



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

July 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Report on Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores

The Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) 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, and produce stronger evidence of positive student outcomes.

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 to the United States Department of Education (USDE) a statement of this procedure along with annual lists of low-performing institutions and any institutions at risk of being considered low performing. The OPPS developed, and the State Board of Education (SBE) approved with amendments, a set of criteria that would reflect the overall effectiveness of the preparation program in a well-rounded way, not relying on one single factor.

The criteria included weighted components from the 2000-2005 periodic review of institutional programs, the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) scores, new teacher efficacy surveys, program completion rates, and additional consideration for the program's mission that is responsive to the state's teacher preparation needs. Attachment A displays the performance score for each approved teacher preparation institution in the state (scores in the various categories have been rounded for consistency in reporting), not including new institutions yet to receive final SBE approval.

Attachment B is the formula used for identifying performance, as amended and approved by the SBE at its June 2006 meeting. The procedures for determining performance scores for teacher preparation institutions were explored with the

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

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

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

Deans Council of the Presidents Council of State Universities of Michigan, the Michigan Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and directors and/or representatives of teacher education institutions during 2002-06. The SBE, in spring 2006, discussed these proposed criteria and minimum scores for each category, increased the score needed to reach satisfactory performance, increased emphasis on the MTTC tests, and added a category of exemplary performance.

The MDE will report the institutions identified as at-risk or low performing to the USDE and thus will be in compliance with HEA Title II state requirements. This report will also be shared with the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers so that its members can assist in developing a technical assistance plan for improving low performing and at-risk teacher preparation programs. 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 raw score is still in the at-risk level.

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

It is recommended that the State Board of Education receive the report on Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 30, 2007.

MDE Teacher Preparation Performance Scores for Academic Year 2005-06														
	Overall Score	MTTC 30		Student Teacher Survey 10			Program Completion Rate 10		Program Review Status 10		Diversity 5		High Need Content 5	
				Eff.	Resp.		(Cohort)							
Exemplary	Points	%	Points	%	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points
Alma	63	91	30	93	85	10	86	8	100	10	0	0	53	5
Andrews	66	90	30	97	100	10	76	6	96	10	41	5	55	5
Aquinas	63	96	30	90	88	10	81	8	100	10	3	0	41	5
Calvin	63	98	30	94	100	10	89	8	100	10	4	0	70	5
Central MI	63	94	30	85	85	10	86	8	100	10	4	0	55	5
Concordia	65	94	30	89	100	10	100	10	100	10	0	0	19	5
Eastern MI	66	93	30	88	83	10	78	6	100	10	10	5	48	5
Grand Valley	66	96	30	91	99	10	88	8	100	10	6	3	43	5
Hillsdale	65	93	30	95	100	10	100	10	100	10	0	0	33	5
Hope	68	96	30	94	100	10	94	10	100	10	6	3	51	5
Madonna	65	94	30	96	100	10	90	10	100	10	4	0	45	5
Michigan State	66	97	30	89	99	10	83	8	100	10	8	3	41	5
Oakland	68	93	30	92	98	10	94	10	100	10	5	3	65	5
Spring Arbor	64	90	30	90	90	10	74	6	95	10	8	3	36	5
Saginaw Valley	63	91	30	91	100	10	88	8	100	10	4	0	42	5
UM-Ann Arbor	64	98	30	86	100	10	91	10	82	4	17	5	55	5
UM-Dearborn	66	90	30	95	100	10	77	6	100	10	29	5	71	5
Wayne State	63	90	30	93	79	5	82	8	100	10	29	5	22	5
Satisfactory														
Albion	61	90	30	78	100	8	82	8	100	10	2	0	29	5
Lake Superior	56	88	25	86	86	10	71	6	100	10	2	0	36	5
MI Technological	56	92	30	85	55	5	88	8	91	8	0	0	100	5
Northern MI	56	95	30	90	70	5	80	8	93	8	3	0	54	5
Siena Heights	60	86	25	93	100	10	90	10	100	10	2	0	11	5
Cornerstone	61	92	30	78	95	8	82	8	100	10	4	0	17	5
Ferris	61	90	30	84	100	10	72	6	100	10	4	0	38	5
UM-Flint	61	89	25	86	81	10	94	10	92	8	7	3	47	5
Western MI	61	90	30	88	31	5	88	8	100	10	5	3	49	5
UDMercy	56	80	20	90	100	10	77	6	100	10	29	5	71	5
Low Performing														
Adrian	41	84	20	0	0	0	91	10	86	6	0	0	32	5
Marygrove	30	65	0	93	100	10	55	2	93	8	58	5	30	5
Olivet	48	89	25	91	37	0	84	8	100	10	4	0	51	5

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores to be used in Response to H.E.A. Title II Classification Requirements

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will comply with the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II state requirements and the 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

Following are the six criteria for placement of a teacher preparation institution into a Title II performance category through the State Board of Education 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)].

All Michigan teacher preparation institutions will remain in their current approval status for one year while the state Periodic Review/Program Approval process is being evaluated.

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** program completers). 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:

- a. 90% or higher = 30 points
- b. 85-89.9% = 25 points
- c. 80-84.9% = 20 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:

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

*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 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. In each case, the cohort will be defined by the number who entered the program (e.g., using 2003 data as the denominator the six-year completion rate would be calculated in 2009).

This information would be calculated by the institution and subject to state audit. The points are awarded as follows:

- 90% = 10 points*
- 80-89.9% = 8 points
- 70-79.9% = 6 points
- 60-69.9% = 4 points
- 50-59.9% = 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 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 needed for success in the specific program.

4. Survey of candidates (10 points):

10 points of the score will depend on the aggregate results of the survey of candidates completing student teaching regarding their perceived readiness in each of the seven Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT) and content endorsement areas. Since 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.

- 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.

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 Register of Education 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.

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

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

Any institution recommending 10% 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 5 points to its score. *Other academic subject areas may be added to this list 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 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 will change to reflect this new information.

Overall score: A range of 0 to 70 is available in 2006. The total points will increase as other factors are implemented.

63 (90%) or higher = exemplary
56 to 62 (80% to 89.9%) = satisfactory
52.5 to 55 (75% to 79%) = at-risk status
52.49 or below = low performing.

Institutions identified as low performing will have two years with an opportunity for technical assistance from the state to improve. 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.

Approved June 13, 2006