



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

September 24, 2007

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** State Board of Education

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

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

The Higher Education Act (HEA), Title II, Section 208(a) requires all state education agencies to establish criteria to identify teacher preparation institutions that are not performing at a satisfactory level. Some states use only one factor—the passing rate on the state’s test for teacher certification, but the Michigan Department of Education decided to use a more comprehensive approach to identify low-performing teacher preparation institutions. The State Board of Education (SBE) approved the “Teacher Preparation Performance Score” criteria and scoring rubric at its June 2006 meeting.

The first operational use of the criteria to calculate a score for each institution was prepared by the Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) in spring-summer 2007 and presented to the SBE at its August 14, 2007 meeting.

The OPPS staff and institution representatives have identified a few areas of improvement needed in the criteria and reporting for this performance score. These could not be anticipated in advance, as they depend on data that had not previously been collected and reported centrally. The changes recommended will raise the bar for meeting state needs in core content areas like science and world languages, add a validation component to the new teacher efficacy survey (using new data collected from supervisors of student teachers), and clarify some procedural gaps in assigning scores.

Attachment A presents the revised criteria and scoring rubric for identifying performance categories of teacher preparation institutions.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the revised Michigan Department of Education procedures for determining teacher preparation institution performance scores, as discussed in the Superintendent’s memorandum dated September 24, 2007.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

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

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

**Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores for Meeting ~~to be used~~  
~~in Response to H.E.A.~~ Higher Education Act Title II Classification  
Requirements:  
(~~revised August 2007~~)**

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

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

~~The following are the six criteria will be used~~ for placement of a teacher preparation institution into a Title II performance category **as identified above.** ~~through the State Board of Education SBE authorized Periodic Review, which is currently being revised, or through an equivalent United States Department of Education recognized national teacher preparation accreditation process [i.e., the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) or the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)].~~

PERFORMANCE SCORE RUBRIC: Total points possible: 70

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

Test pass rate shall be the three-year aggregate of all specialty content areas, for individuals validated by the institution as ready for the content test (note: **not necessarily** program completers). The **Michigan Department of Education (MDE)** creates a summary score for the institution based upon its aggregate pass rate information on validated (subject to state audit) candidates.

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

- a. 90% or higher = 30 points
- b. 85-~~89.9~~ **89%** = 25 points
- c. 80-~~84.9~~ **84%** = 20 points
- d. **Below 80% = 0 points**

~~No points will be awarded to institutions that fail to meet the 80% test pass rate.~~

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

As part of periodic review or an equivalent accreditation process, a determination is made as to the status of each endorsement program. Full approval = 1, approval suspended by the state (or equivalent accrediting body) = 0\*\*. These scores are totaled and divided by the total number of programs so classified, to determine the percent of programs approved (this is done to avoid penalizing institutions of any particular size or number of programs). The possible range of scores is thus 0 through 100%. The points are awarded as follows (**decimals will be rounded to the nearest tenth**):

- 95% or more programs approved = 10 points
- 90-94.9 **94%** programs approved = 8
- 85-89.9 **89%** programs approved = 6
- 80-84.9 **84%** programs approved = 4
- 75-79.9 **79%** programs approved = 3

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

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

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

The number of candidates who are recommended (or who are eligible for recommendation) by the institution for a teaching certificate within six years of entering the a cohort, divided by the total number of candidates admitted into the teacher preparation cohort at or beyond the junior year of a baccalaureate program or at entrance into a post baccalaureate program **during a specified academic year**. In each case, the a cohort will be defined by the number who entered the program (e.g., using **2003-2004 academic year** data as the denominator, the six-year completion rate would be calculated **based on recommendations during 2008-2009 academic year**).

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

- 90% = 10 points\*
- 80-89.9 **89%** = 8 points
- 70-79.9 **79%** = 6 points
- 60-69.9 **69%** = 4 points
- 50-59.9 **59%** = 2 points

**\*Note:** the maximum point category is set only at 90% to acknowledge that institutions have a responsibility to identify candidates whose commitment or classroom performance **are is** not suitable for the profession, even if academic qualifications that led to program admission are strong. However, over time, it is

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

**A. Survey of candidates: (5 points)**

~~10 points of~~ The score will depend on the aggregate results of the survey of candidates completing student teaching regarding their perceived readiness (**efficacy**) in each of the seven Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT) areas, ~~and content endorsement areas.~~ Since **response rate is important to validity of results**, the MDE expects institutions to assure that a large proportion of their student teachers complete the survey. ~~†~~The response rate is built into the points awarded in this area **as indicated in the following table (decimals will be rounded to the nearest tenth):**

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

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

| <b>Student Teachers</b><br>Response rate: | 80-100%<br>Efficacy | 70-79%<br>Efficacy | 60-69%<br>Efficacy | Below 60%<br>Efficacy |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 80-100%                                   | 5                   | 4                  | 3                  | 0                     |
| 60-79%                                    | 3                   | 2                  | 1                  | 0                     |
| Below 60%                                 | 0                   | 0                  | 0                  | 0                     |

**B. Survey of supervisors: (5 points)**

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

| <b>Supervisors</b><br>Response rate: | 80-100%<br>Efficacy | 70-79%<br>Efficacy | 60-69%<br>Efficacy | Below 60%<br>Efficacy |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 80-100%                              | 5                   | 4                  | 3                  | 0                     |
| 60-79%                               | 3                   | 2                  | 1                  | 0                     |
| Below 60%                            | 0                   | 0                  | 0                  | 0                     |

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

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

**A. Diversity score (5 points):** The 2004-2005 Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicates that less than 10% of Michigan's teaching force is represented by ethnic minorities. Ethnic minority categories are consistent with the U.S. Census definition **Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American and Pacific Islander, and multi-racial, as used in other higher education national data.**

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

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

Any institution recommending ~~at least~~ **35%** or more candidates with content specialty (major or minor-based endorsement) in special education, mathematics, science (i.e., endorsement codes DX, DI, at either elementary or secondary levels), or specific science endorsements (chemistry, physics, biology, earth/space science) at the secondary level, or world languages in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort) ~~adds~~ **will receive 5 points.** ~~to the score;~~ Other academic subject areas may be added to this list in the future by the MDE based on statewide teacher shortages.

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

This longer term factor is expected to be ~~added by~~ **identified during 2008.**

Teaching success rate is the number of new teachers from the institution evaluated as satisfactory or better; divided by the total number of all who were placed in Michigan in that focus year and for whom a rating was received, with a minimum of 85% for "Satisfactory" programs. This indicator will be implemented over time; as more systematic information becomes available on new teachers from the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) and from institutional follow up<sup>7</sup>. ~~The formula will~~ **may** change to reflect this new information.

**Overall score:** A range of 0 to 70 **points** is **currently awarded** available in 2006. The total points will increase as other factors are implemented (**decimals will be rounded to the nearest tenth**).

63 (90%) or higher = exemplary  
56 to 62 (80% to ~~89.9~~ **89%**) = satisfactory  
52 to 55 (75% to 79%) = at-risk status  
~~52.49 or b~~ **Below 52** = low performing

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

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