



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

July 27, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman

SUBJECT: Receive the Report on the Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores for Academic Year 2007-08

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has, since 2000, initiated several changes in the procedures for reviewing and approving teacher preparation programs in order to assure that the state's programs continue to advance in quality.

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

The Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) developed, and the State Board of Education (SBE) approved with amendments on October 9, 2007, a set of criteria that reflect the overall effectiveness of the preparation program, using multiple factors. Criteria include weighted components from the 2000-06 reviews of institutional programs, the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) test scores, new teacher efficacy surveys, supervisor validation of new teachers' efficacy, program completion rates, and additional consideration for the program's mission that is responsive to the state's teacher preparation needs. Attachment A shows the performance score for each approved teacher preparation institution in the state, not including new institutions yet to receive probationary SBE approval.

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

Attachment B is the formula used for identifying performance, as amended and approved by the SBE at its October 9, 2007 meeting. The SBE approved increasing the threshold for responsiveness to state needs from the previous 10% to 35% beginning with this report (section 5 of Attachment B).

The MDE will report the institutions identified as at-risk or low-performing to the USED per HEA requirements. Institutions identified as low-performing have two years to improve their performance before state sanctions occur. The MDE has not yet implemented any sanctions as the *Teacher Preparation Institution Self-Assessment and Plan of Improvement* has not yet been approved by the SBE. This document will be presented at the August 11, 2009 SBE meeting and submitted for approval at the September 9, 2009 SBE meeting.

Teacher preparation institutions may appeal preliminary performance scores to the PSCT. No appeals for the 2007-08 scores were received.

Based on the first three years of reports (Appendix):

- Lake Superior State University moved from Satisfactory to At-Risk
- Marygrove College remains in the low-performing category for a third year
- Olivet College moved from at-risk to satisfactory
- University of Detroit Mercy remains in the low-performing category for a second year

Aggregate data at the level of the institution will be reported on the MDE website along with the currently public MTTC scores.

For the 2008-09 academic year, teacher preparation institutions were expected to submit to the OPPS evidence of seeking and using feedback from principals regarding new teachers' preparation. No points are associated with this data for the pilot year.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education receive the report on the 2007-08 Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 27, 2009.

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores For Academic Year 2007-08																		
Institution / Classification	Overall Score	MTTC 30		Teacher Exit Surveys 5			Supervisor Surveys 5			Program Completion Rate 10		Program Review Status 10		Diversity 5		High Need Content * 5		Principal Feedback Rcvd.
				Eff	Resp		Eff	Resp		(Cohort)				%	Points	%	Points	
		%	Points	%	%	Points	%	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points			
EXEMPLARY																		
Andrews	70	93	30	81	92	5	100	92	5	100	10	100	10	46	5	42	5	yes
CMU	68	94	30	88	98	5	96	82	5	91	10	100	10	8	3	48	5	yes
Ferris	68	90	30	91	92	5	89	95	5	86	8	100	10	37	5	35	5	yes
GVSU	68	96	30	92	97	5	90	99	5	91	10	100	10	5	3	39	5	yes
Hope	68	98	30	93	100	5	98	96	5	90	10	100	10	6	3	62	5	yes
Northern	68	95	30	94	96	5	99	100	5	93	10	100	10	7	3	67	5	yes
Oakland	68	93	30	93	100	5	96	100	5	95	10	100	10	7	3	60	5	yes
Saginaw Valley	68	91	30	92	100	5	96	93	5	90	10	100	10	6	3	45	5	yes
Wayne State	68	90	30	94	98	5	97	97	5	83	8	100	10	24	5	48	5	yes
Madonna ³	66	93	30	95	100	5	95	83	5	88	8	100	10	9	3	61	5	yes
MSU	66	97	30	89	100	5	90	94	5	86	8	100	10	7	3	48	5	yes
MTU	66	93	30	84	100	5	94	100	5	89	8	100	10	6	3	147	5	yes
Alma	65	93	30	87	100	5	97	100	5	92	10	100	10	4	0	35	5	yes
Calvin	65	98	30	94	100	5	98	100	5	92	10	100	10	4	0	42	5	yes
Eastern	65	94	30	91	99	5	93	79	4	72	6	100	10	14	5	69	5	yes
UM-Dearborn	64	90	30	94	100	5	96	91	5	64	4	100	10	14	5	75	5	yes
Spring Arbor	63	94	30	93	100	5	93	100	5	89	8	100	10	4	0	35	5	yes
U of M	63	98	30	88	91	5	93	89	5	89	8	100	10	15	5	21	0	yes
SATISFACTORY																		
Albion	61	95	30	92	94	5	94	100	5	84	8	100	10	5	3	32	0	yes
Olivet	61	85	25	91	100	5	93	98	5	72	6	100	10	11	5	40	5	yes
UM-Flint	61	89	25	86	100	5	93	93	5	89	8	100	10	9	3	61	5	yes
Concordia ²	60	92	30	93	100	5	95	100	5	95	10	100	10	0	0	2	0	yes
Hillsdale	60	89	25	93	100	5	100	100	5	92	10	100	10	0	0	59	5	yes
Adrian	58	88	25	94	100	5	98	100	5	90	10	100	10	5	3	16	0	yes
Cornerstone	58	92	30	92	100	5	95	97	5	85	8	100	10	4	0	29	0	yes
Rochester	58	96	30	94	100	5	99	94	5	**		100	10	7	3	47	5	no
Western	58	90	30	91	90	5	95	51	0	86	8	100	10	4	0	49	5	yes
Aquinas ¹	56	96	30	92	99	5	95	45	0	80	8	100	10	8	3	27	0	yes
Siena Hgts	56	88	25	95	100	5	100	68	3	86	8	100	10	13	5	16	0	yes

Institution / Classification	Overall Score	MTTC		Teacher Exit Surveys			Supervisor Surveys			Program Completion Rate		Program Review Status		Diversity		High Need Content *		Principal Feedback Rcvd.
		30		5			5			10		10		5		5		
		Eff	Resp		Eff	Resp		(Cohort)										
		%	Points	%	%	Points	%	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	
AT-RISK																		
LSSU	53	88	25	92	70	4	100	91	5	75	6	100	10	6	3	32	0	yes
LOW-PERFORMING																		
UDMercy	34	77	0	92	95	5	96	96	5	62	4	100	10	54	5	54	5	yes
Marygrove ⁴	31	69	0	93	100	5	93	75	4	53	2	100	10	73	5	50	5	yes

* The requirement of 35% in high need content areas begins with this report.

** As a newly approved institution, there is not yet a six-year cohort to measure; status based on consideration of available data.

¹ MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (Robert B Miller College)

² MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (Finlandia University)

³ MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (Baker College)

⁴ MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (College for Creative Studies)

**Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores for Meeting
Higher Education Act Title II Classification Requirement
(October 2007)**

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

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

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

PERFORMANCE SCORE RUBRIC: Total points possible: 70

1. Test pass rate (30 points):

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

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

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

2. Program Review *(10 points):

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

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

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

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

3. Program Completion (10 points):

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

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

- 90% = 10 points*
- 80 - 89% = 8 points
- 70 - 79% = 6 points
- 60 - 69% = 4 points
- 50 - 59% = 2 points

*Note: the maximum point category is set only at 90% to acknowledge that institutions have a responsibility to identify candidates whose commitment or classroom performance is not suitable for the profession, even if academic qualifications that led to program admission are strong. However, over time, it is expected that institutional admission criteria would increasingly reflect institutional experiences of the qualifications, both academic and interpersonal, needed for success in the specific program.

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

A. Survey of candidates: (5 points)

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

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

B. Survey of supervisors: (5 points)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Any institution recommending 35% or more candidates with content specialty (major or minor-based endorsement) in special education, mathematics, science (i.e., endorsement codes DX, DI, at either elementary or secondary levels), or specific science endorsements (chemistry, physics, biology, earth/space science) at the secondary level, or world languages in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort) will receive 5 points. Other academic subject areas may be added to this list in the future by the MDE based on statewide teacher shortages. This change will be implemented during the 2008-09 reporting period.

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

This longer term factor is expected to be identified during 2008. Teaching success rate is the number of new teachers from the institution evaluated as satisfactory or better; divided by the total number of all who were placed in Michigan in that focus year and for whom a rating was received, with a minimum of 85% for "Satisfactory" programs. This indicator will be implemented over time; as more systematic information becomes available on new teachers from the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) and from institutional follow up. The formula may change to reflect this new information.

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

63 (90%) or higher = exemplary
56 to 62 (80% to 89%) = satisfactory
52 to 55 (75% to 79%) = at-risk
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. The proposed Michigan Teacher Preparation Research Collaborative will be requested to review this document to determine if further revisions are needed.

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores Three Year Comparisons						
	2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Points	Category	Points	Category	Points	Category
Adrian	41	LP	58	Sat	58	Sat
Albion	61	Sat	58	Sat	61	Sat
Alma	63	Ex	63	Ex	65	Ex
Andrews	66	Ex	70	Ex	70	Ex
Aquinas	63	Ex	59	Sat	56	Sat
Calvin	63	Ex	65	Ex	65	Ex
CMU	63	Ex	63	Ex	68	Ex
Concordia	65	Ex	60	Sat	60	Sat
Cornerstone	61	Sat	59	Sat	58	Sat
EMU	66	Ex	64	Ex	65	Ex
FSU	61	Sat	61	Sat	68	Ex
GVSU	66	Ex	68	Ex	68	Ex
Hillsdale	65	Ex	65	Ex	60	Sat
Hope	68	Ex	65	Ex	68	Ex
LSSU	56	Sat	57	Sat	53	AR
Madonna	65	Ex	66	Ex	66	Ex
Marygrove	30	LP	36	LP	31	LP
MTU	56	Sat	63	Ex	66	Ex
MSU	66	Ex	66	Ex	66	Ex
NMU	56	Sat	63	Ex	68	Ex
Oakland	68	Ex	65	Ex	68	Ex
Olivet	56	Sat	54	AR	61	Sat
SVSU	63	Ex	66	Ex	68	Ex
Siena Heights	60	Sat	59	Sat	56	Sat
Spring Arbor	64	Ex	63	Ex	63	Ex
UDMercy	56	Sat	32	LP	34	LP
U of M	64	Ex	64	Ex	63	Ex
UM-Dearborn	66	Ex	61	Sat	64	Ex
UM-Flint	61	Sat	58	Sat	61	Sat
WSU	63	Ex	68	Ex	68	Ex
WMU	61	Sat	56	Sat	58	Sat

Ex = Exemplary

Sat = Satisfactory

AR = At-Risk

LP = Low-Performing