



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING

RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

July 25, 2011

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Receive the Report on the Academic Year 2009-10 Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores

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

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

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

The MDE will report the institutions identified as at-risk or low-performing to the USED per HEA requirements. The MDE plans for corrective action, support, and penalties were approved by the SBE on September 9, 2009. Institutions identified

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

JOHN C. AUSTIN – PRESIDENT • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH – VICE PRESIDENT  
NANCY DANHOF – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER  
RICHARD ZEILE – NASBE DELEGATE • KATHLEEN N. STRAUS  
DANIEL VARNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

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

as low-performing have two years to improve their performance before further state sanctions occur. Institutions identified as at-risk must progress to the satisfactory category within two years or move to the low-performing category, even if their calculated performance score would result in at-risk level. Institutions have two years from that date to remove at-risk or low-performing status without moving to the next lower level.

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

Moved from Low-Performing to Satisfactory

- Marygrove College (Removed from corrective action)

Moved from Satisfactory to Exemplary:

- Albion College
- Hillsdale College

Moved from Exemplary to Satisfactory:

- Ferris State University
- University of Michigan-Flint
- Western Michigan University

Moved from Exemplary to At-Risk:

- Alma College

Moved from Low-Performing to At-Risk:

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

Moved from At-Risk to Low-Performing:

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

Remained in Low-Performing for a second year:

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

Aggregate data at the level of the institution will be reported on the MDE website along with the public MTTC scores. Attachment D shows the status of institutions in corrective action during 2010-11. Attachment E is the explanation of the various levels of corrective action.

For the 2010-11 academic year, teacher preparation institutions were expected to submit to the OPPS evidence of seeking and using feedback from principals regarding new teachers' preparation. No points are associated with this data during pilot years.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education receive the report on the 2009-10 Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 25, 2011.

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores For Academic Year 2009-10																		
Institution / Category	Overall Score	MTTC		Teacher Exit Surveys			Supervisor Surveys			Program Completion Rate		Program Review Status		Diversity		High Need Content *		Principal Feedback Rcvd.
		30		5			5			10		10		5		5		
		%	Points	Eff.	Resp.	Points	Eff.	Resp.	Points	%	Points	(Cohort)	%	Points	%	Points	%	
EXEMPLARY																		
Albion	70	98	30	95	100	5	100	100	5	91	10	100	10	10	5	45	5	Yes
Andrews	70	92	30	97	100	5	94	100	5	95	10	100	10	32	5	59	5	Yes
Calvin	68	96	30	94	100	5	98	100	5	90	10	100	10	6	3	62	5	Yes
GVSU	68	94	30	92	98	5	93	100	5	95	10	100	10	7	3	41	5	Yes
Hope	68	96	30	96	100	5	98	100	5	91	10	100	10	7	3	62	5	Yes
U of M	68	97	30	88	94	5	92	100	5	91	10	100	10	9	3	64	5	Yes
Aquinas <sup>1</sup>	66	93	30	95	100	5	99	100	5	83	8	100	10	7	3	45	5	Yes
CMU	66	90	30	88	100	5	95	95	5	89	8	100	10	6	3	49	5	Yes
Eastern	66	91	30	93	97	5	93	89	5	72	6	100	10	16	5	53	5	Yes
MSU	66	93	30	91	100	5	96	88	5	87	8	100	10	9	3	48	5	Yes
Hillsdale	65	90	30	96	100	5	100	100	5	100	10	100	10	0	0	91	5	Yes
Oakland	65	88	25	95	90	5	95	81	5	91	10	100	10	11	5	55	5	No
UM-Dearborn	65	89	25	95	100	5	98	83	5	91	10	100	10	18	5	78	5	Yes
Cornerstone	63	91	30	92	100	5	95	100	5	88	8	100	10	2	0	40	5	Yes
Madonna <sup>2</sup>	63	88	25	96	100	5	99	98	5	91	10	100	10	6	3	67	5	Yes
Northern	63	93	30	96	99	5	98	56	0	92	10	100	10	7	3	43	5	Yes
Saginaw Valley	63	85	25	93	100	5	97	96	5	90	10	100	10	5	3	45	5	Yes
Spring Arbor	63	89	25	93	98	5	94	100	5	94	10	100	10	6	3	38	5	Yes
Wayne	63	87	25	97	99	5	96	89	5	84	8	100	10	26	5	96	5	Yes
SATISFACTORY																		
UM-Flint	61	86	25	90	100	5	96	88	5	86	8	100	10	7	3	53	5	Yes
Ferris	60	83	20	93	100	5	96	100	5	94	10	100	10	45	5	93	5	Yes
Marygrove <sup>3</sup>	60	80	20	91	100	5	90	100	5	91	10	100	10	63	5	63	5	Yes
Siena Heights	60	85	25	98	100	5	95	100	5	93	10	100	10	11	5	17	0	Yes
Robert B Miller	**	95	30	97	100	5	96	86	5	**	**	100	10	9	3	61	5	Yes
Rochester	58	89	25	98	100	5	100	100	5	85	8	100	10	0	0	64	5	Yes
Western	58	85	25	91	98	5	96	92	5	94	10	100	10	5	3	25	0	Yes
Concordia <sup>4</sup>	56	88	25	86	100	5	91	100	5	73	6	100	10	3	0	59	5	Yes
Michigan Tech.	56	88	25	86	100	5	94	100	5	73	6	100	10	0	0	100	5	Yes

**Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores For Academic Year 2009-10 (Cont.)**

Institution / Category	Overall Score	MTTC 30		Teacher Exit Surveys 5			Supervisor Surveys 5			Program Completion Rate 10		Program Review Status 10		Diversity 5		High Need Content * 5		Principal Feedback Rcvd.
		%	Points	Eff.	Resp.	Points	Eff.	Resp.	Points	(Cohort)		%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	
				%	%		%	%										
AT-RISK																		
UDMercy	<b>54</b>	80	<b>20</b>	91	100	<b>5</b>	93	89	<b>5</b>	60	<b>4</b>	100	<b>10</b>	52	<b>5</b>	52	<b>5</b>	Yes
Alma	<b>53</b>	88	<b>25</b>	94	100	<b>5</b>	94	100	<b>5</b>	88	<b>8</b>	100	<b>10</b>	0	<b>0</b>	19	<b>0</b>	Yes
LOW-PERFORMING																		
Adrian	<b>35</b>	79	<b>0</b>	96	100	<b>5</b>	100	100	<b>5</b>	93	<b>10</b>	100	<b>10</b>	12	<b>5</b>	24	<b>0</b>	Yes
Olivet	<b>34</b>	76	<b>0</b>	92	100	<b>5</b>	99	100	<b>5</b>	75	<b>6</b>	100	<b>10</b>	7	<b>3</b>	51	<b>5</b>	Yes
LSSU	<b>33</b>	79	<b>0</b>	87	100	<b>5</b>	100	92	<b>5</b>	91	<b>10</b>	100	<b>10</b>	8	<b>3</b>	22	<b>0</b>	Yes

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

- <sup>1</sup> MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (Robert B Miller College)
- <sup>2</sup> MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (Baker College)
- <sup>3</sup> MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (College of Creative Studies)
- <sup>4</sup> MTTC score includes results for mentee institution (Finlandia University)

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

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

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

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

PERFORMANCE SCORE RUBRIC: Total points possible: 70

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. Survey of candidates: (5 points)

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

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

B. Survey of supervisors: (5 points)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appeals regarding an institution's performance status will be handled through the Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS). The proposed Michigan Teacher Preparation Research Collaborative will be requested to review this document to determine if further revisions are needed.

<b>Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores Three Year Comparisons</b>						
	<b>2007-08</b>		<b>2008-09</b>		<b>2009-10</b>	
	<b>Points</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Category</b>
<b>Adrian</b>	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>53</b>	AR	<b>35</b>	LP
<b>Albion</b>	<b>61</b>	Sat	<b>61</b>	Sat	<b>70</b>	Ex
<b>Alma</b>	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>53</b>	AR
<b>Andrews</b>	<b>70</b>	Ex	<b>70</b>	Ex	<b>70</b>	Ex
<b>Aquinas</b>	<b>56</b>	Sat	<b>64</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex
<b>Calvin</b>	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>CMU</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex
<b>Concordia</b>	<b>60</b>	Sat	<b>61</b>	Sat	<b>56</b>	Sat
<b>Cornerstone</b>	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>EMU</b>	<b>65</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex
<b>FSU</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>60</b>	Sat
<b>GVSU</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>Hillsdale</b>	<b>60</b>	Sat	<b>60</b>	Sat	<b>65</b>	Ex
<b>Hope</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>LSSU</b>	<b>53</b>	AR	<b>53</b>	AR	<b>33</b>	LP
<b>Madonna</b>	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>Marygrove</b>	<b>31</b>	LP	<b>34</b>	LP	<b>60</b>	Sat
<b>MSU</b>	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex
<b>MTU</b>	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>56</b>	Sat
<b>NMU</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>Oakland</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>65</b>	Ex
<b>Olivet</b>	<b>61</b>	Sat	<b>34</b>	LP	<b>34</b>	LP
<b>Rochester</b>	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>56</b>	Sat	<b>58</b>	Sat
<b>SVSU</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>Siena Heights</b>	<b>56</b>	Sat	<b>60</b>	Sat	<b>60</b>	Sat
<b>Spring Arbor</b>	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>UDMercy</b>	<b>34</b>	LP	<b>36</b>	LP	<b>54</b>	LP
<b>U of M</b>	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>68</b>	Ex
<b>UM-Dearborn</b>	<b>64</b>	Ex	<b>66</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>UM-Flint</b>	<b>61</b>	Sat	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>61</b>	Sat
<b>WSU</b>	<b>68</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>63</b>	Ex
<b>WMU</b>	<b>58</b>	Sat	<b>63</b>	Ex	<b>58</b>	Sat

AR = At-Risk

Ex = Exemplary

Sat = Satisfactory

LP = Low-Performing

<b>Teacher Preparation Institutions Corrective Action Status</b>				
<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>Years in Corrective Action</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>* Report Received</b>	<b>Institution Focus</b>
<b>Adrian</b>	1	2	4/29/11	High Needs and MTTC Scores
<b>LSSU</b>	2	1	4/29/11	High Needs and MTTC Scores
<b>Marygrove</b>	2	2	4/28/11	MTTC Scores
<b>Olivet</b>	1	2	4/27/11	MTTC Scores
<b>UDMercy</b>	2	2	4/27/11	MTTC Scores

\* Due April 29, 2011

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
CORRECTIVE ACTION STEPS for AT-RISK AND LOW-  
PERFORMING TEACHER PREPARATION INSTITUTIONS  
Effective with the August 2009 Performance Score Report**

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

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

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

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

Corrective Action was the initial performance designation), otherwise move to Level 3 Corrective Action; or

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

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

- Immediately stop admission to all specialty programs with Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) test scores below 80% pass rate.
- Provide the MDE with current data, if available, documenting recent improvement in elements that comprise the TPI performance score calculation. For example, a current increase in the aggregate MTTC passing percentage for the most immediate one-year reporting period may be presented to show updated improvement from a less than 80 percent passing percentage documented in the three-year cumulative report used in calculating the performance score.
- Provide the OPPS with three strengths or recent improvements made, which will be highlighted in the TPI performance score report prepared for the MDE and maintained on the MDE website.
- Work with the MDE to nominate a Committee of Scholars to advise the SBE on the conditions under which the institution's approval could be maintained for teacher preparation or recommend a phase-out timeline if the SBE decides to rescind the institution's approval.
- Comply with the SBE and its sole discretion to either continue an institution's approval status for recommending teacher candidate to the MDE based on the SBE's determination that the institution has documented improvement since its original at-risk or low-performing designation; or rescind the institution's approval for recommending teacher candidates to the MDE.
- Work with the MDE to phase out the teacher preparation program, subsequent to the SBE'S decision to rescind the institution's approval status, on a timeline recommended by the Committee of Scholars.
- Assist teacher preparation students to complete teacher preparation at other Michigan approved institutions, including, but not limited to:
  - Notifying students of the timeline by which the teacher preparation program will phase out at the institution.
  - Completing necessary paperwork for cost-free transfer of records, course work, and field experiences to a new Michigan institution.
  - Completing necessary paperwork for cost-free transfer of financial aid to an approved institution.
- If the institution's "performance score" improves to satisfactory or higher the year that it is in level 3 corrective action, the institution's approval will be reinstated including all previously approved subject area programs.

**NOTE:** 2009-10 is the first year that any institution will be assigned to level 1 or level 2 corrective action, which means the earliest an institution would be designated as level 3 would occur during summer 2011.