Performance Score Report Manual

Summary

This document describes the components that make up the annual Educator Preparation Provider Performance Score (EPP PS) for both traditional and alternative route providers. It discusses the data sources and how they are used to measure the indicators in the performance score. For indicators relying on survey data, question wording is presented in appendices at the end of the document.

The Performance Score

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) maintains an accountability system to monitor the performance of Michigan's approved educator preparation providers (EPPs). Each year, MDE collects data to measure EPP performance in alignment with the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-315) and to provide EPPs with information to support their continuous improvement efforts.

Each year, MDE determines whether EPPs meet state standards by using the systems described in more detail below. Performance is measured and tracked over time using a seven-point scale (Phase 0 through Phase 6). EPPs move up the scale (e.g., Phase 0 to Phase 1) if they fail to meet standards in a given year. If they meet standards the following year, they return to Phase 0; otherwise, they advance from Phase 1 to Phase 2. This longitudinal tracking informs MDE whether a provider's performance is satisfactory (Phase 0/1), at risk (Phase 2/3), or low performing (Phase 4/5/6). More details on these classifications and their implications are available in Appendix D. MDE consults with EPPs who fail to meet the annual threshold, as well as with those in at-risk and low performing corrective action phases. Consultations allow MDE to review data and share advice and best practices to help improve performance so that aspiring teachers receive meaningful preparation that allows them to be successful in supporting Michigan's students.

The performance score takes two forms, depending on the type of EPP:

Traditional Route (EPI PS)

A point system is used for traditional route providers. Each indicator is worth a designated number of points, with a total of 95 points available. A simple percentage is calculated and assigned to each provider. To achieve a satisfactory performance rating, providers must receive 77% of the available points (74 points).

Alternative Route (AR PS)

A flag system is used for alternative route providers. Indicators are grouped into critical or a non-critical item. Each individual indicator is then rated as either satisfactory, at risk, or low performing. For the critical items, providers must maintain a satisfactory or at-risk rating for each of these indicators. For the non-critical items, two aggregate requirements must be met to maintain satisfactory performance: (1) half of the non-critical items must be satisfactory, and (2) no more than one-third of the items can be low performing.

Both Traditional and Alternative Route score methodology was developed using the Key Effectiveness Indicators (KEI) as the guiding framework. Develop by Teacher Preparation Analytics, the framework is geared to provide "a set of measures that would be useful for both program

improvement and accountability, focused on program outcomes rather than compliance, meaningful and compelling to a broad set of stakeholders, consistent with empirical research and effective practice, and capable of implementation by states within a five-year period" (Teacher Preparation Analytics, 2017, p. 2).

Michigan adopted the KEI framework's four overarching categories – Candidate Selection & Completion, Knowledge & Skills for Teaching, Performance as Classroom Teachers, and Contribution to State Workforce Needs, and added an additional indicator, Robust Clinical Experiences. Each category is then measured by a series of indicators to determine success of programs within the category (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: KEI Framework as applied to each EPP-type's performance score

Performance Category	Indicator of Performance	Traditional Route	Alternative Route
Candidate Selection & Completion	Teaching Promise	X	X
	Candidate/Completer Diversity	X	X
Knowledge & Skills for Teaching	Mastery of Teaching Subjects	X	X
	Subject-Specific Pedagogical Knowledge	X	X
	Candidate Teaching Skill	X	X
	Candidate Rating of Program	X	X
Performance as Classroom Teachers	Impact on K-12 Student Learning	X	X
	Demonstrated Teaching Skill	X	X
	K-12 Student Perceptions	X	X
Robust Clinical Experiences	Candidate Placement Diversity	X	X
	Candidate Rating of Opportunities	X	X
	All Survey Response Rates	X	X
	Program Partnership Strength	X	X
State Workforce Needs	Entry into teaching		X
	Retention in teaching		X
	Placement in high needs schools/ subject areas		X
	Retention in high needs schools/ subject areas		X

Data Sources

The data utilized in the performance scores are a mix of original MDE survey collections, placement data, MTTC pass rate calculations, and educator effectiveness ratings.

Candidate Suite Surveys

Each year, MDE works with the EPPs to identify candidates eligible to participate in the Candidate Suite Surveys. For traditional route candidates, the candidates must have recently completed (or are in the final stages of completing) their final clinical placement. For alternative route candidates, the candidate must have received their interim teaching certificate and be in their first year of teaching.

The surveys are given to three respondents – the eligible candidates, the candidate's EPP-sponsored supervisor (traditional routes) or coach (alternative routes), and the candidate's school-sponsored cooperating teacher (traditional routes) or mentor (alternative routes). Each group is asked to complete the series of questions asking about the candidate's preparedness and the supports from the provider. See Appendix A for a full list of the questions.

Administrator Survey:

Every spring, MDE identifies teachers who recently received their standard teaching certificate and are teaching at a Michigan public school for the first time during that ongoing school year. The lead administrator of the school building in which the teacher works is identified and invited to participate in the survey, which asks about how well the teacher is performing given their recent preparation. See Appendix B for a full list of the questions.

Educator Effectiveness Ratings

Per Michigan law, Michigan educators working at a public school receive an educator effectiveness rating. This rating is based on a mix of evaluation tool(s) and student growth/assessment data. This rating is reported annually by the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) through the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) collection. More information on educator evaluation in Michigan may be found on the Educator Evaluations site.

MTTC Pass Rates

Providers are required to ensure that candidates are knowledgeable of pedagogy and the subject matter they intend to teach in the classroom. To demonstrate that knowledge, aspiring teachers must the pass the appropriate Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) for the subject matter(s) they wish to teach.

Every fall, the contractor who operates MTTC testing centers provides MDE with a pass rate report that is disaggregated for each EPP. The provided data is cumulative over the last three years and represents the test-takers best attempt on the MTTC test.

Placement Data

To determine whether candidates are placed in a diverse school during their student teaching experience (traditional routes) or interim teaching phase (alternative routes), data from the surveys (traditional routes) or the REP collection (alternative routes) are matched with school-level K-12 student demographic data (e.g., percent of a school's student population that is diverse, economically disadvantaged, etc.). These school-level data are available at https://www.mischooldata.org.

Business Rules for Score Calculation

Survey Efficacy

Survey items are rated by respondents using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all" to "To a great extent". The Candidate Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher Surveys allow respondents to select "not applicable/observable". The Teach Candidate Survey provides a "not applicable/observable" response for only questions 37 through 43.

Efficacy for all survey questions is calculated from summing the number of respondents selecting "to a moderate extent" or "to a great extent" and dividing by the total number of respondents. All

respondents, even if they selected "not applicable/observable" are included in the denominator (except for questions 37 through 43 of the Teacher Candidate Survey for traditional route providers, which are specific to program elements). Efficacies are reported as percentages. All percentages left "as is" (i.e., not rounded).

Administrator Survey exception: the "not applicable/observable" responses are not included in the denominator for the Administrator Survey.

Educator Effectiveness Ratings

Eligible teachers for this calculation are those who were (1) received their certificate (interim or standard) within the last five years, (2) have no more than 3 years of teaching, and (3) have an effectiveness rating in the most recent academic year.

Within this population, the number of effective and highly effective ratings are summed for the most recent year, and this total is divided by the total number of eligible ratings during this time frame. Everyone is only counted once in the annual rating. The data for this calculation is a part of the data provided to EPPs in February or March of each year.

Specific rules for gathering this data:

- At this time, only effectiveness ratings reported in the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) during the end-of-year collection are used. Non-public schools report on a different timeline and their collection does not delineate the assignment of the individuals reported, making ratings a year behind the REP evaluations and not directly comparable.
- Teachers may be placed in multiple assignments and/or school buildings. Thus, they may receive multiple ratings and appear in the initial data pull more than once. Records are deduplication of records, with only the teacher's lowest effectiveness rating included in the analysis.
- Teachers with missing effectiveness labels (e.g., due to school uploading error) were excluded from the analysis.

MTTC Test Codes

Each year MDE reviews the list of eligible tests. Results for test subjects that are in process of elimination or associated with an advanced program are excluded from the calculation. See Appendix C for more details.

Placement Data

Diversity data was only available for Michigan public schools; however, providers are offered an opportunity to provide diversity data for private and out-of-state schools, if available. Candidates where no diversity data was available for the school in which they were placed were excluded from the analysis.

Based on this matching, each candidate's teaching placement was recorded with a diversity status (yes/no) noted. The percentage of diverse student teaching placements is the total number of diverse placements divided by the total number of placements for each preparation provider.

- o For traditional route providers, candidates are allowed up to two placements. However, candidates who were placed in the same school building for both a primary and secondary assignment were only included once in the calculation. When data is unavailable for a specific

school, the calculation "rolls up" to the district level to identify whether the placement was diverse.

o   For alternative route providers, some candidates may be placed at over two schools. In these cases, the number of placements was consolidated by rolling up to the district- or ISD-level so as to reduce placements to two or fewer. For example, a candidate placed at two school buildings in District 1 and worked out of a third school building for District 2 had their District 1 schools consolidated so that one placement was considered diverse at the district level and the second placement's diversity was determined at the school level. As long as the candidate is still teaching with an interim teaching certificate, they are eligible to be included in the placement calculation.

▪   Additionally, candidates from alternative route providers must also have: (1) have an FTE status in REP greater than zero and (2) should have worked in the school for more than 12 months.

Indicators within the Performance Score

Category: Candidate Selection & Completion
Indicator: Teaching Promise

Traditional Routes	*Alternative Routes*
Data Source: Candidate Suite Surveys	**Data Source:** Candidate Suite Surveys
Description: For each survey population, the efficacy percentage was calculated for Question 58 and then averaged across the three groups (i.e., summed and divided by three).	**Description:** For each survey population, Questions 59 through 61 were pooled and an efficacy percentage was calculated; then, a final score was calculated by averaging across the three groups (i.e., summed and divided by three).

Points: 5

Flag: Non-critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Points
90% – 100%	5
85% – 89%	4
80% – 84%	3
75% – 79%	2
70% – 74%	1
Below 70%	0

Percentage Efficacy	Category
90% – 100%	Satisfactory
85% – 89%	Satisfactory
80% – 84%	At Risk
75% – 79%	Low Performing
70% – 74%	Low Performing
Below 70%	Low Performing

Category: Knowledge and Skills for Teaching

Indicator: Mastery of Teaching Subjects I

Traditional Routes	*Alternative Routes*
Data Source: MTTC Pass Rates	**Data Sources:** (1) MTTC Pass Rates
	(2) Educator Effectiveness ratings

Description: (1) The contractor-produced EPP three-year cumulative report serves as the basis for this calculation. Each eligible candidate's best attempt within the three-year timeframe is included. The report shows a pass rate percentage for each EPP which is used in the calculation.

(2) For *alternative route providers only*, a secondary measure that utilizes educator effectiveness ratings during the candidate's first year of teaching under their interim teaching certificate as a second measure. This indicator calculates the percent of candidates who have an effective or highly effective rating from their school.

Points: 20   **Flag:** Critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Points
90% – 100%	20
85% – 89%	17
80% – 84%	14
75% – 79%	11
70% – 74%	8
Below 70%	0

Percentage Efficacy	Category
90% – 100%	Satisfactory
85% – 89%	Satisfactory
80% – 84%	At Risk
75% – 79%	Low Performing
70% – 74%	Low Performing
Below 70%	Low Performing

Category: Knowledge and Skills for Teaching
Indicator: Subject-Specific Pedagogical Knowledge

Traditional Routes	*Alternative Routes*
Data Source: MTTC Pass Rates	**Data Sources:** (1) MTTC Pass Rates and (2) Educator Effectiveness ratings

Description: (1) Utilizing the three-year cumulative report, each MTTC test subject was placed into one of 9 groups (see Appendix C). For each of the groups, the average MTTC pass rate is calculated as well as a standard error and a 95% confidence interval around each average. MDE selects the largest of the nine confidence intervals, and then subtracts that amount from the state average from each group. This becomes the threshold that providers are expected to achieve for satisfactory performance. For each EPP, MDE then calculates the percent of its groups that exceed this threshold.

- Not all EPPs offer each subject group. The fewest subject groups offered is1 while a handful of institutions offer all 9. The percent recorded is the number of subject groups for which the score was above the threshold established using the above procedures divided by the number of subject groups offered by the EPP. For example, if the EPP offered 6 subject groups and was below the expected threshold for 2 groups, the calculation would be 4/6 or 67%.

(2) For *alternative route providers only*, a secondary measure that utilizes educator effectiveness ratings during the candidate's first year of teaching under their interim teaching certificate is also utilized. In this case, the teacher's endorsement code(s) associated with their interim teaching certificate are used to assign them into one or more of the nine previously noted groupings. The calculation then looks at the percent of candidates who have an effective or highly effective rating for each of those nine groups. The same procedures are then used as with the MTTC data where a state average and confidence are calculated to identify expected thresholds for each grouping.

Points: 5

Percentage Efficacy	Points
90% – 100%	5
80% – 89%	4
70% – 79%	3
60% – 69%	2
50% – 59%	1
Below 50%	0

Flag: Critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Category
90% – 100%	Satisfactory
80% – 89%	Satisfactory
70% – 79%	At Risk
60% – 69%	Low Performing
50% – 59%	Low Performing
Below 50%	Low Performing

Category: Knowledge and Skills for Teaching
Indicator: Candidate Teaching Skill

Traditional Routes	*Alternative Routes*
Data Source: Candidate Suite Surveys	**Data Sources:** Candidate Suite Surveys

Description: For the candidate supervisors (provider coaches) and cooperating teachers (school mentors), the efficacy percentage was calculated for Questions 1 through 27 and then averaged across the two groups (i.e., summed and divided by two).

Points: 15   **Flag:** Non-critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Points	Percentage Efficacy	Category
90% – 100%	15	90% – 100%	Satisfactory
85% – 89%	13	85% – 89%	Satisfactory
80% – 84%	11	80% – 84%	At Risk
75% – 79%	9	75% – 79%	Low Performing
70% – 74%	7	70% – 74%	Low Performing
Below 70%	0	Below 70%	Low Performing

Category: Knowledge and Skills for Teaching
Indicator: Candidate Rating of Program

Traditional Routes	*Alternative Routes*
Data Source: Candidate Suite Surveys	**Data Sources:** Candidate Suite Surveys

Description: For the teacher candidates, the efficacy percentage was calculated for Questions 1 through 34 and 37 through 43.	**Description:** For the teacher candidates, the efficacy percentage was calculated for Questions 1 through 34, 38, and 44 – 46.

Points: 10   **Flag:** Critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Points	Percentage Efficacy	Category
90% – 100%	10	90% – 100%	Satisfactory
85% – 89%	8	85% – 89%	Satisfactory
80% – 84%	6	80% – 84%	At Risk
75% – 79%	4	75% – 79%	Low Performing
70% – 74%	2	70% – 74%	Low Performing
Below 70%	0	Below 70%	Low Performing

Category: Performance as Classroom Teachers
Indicator: Impact on PK-12 Student Learning

Traditional Routes	***Alternative Routes***
Data Source: Educator Effectiveness	**Data Sources:** Educator Effectiveness

Description: Eligible teachers for this calculation are those who were (1) issues their initial standard teaching certificated within the last five years, (2) have no more than 3 years of teaching, and (3) have an effectiveness rating in the most recent academic year.

Within this population, the number of effective and highly effective ratings are summed for the most recent year, and this total is divided by the total number of eligible ratings during this time frame. Each individual is only counted once in the annual rating. The data for this calculation is a part of the data provided to EPPs in February or March each year.

Points: 15

Flag: Critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Points
90% – 100%	15
85% – 89%	13
80% – 84%	11
75% – 79%	9
70% – 74%	7
Below 70%	0

Percentage Efficacy	Category
90% – 100%	Satisfactory
85% – 89%	Satisfactory
80% – 84%	At Risk
75% – 79%	Low Performing
70% – 74%	Low Performing
Below 70%	Low Performing

Category: Performance as Classroom Teachers
Indicator: Demonstrated Teaching Knowledge

Traditional Routes	***Alternative Routes***
Data Source: Administrator Survey	**Data Sources:** Administrator Survey

Description: Total efficacy was calculated across the 22 questions of the Administrator Survey. Unlike the other indicators, "n/a" responses are not included in the denominator of this calculation.

Points: 5

Flag: Non-critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Points
90% – 100%	5
85% – 89%	4
80% – 84%	3
75% – 79%	2
70% – 74%	1
Below 70%	0

Percentage Efficacy	Category
90% – 100%	Satisfactory
85% – 89%	Satisfactory
80% – 84%	At Risk
75% – 79%	Low Performing
70% – 74%	Low Performing
Below 70%	Low Performing

Category: Robust Clinical Experiences
Indicator: Candidate Placement Diversity

Traditional Routes	*Alternative Routes*
Data Source: Candidate Suite Surveys and school diversity data	**Data Sources:** REP collection and school diversity data

Description: Each PK-12 school within the state has been determined to be diverse (or not) based on the reporting of the following student demographics at individual schools: race/ethnicity, economic status, English language learner status, and disability status. Schools are considered diverse if their student population in any of these four groups exceeds the state average (e.g., a diverse school has a greater percentage of economically disadvantaged students than the state average for all Michigan students).

To determine point attribution, the statewide average diversity rate was used as the target. A 95% confidence interval was then calculated around the state average. All providers within the lower band of the of the confidence interval are awarded full points. Those below the identified threshold were assigned points according to the table below.

To illustrate, 73.2% of candidates at traditional route providers were placed in a diverse school. The 95% confidence interval around this average was +/- 1.6%. The lower band of the confidence interval, then, is 71.5%. This becomes the threshold for full points.

Points: 4

Percentage Efficacy	Points
71.5% - 100%	4
61.5% - 71.4%	3
51.5% - 61.4%	2
41.5% - 51.4%	1
Below 41.5%	0

Flag: Non-critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Category
87.7% - 100%	Satisfactory
77.7% - 87.6%	Satisfactory
67.7% - 77.6%	At Risk
57.7% - 67.8%	Low Performing
Below 57.7%	Low Performing

Category: Robust Clinical Experiences
Indicator: Candidate Rating of Opportunities

Traditional Routes	Alternative Routes
Data Source: Candidate Suite Surveys	**Data Sources:** Candidate Suite Surveys

Description: The efficacy percentage was calculated and averaged for Questions 35 and 36 of the Teacher Candidate Survey.

Points: 4

Percentage Efficacy	Points
90% – 100%	4
85% – 89%	3
80% – 84%	2
75% – 79%	1
70% – 74%	1
Below 70%	0

Flag: Non-critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Category
90% – 100%	Satisfactory
85% – 89%	Satisfactory
80% – 84%	At Risk
75% – 79%	Low Performing
70% – 74%	Low Performing
Below 70%	Low Performing

Category: Robust Clinical Experiences
Indicator: Program Partnership Strength: Survey Questions

Traditional Routes	Alternative Routes
Data Source: Candidate Suite Surveys	**Data Sources:** Candidate Suite Surveys

Description: For the candidate supervisor and cooperating teacher surveys, the efficacy percentage was calculated for Questions 28 through 34 and then averaged between the two groups (i.e., summed and divided by two).

Description: For all three survey populations (including teacher candidates), the efficacy percentage was calculated for Questions 47 – 54 (teacher candidates) and Questions 28 - 34 (coaches/mentors), then averaged between the two groups (i.e., summed and divided by three).

Points: 6

Percentage Efficacy	Points
90% – 100%	6
85% – 89%	5
80% – 84%	4
75% – 79%	3
70% – 74%	2
Below 70%	0

Flag: Non-critical item

Percentage Efficacy	Category
90% – 100%	Satisfactory
85% – 89%	Satisfactory
80% – 84%	At Risk
75% – 79%	Low Performing
70% – 74%	Low Performing
Below 70%	Low Performing

Category: Robust Clinical Experiences

Indicator: Program Partnership Strengths - Response Rates

Traditional Routes	*Alternative Routes*
Data Source: Educator Effectiveness	**Data Sources:** Educator Effectiveness

Description: Survey respondents must make through the survey and complete relevant "overall" questions for the survey group to be considered a complete response (Question 51 for traditional routes and Question 54 for alternative routes). The number of completed responses is divided by the number of individuals identified on the survey roster sheets provided to MDE.

Points: Six total points, two points for each survey grouping.

Flag: Critical item for teacher candidates and coaches; non-critical for mentors

Percentage Efficacy	Points
80% – 100%	2
60% – 79%	1
0% – 59%	0

Percentage Efficacy	Category
80% – 100%	Satisfactory
60% – 79%	At Risk
0% – 59%	Low Performing

Appendices

Appendix A - Candidate Suite Surveys:

Teacher Candidate Survey

#	Question	Provider Type
As a beginning (early career) teacher entering the profession, to what extent can you…		
1	connect learning experiences to a variety of backgrounds (e.g., cultural, socioeconomic, and ethnic)?	Both
2	support all students' socioemotional (e.g., social, emotional, psychological) development?	Both
3	communicate effectively with families/caregivers to promote individual student growth?	Both
4	build respectful relationships with every student?	Both
5	recognize individuals' potential as demonstrated by setting high expectations for each student?	Both
As a beginning (early career) teacher entering the profession, to what extent can you apply instructional strategies and resources to support...		
6	English learners?	Both
7	high performing students?	Both
8	low performing students?	Both
9	students from culturally diverse backgrounds?	Both
10	students with special needs or disabilities?	Both
11	each individual student's learning abilities and needs?	Both
As a beginning (early career) teacher entering the profession, to what extent can you...		
12	utilize available technology to enhance instruction?	Both
13	support student use of available technology?	Both
14	practice the ethical use of technology?	Both
15	support all students in making connections to prior knowledge and experiences?	Both
16	implement multiple strategies to present key content area(s) concepts?	Both
17	adapt instruction, curriculum, and assessments according to Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and Section 504 plans?	Both
18	organize the learning environment to guide student engagement during instructional time?	Both
19	design or select assessment tools to provide evidence of student learning?	Both
20	analyze assessment data to identify patterns and gaps in student learning?	Both
21	differentiate instruction based on student assessment data?	Both
22	implement research-based behavior management strategies to maximize student engagement?	Both
23	implement literacy and reading strategies appropriate to your content area(s) and grade level(s)?	Both
24	be receptive to feedback to improve instruction?	Both
25	be a reflective educator who utilizes feedback to implement instructional improvements?	Both
26	maintain positive, collaborative relationships with colleagues?	Both

As a beginning (early career) teacher entering the profession, to what extent are you AWARE of...		
27	Michigan Code of Educational Ethics?	Both
28	professional teaching standards for your content area(s) and grade level(s)?	Both
29	PK-12 academic content standards?	Both
30	statewide and national teaching organizations and associations?	Both
31	laws and policies relevant to the teaching profession?	Both
32	current tools utilized for assessing student learning?	Both
33	tools used by districts to evaluate educator performance?	Both
34	professional learning requirements for certificate renewal and advancement?	Both
To what extent did your preparation program provide you with opportunities to work…		
35	with students from a variety of backgrounds (e.g. cultural, socioeconomic and ethnic)?	Both
36	in a variety of school settings?	Both
To what extent did each of the following elements of your preparation program, make a POSITIVE contribution to your readiness to begin a teaching career?		
37	Coursework in your content area(s).	Traditional
38	teaching methods coursework.	Both
39	Early clinical observational experiences (aka early exploratory clinical experiences).	Traditional
40	Pre-student teaching clinical experiences involving direct student contact (aka student contact hours).	Traditional
41	Student teaching (aka internship).	Traditional
42	Support and feedback from the cooperating teacher(s) during student teaching.	Traditional
43	Support and feedback from the preparation program supervisor during student teaching.	Traditional
44	exploratory clinical experiences.	Alternative
45	support and feedback from your school-based mentor during your first teaching placement.	Alternative
46	support and feedback from your provider coach during your first teaching placement.	Alternative
During your first year of teaching, to what extent did your educator preparation program/provider…		
47	make clear to you the expectations for performance in the classroom?	Alternative
48	make clear the roles of coaches, mentors, and other support staff who will support you during your preparation?	Alternative
49	collaborate with your assigned school-based mentors and provider coaches?	Alternative
50	make appropriate resources available to you?	Alternative
51	regularly request feedback from you about the support you are receiving from your PK-12 school based teacher?	Alternative
52	regularly request feedback from you about the support you are receiving from your provider coach?	Alternative
53	support you overall as an early career teacher?	Alternative

54	Overall, to what extent do you believe you are ready to enter the teaching profession?	Traditional
55	Overall, to what extent do you believe you made progress as a developing teacher over the school year?	Alternative
56	Overall, to what extent do you believe you demonstrated the skills and aptitude of a well-prepared early career teacher over the school year?	Alternative
57	Overall, to what extent do you believe you reflect the desired temperament and characteristics of a professional teacher?	Alternative

Aggregate survey results are available on the Educator Workforce Data Report under "Statewide Preparation Satisfaction." Red text indicates subtle wording differences between the traditional and alternative route surveys.

Candidate Supervisor (Provider Coach Survey) / Cooperating Teacher (School Mentor) Survey

#	Question	Provider Type
As a beginning (early career) teacher entering the profession, to what extent can you…		
Q1	connect learning experiences to a variety of backgrounds (e.g., cultural, socioeconomic, and ethnic)?	Both
Q2	support all students' socioemotional (e.g., social, emotional, psychological) development?	Both
Q3	communicate effectively with families/caregivers to promote individual student growth?	Both
Q4	build respectful relationships with every student?	Both
Q5	recognize individuals' potential as demonstrated by setting high expectations for each student?	Both
As a beginning (early career) teacher entering the profession, to what extent can you apply instructional strategies and resources to support...		
Q6	English learners?	Both
Q7	high performing students?	Both
Q8	low performing students?	Both
Q9	students from culturally diverse backgrounds?	Both
Q10	students with special needs or disabilities?	Both
Q11	each individual student's learning abilities and needs?	Both
As a beginning (early career) teacher entering the profession, to what extent can you...		
Q12	utilize available technology to enhance instruction?	Both
Q13	support student use of available technology?	Both
Q14	practice the ethical use of technology?	Both
Q15	support all students in making connections to prior knowledge and experiences?	Both
Q16	implement multiple strategies to present key content area(s) concepts?	Both
Q17	adapt instruction, curriculum, and assessments according to Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and Section 504 plans?	Both
Q18	organize the learning environment to guide student engagement during instructional time?	Both
Q19	design or select assessment tools to provide evidence of student learning?	Both
Q20	analyze assessment data to identify patterns and gaps in student learning?	Both
Q21	differentiate instruction based on student assessment data?	Both
Q22	implement research-based behavior management strategies to maximize student engagement?	Both
Q23	implement literacy and reading strategies appropriate to your content area(s) and grade level(s)?	Both
Q24	be receptive to feedback to improve instruction?	Both
Q25	be a reflective educator who utilizes feedback to implement instructional improvements?	Both
Q26	maintain positive, collaborative relationships with colleagues?	Both
Q27	positively impact the learning and development of PK-12 students	Both

During this teacher candidate's student teaching experience (**the experience with this candidate**), to what extent did the educator preparation program…		
Q28	make clear the expectations for this teacher candidate's performance?	Both
Q29	make clear the expectations for your role within this clinical experience?	Both
Q30	provide training and feedback on how you could best (supervisor / coach / mentor) this teacher candidate?	Both
Q31	make appropriate resources available to you?	Both
Q32	regularly request feedback from you regarding this candidate's performance?	Both
Q33	support you as a (candidate supervisor / provider coach / cooperating teacher / school-based mentor)?	Both
Q34	engage (the / your) PK-12 school as a partner in teacher preparation?	Both
During your first year of teaching, to what extent did your educator preparation program/provider…		
Q35	Overall, to what extent do you believe this candidate is ready to enter the teaching profession?	Traditional
Q36	Overall, to what extent do you believe this candidate made progress as a developing teacher over the school year?	Alternative
Q37	Overall, to what extent do you believe this candidate demonstrated the skills and aptitude of a well-prepared early career teacher over the school year?	Alternative
Q38	Overall, to what extent do you believe this candidate reflects the desired temperament and characteristics of a professional teacher?	Alternative

Aggregate survey results are available on the Educator Workforce Data Report under "Statewide Preparation Satisfaction."
Red text indicates subtle wording differences between the traditional and alternative route surveys.

Appendix B - Administrator Survey

#	Question	Provider Type
As a first-year teacher, compared to other first-year teachers, to what extent is [TeacherName] able to...		
Q1	support all students in making connections to prior knowledge and experiences?	Both
Q2	implement multiple strategies to present key content area(s) concepts?	Both
Q3	utilize available technology to enhance the learning experience of students?	Both
Q4	implement strategies which maximize student engagement to support positive student behavior?	Both
Q5	organize the learning environment to guide student engagement during instructional time?	Both
Q6	implement literacy and reading strategies appropriate to their content area(s) and grade level(s)?	Both
Q7	differentiate instruction based on student assessment data to support each student's academic achievement?	Both
Q8	support each student's socioemotional (e.g., social, emotional, psychological) development with instructional strategies and resources?	Both
Q9	understand and make accommodations based on a student's IEP or Section 504 plan?	Both
As a first-year teacher, compared to other first-year teachers, to what extent can [TeacherName] apply instructional strategies and resources to support...		
Q10	English learners?	Both
Q11	high performing students?	Both
Q12	low performing students?	Both
Q13	students experiencing trauma?	Both
Q14	students from culturally diverse backgrounds?	Both
Q15	students with special needs or disabilities?	Both
Q16	each individual student's learning abilities and needs?	Both
As a first-year teacher, compared to other first-year teachers, to what extent is [TeacherName] able to build positive relationships with. . .		
Q17	students?	Both
Q18	families/caregivers?	Both
Q19	colleagues?	Both
As a first-year teacher, compared to other first-year teachers, to what extent is [TeacherName] able to...		
Q20	demonstrate responsiveness and flexibility to unexpected situations which arise?	Both
Q21	act in a manner consistent with ethical and professional educator expectations?	Both
Q22	utilize constructive criticism to reflect upon and improve practice?	Both

Appendix C - 2020-23 MTTC Subject Area Classification

Subject Area Key
- ELA: English Language Arts
- SS: Social Studies
- SCI: Science
- MTH: Math
- SPED: Special Education
- WL: World Languages
- GL: Grade Level
- CRR: Career/Tech
- ARTPE: Arts, Physical Ed, Health
- NOT: Not to be included; test is either part of an advanced program or is being phased out

Test	Subject Area	Notes
002 English	ELA	
004 Speech	ELA	
005 Reading	ELA	
007 Economics	SS	
008 Geography	SS	
009 History	SS	
010 Political Science	SS	
011 Psychology	SS	
017 Biology	SCI	
018 Chemistry	SCI	
019 Physics	SCI	
020 Earth/Space Science	SCI	
022 Mathematics (Secondary)	MTH	
023 French	WL	
024 German	WL	
026 Latin	WL	
028 Spanish	WL	
029 Italian	WL	
036 Marketing Education	CRR	Phasing out
037 Agricultural Education	CRR	
040 Family/Consumer Science	CRR	
043 Health	ARTPE	Discontinued; replaced with #112/113
044 Physical Education	ARTPE	Discontinued; replaced with #112/113
046 Dance	NOT	Endorsement phasing out

048 Library Media	NOT	Additional endorsement only
050 Computer Science	NOT	Endorsement phasing out
051 School Counselor	NOT	Additional endorsement only
053 Fine Arts	NOT	Endorsement phasing out
056 Cognitive Impairment	SPED	Discontinued; replaced with #115
057 Speech/Lang. Impaired	SPED	
058 Phys/Other Impairment	SPED	
059 Emotional Impairment	SPED	Discontinued; replaced with #116
061 Visually Impaired	SPED	
062 Deaf and Hard of Hearing	SPED	Discontinued, replaced with #128
063 Learning Disabilities	SPED	Discontinued; replaced with #114
064 Autism Spectrum Dis.	SPED	
075 Bilingual Education	WL	Discontinued; replaced with #125
084 Social Studies (Secondary)	SS	
085 Middle Level	GL	
086 ESL	WL	Discontinued; replaced with #126
087 Industrial Tech.	CRR	Discontinued; replaced with #129
089 Mathematics (Elementary)	MTH	
090 Language Arts (Elementary)	ELA	
092 Reading Specialist	NOT	
093 Integrated Science (Elementary)	SCI	
094 Integrated Science (Secondary)	SCI	
095 Visual Arts Education	ARTPE	
097 Physical Science	SCI	
098 Business Mgt Mrkt Tech	CRR	
099 Music Education	ARTPE	
100 Japanese	WL	
101 Chinese (Mandarin)	WL	
102 Arabic (Modern Std)	WL	
103 Elementary Education	GL	Phasing out 2026; see new grade bands
105 Social Studies (Elementary)	SS	
106 Early Child Education (General & Special Education)	GL	Phasing out 2026; see new grade bands
112 Health Education	ARTPE	
113 Phys Education	ARTPE	

114 Learning Disabilities	SPED	
115 Cognitive Impairment	SPED	
116 Emotional Impairment	SPED	
117 Lower Elementary (PK-3) Education (Professional Knowledge and Skills)	GL	
118 Lower Elementary (PK-3) Education (Literacy)	GL	
119 Lower Elementary (PK-3) Education (Mathematics)	GL	
120 Lower Elementary (PK-3) Education (Science & Social Studies)	GL	
121 Upper Elementary (3-6) Education (Professional Knowledge & Skills)	GL	
122 Upper Elementary (3-6) Education (Literacy)	GL	
123 Upper Elementary (3-6) Education (Mathematics)	GL	
124 Upper Elementary (3-6) Education (Science and Social Studies)	GL	
125 Bilingual Education	WL	
126 English as a Second Language	WL	
128 Deaf or Hard of Hearing	SPED	
129 Industrial & Technology Education	CRR	
134 Early Childhood General & Special Education (Birth-K)	SPED	

Appendix D - Corrective Action Details

MET CUT SCORE?

YES | NO

-1 | +1

DEFAULT:

6 5	0 1
5 4	1 2
4 3	2 3
3 2	3 4
2 1	4 5
1 0	5 6

NEW REPORTED LABEL

NEW CORRECTIVE ACTION

REPORTED LABEL

SATISFACTORY

0   1

At Phase 0, no corrective actions are required. EPIs are encouraged to find and pursue continuous improvement and act as mentor or model institutions.

While Phase 1 is still considered "Satisfactory," the Satisfactory label is awarded "with conditions." An EPI at Phase 1 will have the opportunity to work with MDE consultants to identify specific areas that require improvement.

AT RISK

2   3

An At Risk label indicates that the EPI has areas in need of improvement. These areas will be identified both by the EPI and the MDE.

At Phase 2, the MDE supports EPIs in developing a plan with specific goals that address the unique factors that contributed to a less-than-Satisfactory label.

At Phase 3, the EPI provides data and evidence necessary to show full implementation of the plan.

LOW PERFORMING

4   5   6

A Low Performing label is an indication that the EPI needs more intensive interventions aimed at program improvement. A Low Performing label may arise from failure to address known areas that need improvement, or as a result of multiple years of distinct difficulties, or both.

At Phases 4 through 6, the MDE and outside experts become a resource to foster improvement for both the education unit as well as the institution as a whole. Outside experts provide intensive support that must result in rapid change at the EPI.

An important feature of these phases is determining whether the EPI may retain the right to deliver teacher preparation programs, or whether an EPI must begin the process of program closure.

KEY: 1 Satisfactory   At Risk
Phase Number   Low Performing