In June 2018, the Michigan Department of Education notified institutions that some changes needed to be made to the Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score calculation. The EPI Performance Score revision work continued through the 2019, 2020, and 2021 performance periods. Consequently, we did not have any EPI performance data to share from 2019 and only have unpublished 2020 and 2021 reports based on the legacy calculation process.

Because of these changes, we have chosen to provide eight years of EPI Performance Score data. WMU’s performance score has steadily increased since 2016 and we have been rated “Satisfactory” for all eight years.

The EPI performance data that we have received from the Michigan Department of Education is presented in this document as follows:
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MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 5, 2021

TO: Educator Preparation Institution Deans and Directors

FROM: Leah Breen, Director
Office of Educator Excellence

SUBJECT: 2021 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is happy to announce the 2021 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Scores have been calculated and all institutions remain at “Satisfactory” for 2021! We appreciate your commitment to quality teacher preparation and continuous improvement.

MDE is in the final stages of implementing the redesign of the current system. The target implementation of the new system is next year, 2022. Given this, the 2021 Performance Scores were calculated utilizing the previous methodology and have been posted on our site. MDE will be sending each institution their results to support continuous improvement and accreditation activities that rely on these data.

In two subsequent emails, each EPI representative will receive the institution’s score and the data that fed the score. The data that will be provided in these emails is a subset of the certification and employment data sent to all institutions the week of February 22nd focusing on the records that meet the business rules of each Performance Score metric. For example, educator evaluations for educators in the first three years of their teaching career instead of all evaluations available in the last five years.

Additionally, following the recent referent panel to determine the threshold for the redesigned system, MDE will send each EPI their redesigned Performance Score data to assist in understanding the transition before it begins in 2021-22.

If you have questions about the data provided, please do not hesitate to reach out to Katelyn Boswell Gallagher at BoswellGallagherK@Michigan.gov.
Western Michigan University
2021 EPI Performance Score

All MI EPIs were rated **Satisfactory** in 2021
MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 27, 2020

TO: Educator Preparation Institution Deans and Directors

FROM: Leah Breen, Director
Office of Educator Excellence

SUBJECT: 2020 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score

Thank you for your patience with the release of the 2020 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score. We appreciate your commitment to quality teacher preparation and continuous improvement. The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is happy to announce that the Performance Score data places all institutions at “Satisfactory” for 2020! The MDE is still in the process of working with stakeholders from EPIs and the K-12 field to redesign the framework of the current system. Given this, the 2020 Performance Score was calculated utilizing the previous methodology to determine whether positive trends from the previous score system are continuing, and full results will not be published on our site. The MDE will be sending each institution their results to support continuous improvement and accreditation activities that rely on these data.

In two subsequent emails, each EPI will receive their score and the data that fed the score. The data that will be provided in these emails is a subset of the certification and employment data sent to all institutions the week of April 6th focusing on those records that meet the business rules of each Performance Score metric. For example, educator evaluations for educators in the first three years of their teaching career instead of all evaluations available in the last five years. If you have questions about the data provided please do not hesitate to reach out to Katelyn Boswell Gallagher at BoswellGallagherK@michigan.gov.

GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING
Western Michigan University 2020 EPI Performance Score

Overall State Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Score</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTTC State Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SURV State Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFF State Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2020 EPI Performance Score

Source: Michigan Department of Education, April 27, 2020

All MI EPIS were rated Satisfactory in 2020
MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 25, 2018

TO: Educator Preparation Institution Deans and Directors

FROM: Leah Breen, Director
       Office of Educator Excellence

SUBJECT: 2018 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score

Thank you for your patience with the delayed publication of the 2018 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score. This year’s review of the EPI Performance Score data identified some challenges with the current methodology around the calculation of Goal 3 (Educator Effectiveness Ratings) that we feel would best be addressed through meaningful discussion and collaboration with EPI’s.

Given the complexity of these challenges, as well as current time constraints and considerable Office of Educator Excellence (OEE) staff turnover, every institution has been awarded the highest observed score (88.6 out of 100) with respect to Goal 3 in calculating the 2018 EPI Performance Score. Essentially, no institution’s overall score was unduly disadvantaged or overly inflated by this component. The only changes to this year’s EPI score occurred within Goal 3 (Educator Effectiveness Ratings).

The upcoming year will be used to revise the business rules for the EPI Performance Score, including the potential to include new data and eliminate existing data. We are seeking volunteers to serve on a review and redesign committee. While an EPI Performance Score will not be calculated for 2019, the OEE will continue collecting and disseminating MTTC, survey, and educator effectiveness ratings data to support institutional continuous improvement and accreditation activities that rely on these data.

Attached is a spreadsheet identifying all pertinent information related to the 2018 EPI Performance Score. Institutions whose Corrective Action status is affected by the 2018 score will be contacted by consultants in the Professional Preparation and Learning Unit with further information on accountability expectations for 2018-2019.
In two subsequent emails, you will receive your Educator Effectiveness datasets. The first email will include a revised roster of individuals attributed to your institution. The second email will include those individuals’ effectiveness ratings. This dataset will appear a bit different from the original dataset sent to you earlier this year.

- Educators were not included if they were not employed within a Michigan public school in the most recently completed school year (2016-17). This prevented educators from being counted redundantly across reporting periods.
- Appeals data were only included for educators where the dataset had employment information for the corresponding year.
- The calculation of years of experience and labels included all five years of REP data available (2012-13 through 2016-17). In the original data set sent earlier this year only the last three years of labels/experience were included in the final output by mistake.

These data will not go through the appeals process because they were not included in the final EPI Performance Score. The data are being provided for institutional and accreditation use.

In the interest of time, these datasets are not being loaded into the vocalize dashboard or being disseminated in the format used in prior years.

Thank you for continuing to serve as partners in this work. Please feel free to contact me at (517) 241-1392 or breenl1@michigan.gov with questions/comments.
In June 2018, the Michigan Department of Education notified institutions that some changes needed to be made to the Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score calculation and, consequently, 2018 performance scores would be reported in spreadsheet format only. Please see the MDE Memo on pages 4-5 for more details.

WMU’s 2018 score and subscores are reported immediately below.
Corrective Action Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Prior Year’s Corrective Action Phase</th>
<th>Prior Year’s Corrective Action Label</th>
<th>Current Year’s Corrective Action Phase</th>
<th>Current Year’s Corrective Action Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This is the 2016 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Western Michigan University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2014-2015 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year’s report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.
Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2016 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2012 through the July 2015 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates

Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2016 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2014 to January 2015) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2015 to July 2015).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores

Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.
2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.
3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3.

These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of program</th>
<th>Weight for Goal 1</th>
<th>Weight for Goal 2</th>
<th>Weight for Goal 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completers who had</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness labels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% to 10%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% to 20%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% to 30%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% or more</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the 2015 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Western Michigan University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84.5 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year’s report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

### 2014 Performance Category & Phase

**SATISFACTORY**

### 2015 STATUS:

**MET CUT SCORE**

### 2015 Performance Category & Phase

**SATISFACTORY**

An EPI with teacher preparation programs categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- A high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- Teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- Supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- Graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.

### MTTC Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL Score: 85.6**
Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2015 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2011 through the July 2014 administrations of content area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates
Abbreviated SURV on this report

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2015 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2013 to January 2014) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2014 to July 2014).

Each survey audience responded to questions across six categories (for CS surveys) or seven categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores
Abbreviated EFF on this report

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

To compute this component score, the MDE began with data on the effectiveness ratings of teachers in their first three years of experience who had effectiveness labels over a five-year period. Next, MDE assigned a point value to each effectiveness rating. “Highly Effective” labels were worth 1.00 point, “Effective” labels were worth 0.80 point, “Minimally Effective” labels were worth 0.30 point, and “Ineffective” labels were worth zero points. Finally, a factoring weight for each year of these three-year scores was applied; first-year labels were assigned a factor of 0.3, second-year labels 0.5, and third-year labels 0.2. These weighted three-year totals were then added together to create a score out of 100 possible points.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.

2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.

3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3. These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels</th>
<th>Weight for Goal 1</th>
<th>Weight for Goal 2</th>
<th>Weight for Goal 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1% to 10%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% to 20%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% to 30%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% or more</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the 2014 Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score Report for Western Michigan University. On this side, the colored vertical bars show the performance scores for the Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification three-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2012-2013 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). These scores contribute to the calculation of the Overall Score. An overall cut score of 84 is the lowest score needed for satisfactory performance for this year’s report.

On the reverse side are brief summaries about how data for these component scores were collected and scored, and how the overall scores were calculated from the component scores.

The vertical bars also show the minimum and maximum for each component score and for the overall score earned by any Michigan EPI. A mean (average) for that component and overall score is also displayed.

**2014 STATUS: MET CUT SCORE**

**SATISFACTORY**

An EPI whose teacher preparation programs are categorized as SATISFACTORY exhibits most or all of the following:

- a high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their MTTC content-based assessments;
- teacher candidates who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences;
- supervising faculty at EPIs who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates; and
- graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation.
Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC) Component Score

To calculate this component score, the MDE used a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. These were administered to eligible candidates (as verified by each EPI). MTTC passing percentages used in the EPI Performance Score represent the “cumulative” or “best attempt” of all eligible test-takers for content/subject areas, across an unlimited number of testing opportunities. To calculate the combined passing percentage, the number of “best attempt” passing results during a three-year period was divided by the total number of first-time registrations over the same period. The combined passing percentage is not based on the number of times a candidate attempts a given MTTC test during the three-year period. For the calculation of the 2014 EPI Performance Scores, passing percentages from the August 2010 through the July 2013 administrations of content/subject-area tests were used; scores for program areas that had been closed during the three-year period were factored out for the purposes of calculating this component score.

Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey Efficacy Rates (abbreviated SURV on this report)

To calculate this component score, perception data were gathered at two points during the academic year from teacher candidates (TCs) who evaluate their experiences in the teacher preparation programs. These perceptions are matched with corroborating data from the candidate supervisors (CSs), from each EPI, who work with and directly supervise the clinical experiences of those teacher candidates. For the 2014 EPI Performance Score, survey responses were collected from the Fall/Winter time span (late 2012 to January 2013) and the Spring/Summer time span (April 2013 to July 2013). Each survey audience responded to questions across four categories (for CS surveys) or six categories (for TC surveys) with each item in those categories featuring a four-point Likert scale. These responses were combined to generate an overall total of all responses across all categories by Likert number. The SURV score on this report represents the total rate of efficacy, defined as the overall percentage of “3” and “4” responses on the Likert scale across all categories, across both sets of surveys, per survey type (TC or CS).

Teacher Effectiveness Rating Scores (abbreviated EFF on this report)

Once each year, teacher effectiveness labels are captured by the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicating whether teachers are considered “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Minimally Effective,” or “Ineffective” according to several factors that include student academic growth on statewide assessments. From the data captured by the REP, the MDE applied a point attribution methodology to create a third component score based on the ratings of teachers who received their initial certification from Michigan’s EPIs.

Overall Score Calculation

The EPI Performance Score has three underlying measurement goals:

1. Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy.

2. Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrates continuous improvement related to MDE’s priorities.

3. Ensure that program graduates meet standards for effectiveness aligned to MDE policy.

70% of Goal 1 is derived from the three-year MTTC passing percentages, and 30% of Goal 1 is derived from the survey efficacy ratings. The survey efficacy ratings contribute exclusively to Goal 2, and the teacher effectiveness rating point scores contribute exclusively to Goal 3. These goals have a relative weight within the overall score to reflect their significance. However, in order to compensate for smaller teacher preparation programs, different weights for the three goals were applied before the overall score was calculated, depending on the proportion of teachers at each EPI who had effectiveness labels. To separate the EPIs into “tiers” based on this proportion, the total number of teachers who had received teacher effectiveness labels attributed to an EPI was divided by the total number of teachers who had completed a program at that EPI. The percentages and weighted scores are compared in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of program completers who had effectiveness labels</th>
<th>Weight for Goal 1</th>
<th>Weight for Goal 2</th>
<th>Weight for Goal 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1% to 10%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% to 20%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% to 30%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% or more</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>