern side of the state, the central part of the state, and the Upper Peninsula as a whole. An overall geographical distribution was also controlled for when the final list was assembled; where possible among public institutions, representatives from the eastern Upper Peninsula and western Upper Peninsula were invited. The resultant group who appeared at the referent panel event represented the following Michigan EPIs:

Large Public

- University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
- Saginaw Valley State University
- Wayne State University
- Michigan State University
- Central Michigan University

Small Public

- Michigan Technological University
- Lake Superior State University
- University of Michigan at Flint

Large Private

- Olivet College
- Baker College
- Calvin College
- Madonna University

Small Private

- Siena Heights University
- Andrews University

may 2014 referent panel

To maintain an even composition of the referent panel, it was determined that the recruitment of the K–12 teachers needed to match or exceed the number of EPI faculty. In order to recruit the required number of teachers, the MOECS system was leveraged as a data source for the names and e-mail addresses of teachers who were to be invited according to a set of invitation business rules as follows:

1. Only teachers who graduated from one of the 33 Michigan EPIs were invited.
2. Only teachers who held a current, valid teaching certificate (Provisional or Professional) were invited.

After a number of records from the MOECS system were gathered from these two criteria, the records were merged against the REP records for the third criterion:

3. Only teachers who were currently employed were invited, as reported on REP.

This generated a record set of approximately 12,000 teachers, complete with names, e-mail addresses, certification information (including certification type and expiration date to verify validity), and subject area of certificate endorsement. From the REP employment data, these 12,000 records were then sorted accordingly into a fourth criterion:

4. Teachers were grouped into three time spans.
 - a. Those that graduated from a Michigan EPI between one and five years ago;
 - b. Those that graduated from a Michigan EPI between six and ten years ago; and
 - c. Those that graduated from a Michigan EPI between eleven and fifteen years ago.

Once the 12,000 teachers were sorted, a random sampling was taken from each of the three sets in order to generate a total of 203 teachers that fit into the three time span sets. Once these teachers were selected by the random sampling method, teachers in each set were sorted into the following sub-sets:

5. Teachers currently teaching at an elementary level (grades K–5) or a secondary (grades 6–12) level.
6. Subject area among certificate holders.

From these 6 criteria, a total of 203 teachers were sent invitation letters, and from those 203, a total of 13 teachers responded. The teachers were kept in an even distribution among the three time span sets and among the grade-level and subject-area sub-sets so that among confirmed participants, few duplications occurred as possible. At the event itself, 9 teachers participated, representing the following grade-levels and subject areas:

1–5 Years Since Graduation

- Elementary, Physical Education
- Secondary, Biology

6–10 Years Since Graduation

- Elementary, Science
- Elementary, Learning Disabilities
- Secondary, Business Education and Spanish

11–15 Years Since Graduation

- Elementary, Reading Specialist
- Secondary, Chemistry and Science
- Secondary, Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics
- Secondary, English and Physical/Other Health Impairment

PERFORMANCE LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Draft language for 2014 EPI Performance Score Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs) were reached by a consensus among MDE staff and leadership, following a systematic writing process.

In order to draft the PLDs, MDE staff created a matrix of performance levels that described the specific (but qualitative) extent to which a given EPI must perform on each component instrument. With the understanding that the purpose of convening the referent panel was to assign the numeric overall score ranges to EPI categories after their review of component scores, a qualitative description of performance, but no numerical component score data on each component score, was included in the PLDs. Thus, after the judgments for each EPI profile were reached in the "Body of Work" exercise by the referent panel judges, the MDE could then assign the overall score to each category, calculated from the real component score data, knowing that no judgments were predetermined or influenced by a component numerical score listed in the PLDs.

To begin the systematic writing process, the highest level of performance (Satisfactory) was written as a set of statements that included all of the score components, and which introduced no other factors of performance. After this performance level was reviewed by multiple MDE staff and vetted by OPPS leadership, the lowest level of performance (Low Performing) was drafted, using the same phrasing, format, and language structure. This was done to ensure comparability and clarity for the referent panel judges, as well as ease of reference for eventual public release to future stakeholders. Finally, when the Low Performing level was approved by OPPS leadership, the middle level of performance (At Risk of Low Performing) was written as a mid-point between the two existing PLDs. This was then vetted and approved in a similar fashion as the other two performance levels, completing the continuum.

Some flexibility in interpretation was included by use of the qualifying phrases "most or all of the following" (at the Satisfactory level), "one or more of the following" (at the At Risk of Low Performing level), and "most or all of the following" (at the Low Performing level). This was done because the bulleted statements (broken out by instrumentation) for the Satisfactory level are all written with a positive or "high extent" direction, and the bulleted statements for the other two performance levels are written in a negative or "low extent" direction. For example, by including a qualifying phrase for Satisfactory where "most or all" of the positive statements about EPI performance on the component instrumentation must be true to award this level, it became easier for panelists to envision a range of quality for EPIs at this level, versus a hard-line interpretation of absolute success. Similarly, by including the phrase where "most or all" of the negative statements about EPI performance were needed for placement into the Low Performing level, panelists had better guidance as to the range of possible conditions that an EPI needed to exhibit for it to be placed into the lowest level of performance. Finally, in the case of the middle level of performance, the phrase "one or more" allowed panelists to think of this rung as a "caution" whereby an EPI had some positive, yet some negative, trends that would make it fall between the topmost and the bottommost levels.

The following are the proposed Performance Level Descriptors used during the Referent Group process:

Satisfactory: An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as satisfactory exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;

may 2014 referent panel

- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
 - supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
 - graduates who almost exclusively earn “Effective” or “Highly Effective” ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the negative perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
 - graduates who earn many “Ineffective” or “Minimally Effective” ratings, and generally no “Highly Effective” ratings, during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

At Risk of Low Performing: An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as at risk of low performing exhibits one or more of the following:

- a relatively low percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report relatively lower levels of satisfaction with their teacher preparation and clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the negative perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who earn few “Ineffective” or “Minimally Effective,” and generally no “Highly Effective” ratings, during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Low Performing: An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as low performing exhibits most or all of the following:

- a low percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates report a low level of satisfaction with their teacher preparation and clinical experiences;

PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

To review, the MDE collected information about teacher preparation institutions within the state in order to evaluate the programs. The EPI Performance Score, which is calculated for each institution, is based on three measures of educator preparation. The EPI Performance Score contains a component for teacher effectiveness once a teacher is working in the schools, a survey of student and instructor experience in the educator preparation institution, and a component for the percent of teachers passing the teacher and content certification assessments.

The EPI Performance Score is a weighted composite of the components and yields a score of 0 to 100. (In 2014, most institutions received a score of 70–95.) This provides a measure for evaluating educator preparation institutions. The purpose of this standard setting was to assign performance levels to the EPI Performance Score.

A standard-setting method adapted from work on assessment instruments was used to identify locations on the scale which indicate stated performance levels. In this case, a contrasting groups methodology was used. Experts examined the components of the EPI Performance Score in the form of an institutional record before weighting had been applied, and judged which performance level should be assigned to that particular institutional record.

This method is most analogous to the “Body of Work” method used in standard-setting studies in K–12 assessments. Experts view the work product of a student

may 2014 referent panel

on an assessment and assign that work to a particular level, which is defined by a PLD (see above). In this study the experts looked at an institutional record that gave them information about the institution's student performance on certification tests, the institution's graduate's effectiveness ratings at teaching, and the institution's curricular focus as measured by a survey of students and instructors at the institution.

The institutional record that the experts saw contained three numbers:

1. The percentage of students passing content tests over a three year period;
2. the teacher effectiveness rating which ranges from 0 to 100 and is based on teacher effectiveness ratings for teachers who received their training in the particular institution; and
3. the teacher candidate and candidate supervisor survey index, which is an average of the responses to a survey that focuses on policy goals.

These three numbers did not reflect the weighting that was used to calculate the final EPI Performance Score, but they reflected the information that was used and presented so that the experts could judge each component. The overall score was not presented to assure that each panelist reviewed the entire body of work represented by the data for each institution rather than a single summary score. The institutional record, which contained the three numbers, was not associated with a particular institution during the standard-setting process. In fact, all actual institutional records were used, along with some created records. In all, there were 40 institutional records that the experts categorized (33 actual EPIs and 7 "dummy" EPIs).

The two other relevant aspects of the Body of Work methodology are the descriptions of the standards (PLDs) and the expert panelists. The PLD provides a description of a standard level. In this case there were

three standards: Satisfactory, At Risk of Low Performing, and Low Performing. These were developed to focus on the components of the EPI Performance Score.

The expert panelists used the PLDs to associate each Institutional Record with a standard level. The expert panelists were selected from two groups. One set of panelists came from the educator preparation institutions themselves. The second set of panelists was recruited from practicing teachers who graduated from these institutions. The number of panelists from each group totaled 9 (in the K-12 educator group) and 14 (in the EPI faculty group). The standard-setting process required the two groups of panelists to meet in separate rooms in order to facilitate discussion during the process. These two groups were balanced so both institutional and teacher experts were assigned to both rooms.

The Body of Work method uses a holistic approach to standard setting. Experts were asked to classify an entire set of information about an institution. Once classifications are made, the method provides for a contrasting group approach to providing a standard or cut score. In this case, the distribution of EPI Performance Scores for a standard was compared and a cut score selected that produced the best separation between groups. The selection of the cut score depended on the distributions of scores and how they are smoothed. Some data analysis was required before the final cut score recommendations were made from the information provided by the experts.

The standard setting process consisted of three rounds of ratings by panelists. The total group was divided into two groups for the first two rounds. It is typical during standard setting to introduce new information to the panelists as they move from round to round in the process.

This Body of Work process started in Round 1 with the panelists taking the 40 institutional records in random order and making classifications of each. After the panelists completed this task, their classifications were tabulated and presented in a report that showed all

may 2014 referent panel

panelist ratings and sorted the institutional records by actual EPI Performance Score, though the overall EPI performance score was not presented.

The sorting by EPI Performance Score provided the new information for the panelists to discuss before beginning Round 2 ratings. They were able to evaluate their ratings in terms of the other panelists and in terms of the order of institutional records on the EPI Performance Score. Room facilitators led a discussion of the panelists' classifications in each room.

After the panelists finished their Round 2 ratings, the results were summarized again. This time the panelists were provided with impact date of their preliminary cut score recommendations. Since the institutional records were sorted from high to low on the report of expert ratings, the preliminary cut scores were provided according to the order of the institutional records. This was considered "preliminary" in that experts then had an opportunity to make a Round 3 judgment about classifications. The method used to identify the cut score was based on the selection of a median borderline institutional record.

Panelists were provided with a Round 3 activity where they made their final categorizations based on all the information that had been provided. Panelists met in the large group between Round 2 and Round 3 to discuss the categorizations. Panelists did not receive the actual overall EPI Performance Scale cut score, but its location on the ordered EPI institutional records was noted.

Finally, panelists received an Evaluation Form to complete the activity.

In June 2014, the MDE reviewed the findings and recommendations of the May 2014 referent panel. While the referent panel had been tasked with determining the cut scores between the three categories, MDE leadership determined that, due to changes being concurrently anticipated in the corrective action system, only the cut score between At Risk and Satisfactory was sufficient to make the determinations of performance categories necessary for publication later in 2014 under the requirements of the HEA. This was concluded for two reasons:

- No EPIs were found to have been assigned to the lowest performance category by the referent panel.
- A measure of adequate performance is a first step to determining the performance category, but it is not the only step, under the anticipated changes to the corrective action system.

Following the recommendations of the same expert panel, a cut score of 84 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 75% of our panel judges, with the rationales that

- consensus among 75% of our panel judges is enough for the purposes of determining which EPIs did or did not make the cut;
- 90% consensus is rare to find in other scoring mechanisms and seems too high to defend; and
- no EPIs (except for the fake ones that were included in the referent panel exercise) were placed in “Low Performing” by the panel judges, effectively meaning that the referent panel judges established only one discernable cut, not two.

In order to assign the resultant performance category, the cut score of 84 is now used as the first decision in determining how an EPI progresses along the “track” of categories and resultant corrective actions. The progressive corrective action system is explained elsewhere than in this Technical Manual; refer to the MDE OPPS Web site at www.michigan.gov/teachercert for more information.

While the corrective action system is not covered in this Technical Manual, it is important to note that whether or not an EPI has met the cut score for adequate performance each year will now lead to an EPI being assigned a new “phase,” or step, in the corrective action system. This “phase” will then, in turn, determine their reported performance category and thus the corrective action requirements expected for the next year. Starting in 2014, EPIs 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. Thus, the corrective action system that is anticipated is a progressive one, with support and guidance from the MDE taking a more “scaffolded” format, as opposed to a “reactive” one.

The final list of EPIs being assigned to each performance category is expected to be published in July 2014 in a memo from the MDE, which will include general information about the component and overall scores, and a brief description of the anticipated changes to the corrective action system. However, unlike previous years, EPIs will now receive specialized reports detailing their component and overall scores, how overall scores were calculated, and what performance category they have been assigned for 2014-2015.

In addition to changes in its corrective action system, the MDE anticipates further modifications to the measurement instruments used in the EPI Performance Score for 2015, including the possibility of a “Year Out” survey of new teachers to gather additional data regarding their preparation program after having gained a year of teaching experience. Therefore, it is likely that the process of convening a referent panel will occur again in 2015. This will aid the MDE in its work of factoring in new measures into the existing EPI Performance Scores, as well as confirm or improve the reliability of its current component scores.

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Teacher Candidate Survey

For teacher candidates who are finishing up their directed student teaching for their preparation program and are within the last two weeks of that period.

Q0

Tell us about yourself.

Q1

Your gender:

- Female
- Male

Q2

Your age:

- under 25 years of age
- 25 - 29
- 30 - 34
- 35 - 39
- 40 - 44
- 45 - 49
- 50 or more

Q3

Your race/ethnicity:

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic
- Multiracial
- Native American\Pacific Islander
- White
- Other, Please Specify

Q4

Check ALL types of college attended in Michigan:

- Community College
- Public University
- Independent College or University
- Other, Please Specify

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q5

Did you have any college work or teacher preparation at an institution outside of Michigan?

- Yes
- No

Q6

What type of teacher preparation program are you completing?

- Undergraduate Program
- Post Bachelor Program
- Master of Arts in Teaching (MATS)

Q7

Select the PRIMARY CONTENT-AREA, OR MAJOR in which you are currently seeking endorsement:

Q8

Select ALL ADDITIONAL CONTENT-AREA MINORS OR MAJORS in which you are currently seeking endorsement(s):

Q9

[Mandatory]

Select your teaching level:

- Elementary Teacher(PK - 8th grade level only)
- Secondary Teacher(6th - 12th grade level only)
- Special Education Teacher
- K-12 Teacher (Teacher in Art, Health, Physical Education, Music, Library/Media, or World Language)

Q10

If your PRIMARY focus is an ELEMENTARY CERTIFICATE, how much do you agree with the following statements:
I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. teach Mathematics.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. teach Social Studies.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. teach Integrated Science.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. teach Language Arts.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. teach Reading (including oral reading).	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
f. teach Writing in a variety of genres.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
g. teach Reading for comprehension across content areas.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q11

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

	Not Much	2	3	Great Deal
a. teach Social Studies?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. teach Integrated Science?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. teach Writing in a variety of genres?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q12

If your PRIMARY focus is a SECONDARY CERTIFICATE, how much do you agree with the following statements:
I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. teach my major content area(s).	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. teach my minor content area(s).	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. help students with reading comprehension in my content area(s).	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. help students write in my content area(s).	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q13

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

	Not much	2	3	Great Deal
a. teach your major content area(s)?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. help students with in your content area(s)?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q14

If your PRIMARY focus is SPECIAL EDUCATION, how much do you agree with the following statements:
I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. use teaching techniques effective for the identified disability.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. use instructional strategies that help students with their reading comprehension across content.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. use instructional strategies that help students to write.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. collaborate with other teachers to meet student learning needs.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. use adaptive technologies to accommodate students with special needs.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q15

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

	Not Much	2	3	Great Deal
a. use adaptive technology to accommodate students with special needs?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. collaborate with other teachers to meet student learning needs?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q16

If your PRIMARY focus is K-12 ART, MUSIC, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, LIBRARY/MEDIA, OR WORLD LANGUAGE how much do you agree with the following statements:
I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. teach my content area to elementary students.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. teach my content area to secondary students.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. help students with reading comprehension in my content area(s).	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. make connections between my content area and other academic content.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q17

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to ...

	Not Much	2	3	Great Deal
a. teach your content area to elementary students?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. teach your content area to secondary students?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q18

For the following statements, how much do you agree with each regarding your level of preparation to ORGANIZE STUDENT LEARNING:
I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. organize a rich environment for literacy learning.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. use literacy instructional strategies with a variety of texts.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. help students improve their reading skills.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. help students improve their writing skills.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. organize students from different cultures to interact positively with each other.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
f. plan for students with developmental disabilities.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
g. challenge gifted and talented students.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
h. motivate discouraged students for improved academic performance.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
i. help students become independent learners.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
j. adapt instruction for students learning English as a second language.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
k. modify assessments for students with special needs.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q19

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to ...

	Not Much	2	3	Great Deal
a. adapt instructions to meet students' varied academic needs?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. support student literacy across content areas?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q20

For the following statements, how much do you agree with each regarding your KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER: (as you answer each question think about your primary content area.)
I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. teach the core concepts of my content area.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. relate classroom learning in my content area to the real world.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. integrate my subject matter with other content areas.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. help students think critically about my content area.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. use curricular standards to plan instruction.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q21

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

	Not Much	2	3	Great Deal
a. integrate the subject matter with other content areas?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. help students think critically about the content area?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q22

For the following statements, how much do you agree with each regarding your level of preparation in ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING:
I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. use state and local student learning standards to assess and improve my teaching.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. use a variety of authentic assessments.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. use a variety of standardized assessments, to guide my decisions about what to teach.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. communicate information about students' progress to parents and others.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. analyze student work in order to modify my own teaching.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q23

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

	Not Much	2	3	Great Deal
a. analyze student work in order to modify your own teaching?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. use a variety of standardized assessments to guide your decisions about what to teach?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q24

For the following statements, how much do you agree with each regarding your level of preparation in ORGANIZING THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT:

I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. provide alternative explanations or examples when students are confused.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. choose methods that help students to value learning.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. use instructional time effectively to promote student learning.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. use a variety of instructional teaching methodologies.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. structure an inclusive classroom environment that values the learning of all students.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
f. sustain high expectations for students to maximize student learning.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
g. implement a classroom management plan that promotes positive interactions.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
h. uphold the legal responsibilities of teaching.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
i. establish a learning environment that welcomes collaborative teaching practices.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
j. differentiate between assessment and evaluation procedures to use each appropriately for student learning.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q25

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

Not Much **2** **3** **Great Deal**

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. use a variety of research-based instructional methods to meet the needs of all students? | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| b. use classroom management techniques that sustain a productive learning community? | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |

Q26

For the following statements, how well do you agree with each regarding your level of preparation in WORKING IN THE SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ENVIRONMENT:

I am well prepared to...

Not at all Agree **Somewhat Agree** **Mostly Agree** **Strongly Agree**

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. collaborate with parents, guardians, and students to enhance student development. | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| b. behave ethically in the variety of situations I will face as a teacher. | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| c. adapt my instruction to existing resources. | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| d. use professional development opportunities to improve my teaching. | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| e. collaborate with colleagues and other school personnel. | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| f. seek out district resources that students need. | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| g. take on service roles in the teaching profession (such as curriculum committees and school improvement teams). | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| h. engage in reflection on my professional practice as part of a life-long learning process. | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |

Q27

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

Not Much **2** **3** **Great Deal**

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. collaborate with colleagues and other school personnel? | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| b. engage in reflection on your professional practice as part of a life-long learning process? | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q28

For the following statements, how much do you agree with each regarding your level of preparation to PARTICIPATE IN THE COMMUNITY BEYOND THE SCHOOL:

I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. participate in the community in which I teach.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. use home and community resources to teach students.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. design learning activities for students that involve community groups.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q29

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

	Not Much	2	3	Great Deal
a. design learning activities for students that involve community groups?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. participate in the community in which you teach?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q30

For the following statements, how well do you agree with each regarding your level of preparation to USE TECHNOLOGY TO MAXIMIZE STUDENT LEARNING:

I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. integrate educational technology into my classroom instruction.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. practice high ethical standards surrounding the use of technology.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. use technology for my professional development.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. develop on-line learning experiences for students in my classroom.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. evaluate the effectiveness of technology-enhanced learning environments.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
f. support students' use of technology to enhance conceptual understanding.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q31

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

	Not Much	2	3	Great Deal
a. integrate educational technology into your classroom instruction?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. practice high ethical standards surrounding the use of technology?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q32

Regarding your LIBERAL ARTS BACKGROUND, how much do you agree with each of the following statements:
I am well prepared to...

	Not at all Agree	Somewhat Agree	Mostly Agree	Strongly Agree
a. use knowledge from the liberal arts to enrich my teaching practice.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. communicate effectively in several forms of writing.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. use mathematics to enhance my teaching.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. make interdisciplinary connections with my content area.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. demonstrate understanding of multiple perspectives and individual differences.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
f. demonstrate an understanding of responsible citizenship.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
g. articulate my responsibility to prepare students to succeed in a world that is ever-changing.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
h. discuss how cultural differences affect U.S. historical policy.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
i. discuss Michigan history.	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q33

How much did your Teacher Preparation Institution contribute to your ability to...

	Not Much	2	3	Great Deal
a. demonstrate understanding of multiple perspectives and individual differences?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. use knowledge from the liberal arts to enrich your teaching practice?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. adapt the classroom curriculum to meet the needs of a changing society?	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q34

Please respond to the following:
What does it mean to be an effective teacher?

Q35

How would you rate yourself overall in effectiveness, based on your description of an effective teacher?

- Greatly Effective
- Mostly Effective
- Somewhat Effective
- Not at all Effective

Q36

How much has your recent student teaching experience added to your readiness to be an effective teacher?

- Very Much
- Quite a Bit
- Slightly
- Not at All

Q37

Identify THREE areas of teaching practice in which you feel most confident of your ability:

- Knowledge of subject matter
- Assessment of student learning
- Classroom organization
- Instructional practices
- Professional practices
- Developing community partnerships
- Participating with colleagues in learning
- Using technology to teach
- Working with other adults to support students
- Other, Please Specify

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q38

Identify THREE areas of teaching practice in which you know you need more experience:

- Knowledge of subject matter
- Assessment of student learning
- Classroom organization
- Instructional practices
- Professional practices
- Developing community partnerships
- Participating with colleagues in learning
- Using technology to teach
- Working with other adults to support students
- Other, Please Specify

Q39

Do you intend to get your teaching certification within the next 12 months?

- Yes
- No

Q40

Additional comments regarding the teacher preparation program:

Q 41

[Mandatory]

To what extent are you aware of the following state and federal policy initiatives?

	Not Aware	Slightly Aware	Moderately Aware	Highly Aware
a. Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT)	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. Individualized Education Plans (IEP)	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. Michigan Educator Code of Ethics	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE)	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
f. Michigan High School Content Expectations (HSCE)	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
g. Michigan Merit Curriculum (MMC) requirements	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
h. Michigan Model Anti-Bullying Policy	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
i. Michigan Positive Behavior Support Policy	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
j. No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
k. Response to Intervention (RTI)	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
l. Universal Design for Learning (UDL)	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q42 [Mandatory]

To what extent have you become aware of each of the following during your preparation as a teacher?

	Not Aware	Slightly Aware	Moderately Aware	Highly Aware
a. Approaches to inclusion	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
b. Criteria for use of seclusion or restraint	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
c. Fingerprinting requirement for school staff	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
d. Instructional support for English language learners	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
e. Mandatory reporting of suspected abuse	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
f. New teacher induction and mentoring requirements	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
g. Professional development requirements	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4
h. Reading requirement to obtain a Professional Certificate	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4

Q43

Identification Information:

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Candidate Supervisor Survey

For EPI faculty who directly supervise the placement and directed student teaching of teacher candidates and have regular contact with them throughout that period.

Q1 [Mandatory]

Student Identification:

Q2 [Mandatory]

Type of program enrolled in at present:

- Graduate
- Undergraduate
- Post Bachelor (not leading to a graduate degree)
- Master of Arts in Teaching (MATS)

Q3 [Mandatory]

Teaching Certificate:

- Elementary (K - 5) + 6-8
- Secondary (6 - 12)

Q4 [Mandatory]

Content Specialty (Major/Minor) Choose all that apply:

- Art
- Career Technology
- Health/Physical Education
- Language Arts, English or Reading
- Library/Media
- Mathematics
- Music
- Science (or sub area)
- Social Studies (or sub area)
- Special Education
- World Language
- Other, Please Specify

Q5

School District: (If Private or Parochial skip to next question.)

Q6

Parochial or Private School:

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q7

[Mandatory]

Consider the following aspects of the student teacher/intern ability regarding SUBJECT MATTER KNOWLEDGE:
Teaches the core concepts of the assigned subject area(s).
Relates classroom learning to the real world.
Integrates subject matter with other content areas.
Helps students think critically (e.g. analyze, solve problems, make decisions).

This student teacher/intern demonstrates thorough knowledge of the subject matter.

Not At All Agree

1

Somewhat Agree

2

Mostly Agree

3

Strongly Agree

4

Q8

[Mandatory]

Consider the following aspects of the student teacher/intern ability to SUPPORT STUDENT LITERACY:
Organizes an environment for developing literacy in content area learning.
Uses literacy instructional strategies with a variety of texts.
Uses a variety of strategies to help students improve their reading skills.
Uses a variety of strategies to help students improve their writing skills.

This student teacher/intern demonstrates thorough knowledge of student literacy.

Not At All Agree

1

Somewhat Agree

2

Mostly Agree

3

Strongly Agree

4

Q9

[Mandatory]

Consider the following aspects of the student teacher/intern abilities in ORGANIZING THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT:
Chooses a variety of teaching strategies to meet the different needs of students.
Ensures a safe and orderly classroom environment.
Develops curriculum that builds on students' experiences, interests and abilities.
Helps students become self-motivated and self-directed.
Chooses methods that help students to value learning.
Facilitates rich discussions of content.

This student teacher/intern is able to organize the classroom environment.

Not At All Agree

1

Somewhat Agree

2

Mostly Agree

3

Strongly Agree

4

Q10

[Mandatory]

Consider the following aspects of the ability to MAXIMIZE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE RANGE OF STUDENTS TRUSTED TO THE STUDENT TEACHER/INTERN:
Structures opportunities for all students to interact positively across cultures.
Plans for students with disabilities or developmental delays.
Challenges gifted and talented students.
Motivates discouraged students for improved academic performance.
Adapts instruction for students learning English as a second language.

Given the opportunity, this student teacher/intern is able to maximize learning opportunities for diverse students.

Not At All Agree

1

Somewhat Agree

2

Mostly Agree

3

Strongly Agree

4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q11 [Mandatory]

Consider the following aspects of the student teacher/intern ability to ASSESS LEARNING:
Uses authentic assessment (eg. portfolios, performance tasks, anecdotal records) in the classroom.
Uses the results of a variety of assessments to guide instructional decisions.
Communicates information about students' progress to students, parents and others.
Adapts assessments for students with special needs.
Analyzes student work in order to modify teaching strategies.

This student teacher/intern is able to assess learning .

Not At All Agree

1

Somewhat Agree

2

Mostly Agree

3

Strongly Agree

4

Q12 [Mandatory]

Consider the following aspects of the student teacher/intern ability in USING TECHNOLOGY TO MAXIMIZE STUDENT LEARNING POTENTIAL:
Integrates educational technology into classroom instruction.
Practices high ethical standards surrounding the use of technology.
Uses technological resources to bring new learning opportunities into the classroom.
Uses technology to organize and manage student records.
Supports the use of a variety of technology in student work.

Given the opportunity, this student teacher/intern is able to use technology to maximize students' learning potential.

Not At All Agree

1

Somewhat Agree

2

Mostly Agree

3

Strongly Agree

4

Q13 [Mandatory]

Consider the following aspects of the student teacher/intern ability regarding LIBERAL ARTS BACKGROUND.
Uses knowledge from the liberal arts (eg. humanities, mathematics and science) to enrich teaching practices.
Communicates effectively in several forms of writing.
Uses mathematics as a tool in learning.
Models the role of an individual in a free society.
Demonstrates understanding of multiple perspectives and individual differences.
Demonstrates an understanding of responsible citizenship.

This student teacher/intern is able to incorporate liberal arts into teaching practices.

Not At All Agree

1

Somewhat Agree

2

Mostly Agree

3

Strongly Agree

4

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Q14 [Mandatory]

Consider the following aspects of the student teacher/intern abilities in WORKING IN THE SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ENVIRONMENT:

- Uses state and local student learning standards to plan instruction.
- Communicates with parents, guardians and families.
- Behaves ethically in the variety of situations faced as a teacher.
- Teaches effectively in schools with limited resources.
- Collaborates with colleagues on professional issues.
- Access school and district resources that students need.

This student teacher/intern is able to work in the school and district environment.

Not At All Agree

1

Somewhat Agree

2

Mostly Agree

3

Strongly Agree

4

Q15 [Mandatory]

Consider the following aspects of the student teacher/intern ability in PARTICIPATING IN EXTENDED LEARNING COMMUNITIES.

- Arranges for students to connect with the community.
- Participates in professional growth opportunities.
- Uses school and district resources to enrich instruction.

This student teacher/intern is able to participate in extended learning communities.

Not At All Agree

1

Somewhat Agree

2

Mostly Agree

3

Strongly Agree

4

Q16

Please comment on observed Student Teacher/Intern strengths:

Q17

Please comment on observed Student Teacher/Intern weaknesses:

appendix a: 2012-2013 teacher candidate and candidate supervisor surveys

Table 8: SURVEY QUESTION CORRESPONDENCES TO CATEGORY AREAS CONTRIBUTING TO EPI SCORE

	High-Quality Learning Experiences	Real-World Problems and Local/Global Issues	Use of Educational Technology	Needs of Special Populations	Organize Learning Environments	Effective use of Assessments and Student Data
Teacher Candidate Survey	Q10 (a) through (g) Q12 (a) through (g) Q20 (a), (c), and (e) Q24 (a)	Q20 (b)	Q30 (a) through (f)	Q18 (e) through (k)	Q18 (a) through (d) Q24 (b) through (g) and (i)	Q22 (a) through (e) Q24 (j)
Candidate Supervisor Survey			Q12	Q10	Q8	Q11

Efficacy rates from both teacher candidates and candidate supervisors from the survey questions listed above contributed to directly Goal 1 (shown as “Part I” on the 2014 Component and Overall Score Reports).

An average of the efficacy rates across all of the questions listed above was used to contribute directly to Goal 2 (shown as “Part II” on the 2014 Component and Overall Score Reports).

Questions that appeared on the surveys but were omitted from contributing to the score were those questions that were deemed not to align with the Michigan Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (MI-InTASC) standards, as adopted by the MDE in April 2013.

appendix b: referent group panel agenda

EDUCATOR PREPARATION INSTITUTION (EPI) PERFORMANCE SCORE REFERENT GROUP PANEL

Tuesday, May 13

8:30–9:00 Panelists Sign In and Panelists Numbers Assigned

Panelists sign in. A roster should be available before the meeting and a panelist number will be assigned. Each panelist will receive a number upon sign-in. This will be used on our reporting materials in order to allow the panelists to keep their ratings confidential if they wish.

9:00–10:00 Introductions and Description of the Standard-Setting Process

The facilitator will introduce himself and department staff. He will ask panelists to introduce themselves: name, school, and position.

The facilitator will lead a general discussion of the purpose of the meeting—setting standards for the EPI Performance Score. The discussion will cover why standards are needed and how the standards will be used.

The facilitator will present a summary of the standard process in general and specifically how the standard setting is conducted by reviewing the agenda.

The “Body of Work” method and its adaptation to this task will be discussed in general.

10:00–11:00 Description and Explanation of the EPI Data Vectors

Michigan staff will review in detail the data vectors that will be presented to the panelists during the body of work process. They will need to understand each of the variables in the data vector (Aggregate Pass Rates, All Likert Response Variables including the scale that was used, and Teacher Effective Ratings). This understanding will be critical for the panelists to make classifications of the data vectors.

11:00–11:15 Break

11:15–12:00 Description of the Goals and EPI Performance Score Calculation

Michigan staff will explain how the EPI Performance Score is calculated from the data vectors that have been discussed. Even though panelists will not need to calculate an EPI Performance Score, they should have a clear understanding of how they move from the data vectors they are working with to the final score.

12:00–1:00 Lunch

1:00–1:45 Discussion of Performance Level Descriptors

The facilitator will review the Performance Level Descriptors and show how these, and the data vectors, are the key components in the standard-setting process. Some discussion of the PLDs will be allowed, but the primary focus will be on how they arise from an analysis of the goals.

1:45–2:15 Round 1 Task Description, Questions, Survey of Process Understanding, and Practice

The facilitator will describe the process for Round 1. Panelists will be given the data vectors, materials that describe each vector, and a Ratings Sheet that they will use to record their Round 1 ratings. The facilitator will lead a discussion of an example data vector and how it should be rated using the PLDs.

The facilitator will answer or find the answer to final questions. Panelists will be asked to affirm that they understand the process with a show of hands.

appendix b: referent group panel agenda

2:15–4:15 Round 1 Ratings—Breakout Rooms

Panelists go to their breakout rooms to complete the Round 1 task. Panelists will be provided with a Rating Sheet to provide their classifications for the 40 institutional records. Panelists should work alone on this portion of the task. Breakout room facilitators will answer any questions from panelists. The speed of panelists will vary quite a bit, so as panelists complete their task, rating sheets will be collected and recorded into the software.

Wednesday, May 14

8:30–9:00 Panelist Sign In

9:00–10:00 Discussion of Round 1 Results—Breakout Rooms

Panelists' ratings will be compiled and ratings summaries that contain all panelist ratings will be shared with the breakout group. The report will be organized as a matrix with institutional cards as rows and panelist ratings as columns. The rows will be sorted by the institutional card EPI score with the highest-rated EPI institutional card at the top of the matrix and the lowest at the bottom. Panelists will be able to see inconsistencies in individual panelist ratings and biases in particular panelists.

Discussion led by the facilitators in their respective rooms will focus on the matrix and cells that appear out of place. There will be no pressure to change panelists' ratings in the discussion, but the Round 2 rating exercise will provide the opportunity for panelists to refine their ratings given the group matrix presentation.

10:00–10:30 Round 2 Ratings—Breakout Rooms

Panelists will be asked to provide a Round 2 set of ratings, which may reflect any changes they want to make as a result of the Round 1 discussions. Again, panelists will not be pressured to make changes.

10:30–10:45 Break

10:45–11:30 Discussion of Round 2 Results—Large Group Room

Panelists will gather in the large group room for a presentation of their Round 2 results. The panelists will be given a new matrix based on Round 2 results. Panelists will also be given the positions on the matrix that indicate the preliminary cut scores.

The facilitator will lead a discussion of the results, focusing on group differences and vectors above and below assumed standards.

Please note that the standards themselves, and where the cut exactly falls on the EPI Performance Scale, are not completely clear to the panelists in this process. The matrix will provide a general idea, but an exact cut score recommendation from this panel will need to be based on further analysis of the data.

11:30–12:00 Round 3 Ratings and Completion of Standard Setting Feedback Form

Based on the large group discussion of Round 2 results, panelists will have the opportunity to make any final changes to their ratings in Round 3. Round 3 results will provide the final panelist input.

Panelists will complete an evaluation or feedback form before the Referent Panel meeting ends.

appendix c: referent group panel results

REFERENT GROUP PANEL RESULTS

The Referent Group Panel completed the last round of ratings for the Body of Work method at noon on Friday, May 14. The process yielded 3 rounds of Institutional Card categorizations for 40 institutions for each of the 23 panelists.

The results of the Round 3 categorizations were used to identify cut scores for the Satisfactory/At Risk standard and the At Risk/Low Performing standard. The Round 3 results yielded a distribution of EPI Performance Scores for each standard category. These distributions were examined to determine the Referent Group Panel's recommended cut scores. A summary of each round is provided below.

Round 1

Panelists were provided with the 40 Institutional Cards in a random order. Each card contained the three data points about the institution:

- MTTC—the percent of students passing the content assessments for that institution
- SURV—the accumulated result of the survey questions to students and instructors
- EFF—the effectiveness rating for teachers who graduated from the institution

Each data point could range from 0 to 100, but most are within the 70 to 95 range. Panelists were also provided with an institutional size indicator.

Institutional Cards EPI1 and EPI 2 appear below. Panelists were given institutional cards EPI1 through EPI40 to categorize. A list of the data points for EPI1–EPI40 follow the EPI1 and EPI2 card examples. The forty cards are based on 33 actual institutions and their data for 2014, while seven cards were created to round out the distribution and to make it more difficult for panelists to identify particular institutional cards with specific institutions.

EPI #1

SIZE: Small

COMPONENT SCORES

MTTC	SURV	EFF
80.20	95.75	77.24

EPI #2

SIZE: Large

COMPONENT SCORES

MTTC	SURV	EFF
88.80	93.08	77.86

Panelist Rating Form

appendix c: referent group panel results

Panelist Rating Form

JUDGE NUMBER								
		ROUND 1	ROUND 2	ROUND 3		ROUND 1	ROUND 2	ROUND 3
EPI 1					EPI 21			
EPI 2					EPI 22			
EPI 3					EPI 23			
EPI 4					EPI 24			
EPI 5					EPI 25			
EPI 6					EPI 26			
EPI 7					EPI 27			
EPI 8					EPI 28			
EPI 9					EPI 29			
EPI 10					EPI 30			
EPI 11					EPI 31			
EPI 12					EPI 32			
EPI 13					EPI 33			
EPI 14					EPI 34			
EPI 15					EPI 35			
EPI 16					EPI 36			
EPI 17					EPI 37			
EPI 18					EPI 38			
EPI 19					EPI 39			
EPI 20					EPI 40			

appendix C: referent group panel results

Institution Card Information

Institution Card	Size	MTTC	SURV	EFF
EPI1	Small	80.20	95.75	77.24
EPI2	Large	88.80	93.08	77.86
EPI3	Small	85.80	94.08	83.43
EPI4	Small	96.10	97.25	92.25
EPI5	Small	74.60	94.58	79.42
EPI6	Small	80.40	90.67	80.43
EPI7	Medium	92.90	94.75	77.07
EPI8	Medium	57.80	71.75	64.45
EPI9	Small	85.50	92.83	79.81
EPI10	Small	90.90	94.42	82.17
EPI11	Medium	85.00	92.75	81.88
EPI12	Small	84.70	94.83	87.33
EPI13	Medium	86.50	93.92	79.20
EPI14	Small	70.80	92.50	79.66
EPI15	Small	81.10	92.67	85.42
EPI16	Medium	80.90	94.17	76.23
EPI17	Small	82.30	92.00	71.00
EPI18	Small	92.40	94.83	78.85
EPI19	Medium	89.60	97.25	76.37
EPI20	Small	83.10	98.33	75.42
EPI21	Small	91.00	93.92	80.00
EPI22	Medium	72.00	84.17	75.12
EPI23	Small	89.60	91.83	80.97
EPI24	Medium	90.40	95.75	88.10
EPI25	Small	95.80	90.83	90.00
EPI26	Medium	92.10	92.75	79.52
EPI27	Medium	85.10	95.25	81.19
EPI28	Small	94.50	93.58	82.36
EPI29	Large	89.10	91.50	80.19
EPI30	Medium	84.20	93.42	81.12
EPI31	Medium	95.50	91.92	77.31
EPI32	Small	76.50	92.83	81.52
EPI33	Large	84.40	92.08	86.54
EPI34	Medium	94.80	94.83	79.19
EPI35	Small	65.50	81.92	66.57
EPI36	Large	92.10	96.08	87.73
EPI37	Medium	68.80	81.00	72.05
EPI38	Medium	84.50	95.33	77.25
EPI39	Medium	83.00	92.00	83.77
EPI40	Large	92.30	92.67	80.52

Panelists rated each of the 40 Institutional Cards as characteristic of a Satisfactory, At Risk, or Low Performing institution based on the Performance Level Descriptors for those levels. The cards were presented to the panelists in an EPI1 to EPI40 order that was a random sorting of the institutional cards. Each card also had a corresponding EPI Performance Scale score, which is a weighted composite of the data components on the card. The EPI Performance Scale score for each card was used to sort the institutional card information and the variable used in the contrasting groups analysis to determine the cut scores.

Round 1 Results are presented by discussion group. Panelists gathered in two rooms to complete their Round 1 categorizations: Group C and Group P. Twelve panelists were in Group C and eleven were in Group P. The results presented below are for each group. The first table shows the rating for EPI1 through EPI40 for each panelist. Panelists are the columns and EPI Institutional Cards are the rows. Each group's results are presented in two charts. The first chart is in EPI1 through EPI40 order, which is how the panelists were given the cards. The second chart for each group is sorted by the EPI Performance Scale score. In this chart the EPIs are ordered from the highest EPI Performance Scale score to the lowest.

Panelists entered a "1" if they categorize the institutional card as Satisfactory, a "2" if At Risk, or a "3" if Low Performing. The #1, #2, and #3 columns at the end of the Panelist row indicate how many panelists categorized that particular EPI card as "1" for Satisfactory, "2" for At Risk, or "3" for Low Performing.

appendix c: referent group panel results

Round 1 - Group C

	C1	C3	C6	C7	C9	C10	C12	C14	C16	C18	C21	C23	#1	#2	#3
EPI1	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	7	4	1
EPI2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	7	5	0
EPI3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	2	0
EPI4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	0	0
EPI5	3	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	1	2	1	3	7	2
EPI6	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	2	1
EPI7	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	9	3	0
EPI8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	12
EPI9	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	3	0
EPI10	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	1	0
EPI11	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	2	0
EPI12	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	2	0
EPI13	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	4	0
EPI14	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	8	2
EPI15	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	3	0
EPI16	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	6	6	0
EPI17	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	3	8	1
EPI18	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	9	3	0
EPI19	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	7	5	0
EPI20	2	3	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	6	5	1
EPI21	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	1	0
EPI22	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	0	7	5
EPI23	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	2	0
EPI24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	0	0
EPI25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	0	0
EPI26	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	2	0
EPI27	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	2	0
EPI28	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	1	0
EPI29	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	3	0
EPI30	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	3	0
EPI31	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	8	4	0
EPI32	3	2	1	2	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	7	3	2
EPI33	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	2	0
EPI34	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	2	0
EPI35	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	0	2	10
EPI36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	0	0
EPI37	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	0	4	8
EPI38	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	6	6	0
EPI39	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	3	0
EPI40	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	2	0

appendix C: referent group panel results

Round 1 Sorted - GRP C

	C1	C3	C6	C7	C9	C10	C12	C14	C16	C18	C21	C23		#1	#2	#3
EPI4	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		11	1	0
EPI36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		12	0	0
EPI25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		12	0	0
EPI24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		12	0	0
EPI28	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		11	1	0
EPI34	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		10	2	0
EPI10	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		11	1	0
EPI18	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1		9	3	0
EPI12	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		10	2	0
EPI40	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		10	2	0
EPI21	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		11	1	0
EPI7	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1		9	3	0
EPI31	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1		8	4	0
EPI26	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		10	2	0
EPI19	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1		7	5	0
EPI33	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		10	2	0
EPI3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		10	2	0
EPI23	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		10	2	0
EPI27	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		10	2	0
EPI29	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		9	3	0
EPI2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1		7	5	0
EPI13	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		8	4	0
EPI11	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		10	2	0
EPI15	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		9	3	0
EPI30	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		9	3	0
EPI39	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		9	3	0
EPI9	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		9	3	0
EPI20	2	3	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1		6	5	1
EPI38	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1		6	6	0
EPI1	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1		7	4	1
EPI16	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1		6	6	0
EPI6	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		9	2	1
EPI32	3	2	1	2	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	1		7	3	2
EPI5	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	1		3	8	1
EPI17	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2		3	8	1
EPI14	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	2		2	8	2
EPI22	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2		0	7	5
EPI37	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3		0	4	8
EPI35	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3		0	2	10
EPI8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3		0	0	12

appendix c: referent group panel results

Round 1 - Group P

	P2	P4	P5	P8	P11	P13	P15	P17	P19	P20	P22	#1	#2	#3
EPI1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	2	0
EPI2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI5	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	8	0
EPI6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI8	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	1	10
EPI9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI12	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI14	2	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	4	6	1
EPI15	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI16	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	7	4	0
EPI17	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	6	5	0
EPI18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI19	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	9	2	0
EPI20	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	8	3	0
EPI21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI22	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	8	2
EPI23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI30	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI31	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI32	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	5	6	0
EPI33	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	2	0
EPI34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI35	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	0	3	8
EPI36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI37	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	0	6	5
EPI38	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI39	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0

appendix C: referent group panel results

Round 1 Sorted - GRP P

	P2	P4	P5	P8	P11	P13	P15	P17	P19	P20	P22	#1	#2	#3
EPI4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI12	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI31	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI19	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	9	2	0
EPI33	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	2	0
EPI3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI15	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI30	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI39	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI20	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	8	3	0
EPI38	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	0
EPI1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	2	0
EPI16	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	7	4	0
EPI6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	0
EPI32	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	5	6	0
EPI5	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	8	0
EPI17	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	6	5	0
EPI14	2	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	4	6	1
EPI22	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	8	2
EPI37	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	0	6	5
EPI35	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	0	3	8
EPI8	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	1	10

Panelists categorized the majority of cards as Satisfactory, while the fewest were categorized as Low Performing. Round 1 results indicate that the panelists also categorized the cards along the lines of the EPI Performance Scale Score. In the sorted charts for both Group C and Group P, the number of Satisfactory Ratings increases as the EPI Performance Scale score increases.

Panelists were provided with the sorted chart information in each of their respective breakout rooms. They discussed at length their categorizations and rationale for making them. They also discussed at length the impact of the classifications on the institutions.

Round 2

Following the discussions, panelists were asked to make their Round 2 categorizations. They were told they did not need to make changes, but based on the new information provided by the EPI Performance Scale sorted presentation and group discussion, they could make changes in their categorizations.

All 23 panelists gathered together to discuss the Round 2 results as shown on next page. In this case, the Round 2 results were presented with all 23 panelists in the EPI Performance Score sorted as appears on next page.

appendix C: referent group panel results

Round 2 Combined Groups Sorted

	C1	C3	C6	C7	C9	C10	C12	C14	C16	C18	C21	C23	P2	P4	P5	P8	P11	P13	P15	P17	P19	P20	P22	#1	#2	#3	
EPI4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22	1	0	
EPI10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI18	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI12	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22	1	0	
EPI40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22	1	0	
EPI31	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI26	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI19	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI33	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI29	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22	1	0	
EPI2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI13	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	20	3	0	
EPI11	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22	1	0	
EPI15	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22	1	0	
EPI30	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI39	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI9	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI20	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	18	5	0	
EPI38	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	19	4	0	
EPI1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	18	5	0	
EPI16	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	16	7	0	
EPI6	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	20	3	0	
EPI32	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	12	11	0	
EPI5	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	8	15	0
EPI17	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	12	11	0	
EPI14	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	4	18	1
EPI22	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	0	16	7	
EPI37	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	0	10	13	
EPI35	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	0	4	19	
EPI8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	23	

appendix C: referent group panel results

The Round 2 results show some differences from the Round 1 results. The panelists are even more likely to rate cards EPI1 to EPI40 as Satisfactory. Panelists also made their ratings more in line with the EPI Performance Scale score. At the end of Round 2, only 6 of the institutional cards were classified as At Risk or Low Performing.

Panelists were presented the chart above and participated in a whole group discussion of the Round 2 Results. Panelists were also told where the standards might fall on the sorted EPI scale. After Round 2 results, the Satisfactory/At Risk standard was between EPI5 and EPI17, while the At Risk/Low Performing standard was between EPI22 and EPI37.

Panelists discussed the Round 2 categorizations and the possible standards in the large group. They were then asked to return to their breakout rooms to complete the Round 3 ratings and the Evaluation Form. Again panelists did not need to make any changes from Round 2 to Round 3, but were allowed to make changes if they wished. Only about one third of panelists made changes from Round 2 to Round 3.

The Round 3 results appear on the next page. Any changes that were made by panelists again were in the direction of categorizing more institutions as Satisfactory.

appendix C: referent group panel results

Round 3 Sorted Combined Groups

	C1	C3	C6	C7	C9	C10	C12	C14	C16	C18	C21	C23	P2	P4	P5	P8	P11	P13	P15	P17	P19	P20	P22	#1	#2	#3	
EPI4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI31	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI33	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI30	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI39	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI20	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI38	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	
EPI1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	
EPI16	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	18	5	0	
EPI6	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22	1	0	
EPI32	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	16	7	0	
EPI5	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	12	11	0	
EPI17	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	14	9	0	
EPI14	3	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	5	16	2	
EPI22	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	15	6	
EPI37	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	0	9	14	
EPI35	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	0	3	20	
EPI8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	23	

appendix C: referent group panel results

Round 3

At the conclusion of Round 3, panelists had made a total of 40 times 23, or 920 categorizations. In Round 3, Satisfactory categorizations numbered 775 or 84.2%, while panelists categorized 80 of the 920 as At Risk or 8.7%, and 65 or 7.1% as Low Performing. Panelists felt that most institutions fell in the Satisfactory performance level—this is not unexpected as it is the case with the present rating system.

The distribution does present some challenges for producing cut scores in the Contrasting Group Design because so few instances of At Risk or Low Performing institutional cards exist.

The chart below adds two pieces of information that panelists did not see during the Referent Panel process. In the far right column, the mean of the panelist classifications for each EPI card is provided. Also on the far left, the actual EPI Performance Score for each card is provided. This is the scale that these cards were sorted by and it ranges from the highest to the lowest value. The EPI Performance Scale is the metric on which cut scores will be determined.

From the chart below, the dividing line between Satisfactory and At Risk is clearly between EPI17 with an EPI Performance Scale of 82.10 and EPI14 with an EPI Performance Scale of 80.77. The line between At Risk and Low Performing is defined by EPI22 at 77.21 and EPI37 at 74.54. From this chart, the whole number EPI Performance Score standard for Satisfactory is 80–81 and the EPI Performance Score standard for At Risk is 75. The standards are those recommended through the Body of Work/Contrasting Group process.

appendix C: referent group panel results

Round 3 Sorted Combined Groups with EPI Performance Score

EPI PS		C1	C3	C6	C7	C9	C10	C12	C14	C16	C18	C21	C23	P2	P4	P5	P8	P11	P13	P15	P17	P19	P20	P22	#1	#2	#3	Mear	
95.37	EPI4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
92.33	EPI36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
92.00	EPI25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
91.43	EPI24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
90.19	EPI28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
90.01	EPI34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
89.26	EPI10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
89.18	EPI18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
88.85	EPI12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
88.80	EPI40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
88.65	EPI21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
88.61	EPI7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
88.54	EPI31	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
88.40	EPI26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
88.26	EPI19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
88.02	EPI33	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
87.82	EPI3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
87.57	EPI23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
87.39	EPI27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
87.20	EPI29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
86.85	EPI2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
86.76	EPI13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
86.72	EPI11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
86.56	EPI15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
86.43	EPI30	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
86.31	EPI39	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
86.28	EPI9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
86.08	EPI20	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	1.09	
85.97	EPI38	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	0	0	1.00	
84.77	EPI1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	2	0	1.09	
84.22	EPI16	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	18	5	0	1.22	
83.77	EPI6	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22	1	0	1.04	
83.54	EPI32	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	16	7	0	1.30	
82.80	EPI5	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	12	11	0	1.48	
82.10	EPI17	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	14	9	0	1.39	
80.77	EPI14	3	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	5	16	2	1.87	
77.21	EPI22	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	15	6	2.17
74.54	EPI37	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	0	9	14	2.61
71.84	EPI35	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	0	3	20	2.87
64.80	EPI8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	23	3.00

appendix d: evaluation form feedback

EVALUATION FORM FEEDBACK

Panelists were asked to complete an Evaluation Form at the end of the Standard Setting Workshop. The Evaluation Form focused on the sections of the standard-setting process and their importance to the panelists. A copy of the Evaluation Survey and the number of panelists who responded to each option appears below. There were 23 panelists and all completed the standard-setting process. Some panelists left some items blank, but most panelists completed all Evaluation Form items.

Panelists also provided answers to the open-ended questions. A summary of those responses follows the responses to the selection items.

EPI Referent Group Evaluation Form

On this evaluation form, we ask that you share your feedback about the referent group process and outcomes. Your feedback will help us evaluate the training, methods, and materials we used. Please do not put your name on the form as we want your feedback to be anonymous.

Instructions: Please place an "X" in the response option that best reflects your opinions related to the statements below.

1: Please indicate the level of success of various components of the referent group process.

	Component	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a.	Introduction to the EPI Data		1	13	9
b.	Performance Level Review		2	16	5
c.	Process Training		2	14	7
d.	Practice Exercise		3	14	6
e.	Group Discussions			8	15
f.	Data Presentations		2	12	9

appendix d: evaluation form feedback

2: Please indicate the importance of the following factors in your recommended EPI performance levels.

	Factor	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
a.	Performance Level Descriptors		3	10	10
b.	Your perceptions of the difficulty of the metrics	2	2	11	8
c.	Your perceptions of the quality of EPI data		4	7	12
d.	Your own experience	1	3	9	10
e.	Your initial classification of EPI performance	2	4	11	6
f.	Panel discussions		1	6	16
g.	Feedback data		2	12	8
h.	Summaries of Score Calculations		5	8	10
i.	Policy environment		2	10	7

3: How confident are you in the classification of EPIs at each level of proficiency?

Performance Level	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Satisfactory		2	9	11
At Risk of Low Performing		7	12	3
Low Performing		5	7	9

appendix d: evaluation form feedback

4: What strategy did you use to assign EPIs to performance levels?

5: Please use the space below to make any additional comments you wish to make about the process or your experience. Thank you for taking the time to evaluate the session.

Adapted from Hambleton, R., (2001). Setting performance standards on educational assessments and criteria for evaluating the process. In Cizek, G. (Ed.) Setting performance standards: Concepts, methods and perspectives. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

appendix d: evaluation form feedback

The first question on the Evaluation Form asked about the success of six components of the Referent Group process. All components were thought to be successful by approximately 90% of the panelists. Panelists found the Group Discussions most useful.

The second question asked panelists to rank the importance of factors used in the standard-setting process. Most panelists found all the factors listed to be Important or Very Important. Approximately 75% or more selected the Important or Very Important category for the factors provided. The highest-rated factor in importance was the Panel Discussions. This result confirms the response to Question 1 that the discussions were considered the most useful component. The least important factor in recommending the EPI Performance standards was Policy Environment.

The panelists were asked to rate how confident they were in the classifications according to performance level. The results for Question 3 show that panelists were overall Confident or Very Confident in their classifications. For the Satisfactory level classification 90% of panelists were Confident or Very Confident. The At Risk level confidence rating was a little lower, with 68% stating they were Confident and Very Confident.

The lowest category of Low Performing evidenced similar confidence ratings as the At Risk level in panelist classification. One panelist indicated that he or she was Not Confident in his or her classification, while overall 73% indicated they were Confident or Very Confident in their classification.

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report



This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Adrian College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.



2013 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Adrian College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Albion College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Albion College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Alma College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Alma College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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

1. The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:
2. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
3. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
4. 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Andrews University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Andrews University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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

1. The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:
2. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
3. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
4. 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Aquinas College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Aquinas College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Baker College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 2


2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 1

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Baker College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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

1. The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:
2. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
3. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
4. 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report


This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Calvin College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

Calvin College



2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Central Michigan University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Central Michigan University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Concordia College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 2

2014 STATUS: DID NOT MEET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 3

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING exhibits one or more of the following:

- a relatively low percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report relatively lower levels of satisfaction with their teacher preparation and clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the negative perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who earn few Ineffective or Minimally Effective, and generally no Highly Effective ratings, during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Concordia College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Cornerstone College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Cornerstone College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Eastern Michigan University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Eastern Michigan University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Ferris State University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 2


2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 1

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Ferris State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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

1. The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:
2. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
3. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
4. 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Grand Valley State University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Grand Valley State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report


This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Hope College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

Hope College



2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Lake Superior State University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 1

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Lake Superior State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Madonna University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Madonna University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Marygrove College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: DID NOT MEET CUT SCORE

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 1

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Marygrove College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Michigan State University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Michigan State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Michigan Technological University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Michigan Technological University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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

1. The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:
2. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
3. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
4. 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Northern Michigan University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Northern Michigan University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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

1. The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:
2. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
3. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
4. 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Oakland University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Oakland University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Olivet College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Olivet College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Robert B. Miller College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Robert B. Miller College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Rochester College**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
LOW PERFORMING 4


2014 STATUS: DID NOT MEET CUT SCORE

2014 Performance Category & Phase
AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 3

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING exhibits one or more of the following:

- a relatively low percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report relatively lower levels of satisfaction with their teacher preparation and clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the negative perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who earn few Ineffective or Minimally Effective, and generally no Highly Effective ratings, during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Rochester College



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Saginaw Valley State University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Saginaw Valley State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Siena Heights University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase
SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Siena Heights University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Spring Arbor University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Spring Arbor University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **University of Detroit Mercy**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

University of Detroit Mercy



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **University of Michigan - Ann Arbor**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

University of Michigan - Ann Arbor



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **University of Michigan - Dearborn**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

University of Michigan - Dearborn



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **University of Michigan - Flint**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase
LOW PERFORMING 4


2014 STATUS: **MET CUT SCORE**

2014 Performance Category & Phase
AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING 3

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as AT RISK OF LOW PERFORMING exhibits one or more of the following:

- a relatively low percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report relatively lower levels of satisfaction with their teacher preparation and clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the negative perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who earn few Ineffective or Minimally Effective, and generally no Highly Effective ratings, during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

University of Michigan - Flint



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Wayne State University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE


2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

Wayne State University



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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

2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Score Report

This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for **Western Michigan University**. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year's report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

KEY: Highest Mean Lowest

2013 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0


2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE

2014 Performance Category & Phase

SATISFACTORY 0

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.



Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-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/subject 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 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-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 Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

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 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013).

Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six 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 Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each 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, the 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, the 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 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero 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:

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


2014 EPI PERFORMANCE CORRECTIVE ACTION SYSTEM

DRAFT, Last Updated 7-14-14

Appendix C

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



EPI HISTORICAL PERFORMANCE CATEGORY STATUS

KEY:  Closed  Satisfactory  At Risk  Low Performing

With Proposed Phase Number

EPI	2011	2012	2013	2014
ADRIAN				
ALBION				
ALMA				
ANDREWS				
AQUINAS				
BAKER				
CALVIN				
CMU				
CONCORDIA				
CORNERSTONE				
EMU				
FSU				
GVSU				
HILLSDALE				
HOPE				
LSSU				
MADONNA				

EPI HISTORICAL PERFORMANCE CATEGORY STATUS, cont.

KEY:  Closed  Satisfactory  At Risk  Low Performing

With Proposed Phase Number

EPI	2011	2012	2013	2014
MARYGROVE				
MSU				
MTU				
NMU				
OAKLAND				
OLIVET				
R.B. MILLER				
ROCHESTER				
SVSU				
SIENA HEIGHTS				
SPRING ARBOR				
U-D MERCY				
UM-ANN ARBOR				
UM-DEARBORN				
UM-FLINT				
WAYNE				
WMU				