State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Shepard Building
255 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3400

Deborah A. Gist
Commissioner

Enclosure 8b
November 13, 2013

TO: Members of the RI Board of Education

FROM: Deborah A. Gist, Commissioner

RE: Adoption of Rhode Island Educator Preparation Program Standards

---

Rhode Island's standards for approving preparation programs were last revised in 2001. In order to create stronger connections between educator preparation and PK-12 districts, the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) has revised the standards used for approving Rhode Island educator preparation programs. RIDE began the standards redesign process in May 2013 in partnership with educator preparation programs. Following Board approval for public comment in September, RIDE engaged with stakeholders through four public comment in-person sessions and collected written public comment. Upon closure of public comment, RIDE analyzed the comment, made improvements where appropriate, and discussed adjustments with the preparation programs.

Enclosed in this packet are:

- Public Comment Summary
- Rhode Island Educator Preparation Program Revised Standards- November 2013
- Updated Admissions Requirements
- Draft Glossary

The purpose of the revised standards is to connect educator preparation to the state's broader education initiatives and to ensure approved Rhode Island educator preparation programs are preparing effective educators to serve the students and families of Rhode Island.

RECOMMENDATION: THAT, The Rhode Island Board of Education approves the Rhode Island Educator Preparation Program Standards, as presented.

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Shepard Building
255 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3400

Deborah A. Gist
Commissioner

RI Educator Preparation Standards Stakeholder Engagement and Public Comment Summary

OVERVIEW: On September 9th 2013, the Rhode Island Board of Education approved a draft set of RI Educator Preparation Standards for public comment. This document outlines stakeholder engagement during public comment, a summary of the public comment received, and RIDE's response. Public comment was collected between September 10, 2013 and October 10, 2013.

OUTREACH & ENGAGEMENT: RIDE conducted extensive outreach to solicit broad feedback. Outreach included in-person sessions, emails to relevant stakeholder listservs, and the creation of an online survey to collect comment. Programs involved in the revision process received notification of the public comment process, access to the standards, and access to the online survey. The survey asked for the respondent's current role in education, opportunity to offer high level feedback or overall feedback, and/ or opportunity to provide support and/or critique of each of the five standards.

In-person sessions led by RIDE staff included the RI Program Approval background, an overview of changes, and an opportunity for questions and dialogue with RIDE staff. Attendees were provided access to the online survey to submit comment. The following sessions were held: Session 1 (9/25) was hosted by Rhode Island College and had 5 attendees, Session 2 (10/2) was hosted by URI (Kingston Campus) and had 3 attendees, Session 3 (10/9) hosted by Youth in Action, a Providence youth organization, and had 7 youth attendees and 3 adult mentors and Session 4 (9/25) was held during an Induction Coach forum and had about 25 coaches in attendance. A revised version of the standards was also shared with all prep programs on October 28 for an additional opportunity for input.

COMMENT DEMOGRAPHICS: RIDE received seventy-two submissions through the online survey and 4 letters from organizations. Organizations that submitted letters include Rhode Island Association of School Principals (RIASP), Teach for America (TFA), and the Rhode Island Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (RIACTE). The Rhode Island School Superintendents Association (RISSA) submitted comments on 10/11/13 which are also included.

Online submissions included two faculty/staff members at an alternative preparation program, seven faculty/staff members at an institution of higher education, seven PK-12 teachers, nine PK-12 district administrators, and 13 induction coaches. One respondent reported that he or she was both a faculty/staff member at an IHE as well as a PK-12 educator. The remaining respondents came from a variety of backgrounds, including one parent, one school board member, two directors of educational non-profits, one educational consultant, and three child care directors. Other respondents included staff from TNTP, a national organization that supports alternative teacher preparation programs and works with districts and states to improve human capital policies; and staff from the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ). A number of respondents did not identify their role.

PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY: The online survey asked commenters to provide "Overall Feedback" within an open field and was followed by ten fields that asked for standard-specific comments. Many individuals only completed the "Overall Feedback" section. The major themes that emerged are outlined in Table 1: Overall Summary of Feedback by Topic.

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC SUMMARY: Upon closure of public comment, RIDE analyzed all comment including both letters and online survey information. RIDE adjusted the RIPA standards to ensure there was a precision of language and to reflect comment received. Standard-specific comment mirrored the major themes of the "Overall Feedback" and raised questions about how the standards would be measured during approval visits. Specific comment summaries and adjustments can be found in the Appendix. Comments pertaining to the operationalization of the standards will be addressed during the next phase of the work.

Table 1: Overall Summary of Feedback by Topic

Topic	Comment
Revision Process	**Strengths:** • One faculty/staff of IHE noted that they were glad to see that the standards development process is collaborative and is listening to stakeholders.
Scope, Clarity, and Rigor	**Strengths:** • Several organizations commended RIDE for revising the approval standards for educator preparation to ensure programs produce classroom-ready teachers. *(NCTQ , TNTP , a Building Level Administrator and2 induction coaches).* • Induction coaches and PK-12 educators claimed that the document was clear, concise, adequate, and fluid. RIASP and PK-12 educators remarked that the standards are rigorous, comprehensive, and aligned to "our expectations for RI teacher prep programs" . • TNTP requested that RIDE collect and publish annually the data required under standards 2.2, 3.1-3.6 and 4.1-4.2 with clear consequences attached to them including closing low performing programs. **Critiques:** • RIDE needs to ensure that indicators for program approval standards are specific and measureable. (*NCTQ and an induction coach)* • Language could be streamlined throughout (*mentioned repeatedly*).
Approval Process	**Strengths:** • One faculty/staff of IHE noted that they were "happy to see this process get underway. We need new program approval guidelines in order to add clarity to a period where change is rapid". • A member of a leadership team of non-profits who launches and supports a national network of schools noted the importance of ensuring the process for review is thorough. **Critiques:** • NCTQ noted the "key to the effectiveness of the standards will be the extent to which they include clear guidelines for programs to follow while still allowing programs flexibility and room to innovate". • One faculty/staff of IHE asked if rubrics will be developed similar to the old rubrics and what recommendation policy will be used in the new format. • RIACTE asked about the type of rubric that will be developed to guide program approval visits; also if the same recommendation policy used now will be included in the new process. • RISSA noted that many of the statements are broad and general. Their executive board wondered about the assessment procedures which will be utilized to evaluate and monitor progress and/or compliance. • Youth in Action group wondered how the RIPA Standards will play out in the approval process. Many of the comments are in the form of questions to consider when creating the rubric and process.
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)	**Strengths:** • 1 faculty/staff of IHE noted "the new standards are high, clear, and well-aligned to the next generation national standards from CAEP". • TFA noted an appreciation for "the effort to create alignment between program approval and national accreditation standards". **Critiques:** • Four faculty/staff of IHE requested a RI partnership with NCATE/CAEP using the NCATE/CAEP process for program review with an addendum of RI specific standards not aligned to the CAEP standards. • RIACTE asked if RIDE will adopt the CAEP site visit of 7 years and if there would be interim or yearly reporting. • Multiple faculty/staff of IHE noted the need for prep programs to submit Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) reports as a basis for program review.

Appendix: Standard and Component-Specific Summary

STANDARD 1	Standard 1 received eighteen responses regarding strengths and sixteen responses with critiques. The standard name and description was improved to capture the breadth of professional knowledge needed for RI educators. Many of the components now contain more inclusive language for the variety of roles preparation programs are working with. Feedback from public comment encouraged a strong and explicit alignment to the current Rhode Island educational expectations. Two components were combined to include a broader range of pedagogical content and one component was added to call out the importance of standards-driven instruction. NOTE*: Component adjustments are listed by the original component number.*

Public Comment and Feedback	**ADJUSTMENTS**
STRENGTHS • One faculty/staff of IHE noted that the RIPTS should stay within the standard as aligned to CAEP InTASC standards • An early learning specialist noted the focus on professional dispositions and content as a strength. • PK-12 educators suggested going deeper into the understanding of content pedagogy • One induction coach noted the importance of an emphasis on pedagogical skills • PK-12 educators noted the importance of ensuring program completers use data effectively to meet the needs of the diverse students and that the specificity in 1.4 is warranted • TFA noted "we applaud the focused effort to ensure that frequent data collection and analysis is a central tenet of teacher candidate preparation. We have found that this is a critical element in our approach to teacher preparation" • Induction coaches saw the separate component for technology as a strength • Three induction coach and the Youth in Action group saw the inclusion of a separate component for equity as important and the language strong. The inclusion of sexual orientation was also a positive • Commenters liked that the standard included the concept of cultural competence **CRITIQUES** • One faculty/staff of a teacher residency program asked that "they choose which standards" • One faculty/staff of a teacher residency asked "how do you expect candidates to demonstrate understanding? What is the measurement tool and where is the bar?" • The inclusion of formative assessment was raised by a variety of individuals • RIASP and PK-12 educators noted a requisite shift in instruction based on CCSS • In-depth assessment literacy was called out as a strong need for completers. Feedback specifically asked that the standards include how educators should use ongoing assessment data • Multiple PK-12 administrators thought the component did not provide enough clarity in terms of the connecting technology to the many facets of teaching (improve student achievement, differentiate, and general appropriate application) • One faculty/staff teacher residency program asked to streamline the language • Building level administrators and induction coaches noted that they liked that programs are required to ensure candidates understand RIDE initiatives • Ensuring familiarity with the evaluation system was mentioned numerous times	**(1.1)** Language was shifted to be meaningful to all educators (teachers, support professionals, and administrators) trained in RI preparation programs. **(1.2)**Language was shifted to include all educators trained in RI preparation programs and to specify types of standards included. Component 1.2 and 1.3 were combined to avoid redundancy. **(1.3)** Language was improved to clarify the focus of standard 1.3 on student access to appropriate academic standards. Further, this standard aligns to standard 1.4 of CAEP. **(1.4)** Language was simplified and adjusted to be inclusive of instructional and professional practice. **(1.5)** Language was strengthened and simplified to align with the field's broad expectations for technology use. After discussion with preparation programs "professional practices" term was re-inserted. **(1.6)** The explicit calling out of educator evaluation was moved after 10/28/13 conversation with educator preparation programs. Rhode Island expectations and focus areas will be clarified by RIDE in the future. *This component was moved to 1.7.* **(1.7)** Language was clarified and the list of diverse learners has been removed and added to the

• Suggestions for further clarity of "any additional knowledge or skills required by RI law" • One induction coach asked if candidates will be effectively prepared to support student learning in the full diversity of Rhode Island public schools. "Will Ed Prep Programs prepare teachers for any type of community in which they may be hired?" • Youth in Action group wondered how this component would be measured	glossary. This removal does not signify a lack of importance but rather a need to maintain succinct standards and acknowledge the evolving landscape of affinity groups.. *This component was moved to 1.6.*

STANDARD 2	Standard 2 received thirteen responses regarding strengths and thirteen responses with critiques. A strong and deliberate connection to the RI education context was an area that RI educators would like to bolster. In order to prepare educators for RI expectations, a focus on quality experiences and structures to assess and guide impact on students has been more clearly defined within the components. Overall, Standard 2 addresses readiness for the field and ensures coherence between academic coursework, clinical experience, and RI educator expectations. Improvements within the current version include the repurposing of one component to ensure what is valued in the field is also valued and assessed during clinical experiences.

Public Comment and Feedback	ADJUSTMENTS
STRENGTHS • Faculty/staff of IHE liked the consistency with CAEP. • Induction coaches noted the emphasis on evidence based practice, inclusion of diverse clinical sites, and the importance of coherent and intentional learning across program learning and clinical practice. • PK-12 educators noted the importance of a shared responsibility for educating teachers (inclusive of programs, school districts, and program participants) • Youth In Action group and induction coaches found a strength in ensuring clinical partnerships are of high quality (in regards to educator effectiveness) • Administrators, NCTQ, and induction coaches noted the importance of aligning expectations between the preparation program and the field; Commenters explicitly called out the Danielson Framework, the RI Evaluation Model and the need for actual demonstration of impact • A district administrator noted the inclusion of the demonstration of clinical skill as a strength • Two Induction coaches and an educational consultant noted a strength of requiring candidates to demonstrate proficiency through multiple measures before completion of field work **CRITIQUES** • Timing, placement, and general coordination of clinical partnerships surfaced as a current challenge • NCTQ suggested there be a clear level of skill and competency for novice educators based on evaluation rubrics • Questions were raised regarding the currency of clinical educators, the need for stronger partnerships • A concern was expressed about teacher hesitancy to accept student teachers • RISSA acknowledged an increase in time spent in schools, but wondered about a future possibility of one-year internships being combined with induction support and part of the preparation/certification process • Youth in Action group noted the importance of future educators learning about diverse communities and community resources suggesting that diverse clinical experience extended beyond the traditional classroom preparation • Some comments noted the need for more clinical time	**(2.1)** Language was simplified to explicitly connect content from Standard 1 to clinical preparation. Questions regarding terms used within the component were addressed in the glossary. **(2.2)** The original 2.4 was deleted and a new component created to include student impact to align expectations within the field and between preparation programs. This improvement is based upon comment regarding the alignment of expectations between Rhode Island educators and the clinical experience. The component does not require a cut point for demonstration of impact on students, but rather the structure for programs to ensure that this is a focus of the clinical experience. **(2.3)** Intention of the component has been clarified by grounding the language in the continuous improvement data cycle. **(2.4)** This was the original 2.3- adult learning has been further specified as 'coaching and supervision'.

• Several people commented about the selection of cooperating teachers	
STANDARD 3	Standard 3 received eleven responses regarding strengths and fourteen responses with critiques. Standard 3 follows the human capital process of recruitment, admission, assessment throughout preparation, as well as the overall recommendation for certification. The components ensure there are meaningful checkpoints prior to educators serving in the PK-12 system. Improvements in this section include re-ordering the components to reflect the continuum of progression within a program and adjustments to language to be clearer about expectations. NOTE*: Component adjustments are listed by the original component number.*
<u>STRENGTHS</u> • A broad variety of commenters praised the admissions requirements and the ongoing assessment of candidates through their program progression • PK-12 educators noted the standard outlined a clear and concise pathway to certification • An Elementary principal, TFA and induction coaches liked the inclusion of recruitment of diverse candidates, noting that diversity should be encouraged and emphasized • Both TFA and Youth in Action group noted the importance and power of screening for and cultivating 'grit', 'leadership', and 'critical thinking ability' • PK-12 educators also noted that the admissions goals were positive and liked the inclusion of GPA • Youth in Action group noted that additional factors are important • One educator noted that it is important to acknowledge that not everyone should be a teacher and there is a place for that in these standards **<u>CRITIQUES</u>** • Questions were raised regarding the defining and measuring of additional selectivity factors • Questions were raised regarding the overall diversity implications of the components • Program faculty/staff worried about the risk of teacher shortages given the raising entrance standards and also requested that shortage fields be shared on a regular basis • TFA requested that 3.1 be pushed further to move beyond the act of recruitment to matriculation; an elementary principal wondered the same • An early childhood educator noted the need for more access to IHE programs for people with prior work experience • Questions were raised regarding the definitions within 3.3 specifically around the types of programs (initial, advanced, etc) and the relevance of various admission standardized assessments • TFA noted that the bar of GPA should remain a cohort average as other selectivity factors have proven to be critical in the success of new teachers • 3 Faculty/staff of IHE asked about the Pre-Professional Skills test for individuals with 2.75 or above and one of the three noted that this is inconsistent with current policy that ACT/SAT/GRE are other options for this • One faculty/staff at a teacher residency program asked if programs with a hefty tuition price really counsel folks out of the program • Three induction coaches noted that the RIDE evaluation teacher rubric should be used/mentioned here as a means to measure	**(3.1)** Language was adjusted to extend beyond the recruitment process. **(3.2)** After discussion with preparation programs on 10/28/13 the name of this component was changed to reflect high standards within the profession. Connotations of the outdated industrial model surfaced with the term 'workforce'. **(3.3)** In response to many questions in the original draft, RIDE developed a detailed guidance document outlining updated admissions requirements and implementation guidance. Additional detail was added following the 10/28 meeting with programs. In addition key terms associated with this component were defined in the glossary. **(3.4)** Additional selectivity factors component has been moved to 3.6 to signify the ongoing nature of the component. **(3.5)** Assessment during preparation has moved to 3.4. Language was adjusted to focus on ongoing assessment of candidates, support of candidates and the use of performance assessments. Reporting language was moved to standard 5. **(3.6)** This is now 3.5. The component title has been adjusted. Reporting language was added to standard 5. Additional language edits were made to clarify meaning.

• TNTP recommended 3.6 be reworded to emphasize impact on student growth and candidates should not be recommended for certification until they demonstrate an acceptable level of performance. Programs should be required to set a high bar and it should not be expected that all candidates will meet it. • Youth in Action noted that additional factors should include being a good facilitator, building relationships, and being a leader.	
STANDARD 4	Standard 4 received twelve responses regarding strengths and ten responses with critiques. Minimal adjustments were made in Standard 4. Changes streamlined language and maintained focus on completer impact. As one RI educator noted "Standard 4 directly addresses the goal of the program which is to produce teachers who are prepared to go out into the work force and improve the quality of education in RI". Concerns regarding the collection and usage of the data will be addressed during the next phase of work. As with all RIDE data collections, all appropriate measures will be taken to guarantee security and proper reporting boundaries.
Public Comment and Feedback	**ADJUSTMENTS**
<u>STRENGTHS</u> • NCTQ, 2 building administrators, and 3 induction coaches noted a strength of incorporating evaluation results from the RI Evaluation system rather than producing separate growth or value added measures only for purposes of ed prep accountability. This ensures that performance of many more teachers beyond those of tested grades and subjects can be considered • Program staff noted it will be useful for programs to get feedback on the performance of their program completers in RI classroom for continuous program improvement • PK-12 educators noted the strong link to the importance of being ready for the classroom and experiencing evaluation • An early childhood educator noted a strength in including student impact **<u>CRITIQUES</u>** • Questions were raised regarding program completers that find employment in other states and to what extent regional and national data should be included • Concerns were raised about the capacity to collect data from LEA and RIDE and how the evaluation and employment data will be used to make program approval decisions (while accounting for local/national economic factors) • NCTQ notes that minimum standards of performance must be established • RISSA asked about the level of data that can be shared with programs • A district level administrator noted that program completers should be monitored as a cohort for continued employment, not just initial employment • One educator noted a need to understand the job market	**(4.1)** Language was simplified. **(4.2)** Language adjustments made.
STANDARD 5	Standard 5 received fourteen responses regarding strengths and ten responses with critiques. Two components, 'Analysis of Data' and 'Use of Data', were combined to eliminate redundancy and to ensure alignment to the commonly used data cycle. The analysis and usage of data are now found within the component 'Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement'. Due to this combining, the number of the components is reduced. Overall feedback praised the focus on data driven improvement. Similar to Standard 4, concerns centered on data reporting feasibility and interpretation.

Public Comment and Feedback	**ADJUSTMENTS**
STRENGTHS • Broad range of commenters praised the emphasis on continuous improvement and public sharing of data • PK-12 educators noted that standard 5 clearly states the expectations for quality and capacity expected in RI • An induction coach noted that following beginning teacher progress via their employers and their performance as valuable for program continuous improvement • An induction coach noted the importance of models of instruction in programs **CRITIQUES** • A few commenters expressed questions and some concern regarding public reporting (sample size, interpretation of data) • Challenges were named regarding the ongoing monitoring of educators after program completion • A faculty/staff of IHE notes that "section V of each program's SPA report is a detailed narrative explaining program improvements/changes made based on data analysis" • Several suggestions were made for glossary terms • A faculty member wanted to know what might be used as evidence of data to improve programs • A consultant noted concern about the role of tenured professors and adjunct professors and wondered if the emphasis on being a practitioner would diminish the role of tenured professors	**(5.1)** Title of the component is adjusted to focus specifically on program quality and to call out a systematic approach to collecting relevant data. A definition for data was included in the glossary. **(5.2)** Component has been combined with the original 5.3 to intentionally link analysis and usage of data. Additional language was added to emphasize continuous improvement. **(5.3)** Original 5.3 has been combined with 5.2. **(5.4)** Language about the reporting of data was moved here from standard 3 and added to the title. This is now 5.3. **(5.5)** Two words were deleted that were adding to confusion. This is now 5.4. **(5.6)** Diversity was added based on discussion around the importance of diverse, high quality faculty. This is now 5.5. A definition for faculty was included in the glossar. **(5.7)** This component is now 5.6. Language was edited to focus on having adequate resources to meet standards.

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Shepard Building
255 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3400

Deborah A. Gist
Commissioner

Rhode Island Department of Education Minimum Admissions Requirements and Implementation Guidance

Beginning in 2009, the Rhode Island Department of Education established minimum basic skills requirements for entering educator preparation programs to ensure a high level of academic ability and achievement for Rhode Island students. The current requirements will remain in effect until the 2016-2017 cohorts. New requirements are outlined below. These requirements reflect the shared Rhode Island and CAEP minimum expectations for cohorts and outline expectations for individual candidates. The requirements outlined in this memo will be monitored and reviewed as programs collect related data.

***Cohort Requirements**: Approved undergraduate and post-baccalaureate programs ensure that the mean GPA of their admitted candidate cohorts meets or exceeds 3.0 and that the mean score of their admitted candidate cohorts on nationally normed admissions assessments (such as the ACT, SAT or GRE) meet or exceed the annual benchmarks:*

- *top 50 percent of the national distribution from 2016-2017;*
- *top 40 percent of the national distribution from 2018-2019; and*
- *top 33 percent of the national distribution by 2020.*

Note: Post-baccalaureate programs may or may not have rolling admissions. Programs have the flexibility to determine the most practical date for determining a cohort if rolling admissions is in place, but must establish this date, maintain consistency of the date and report it to RIDE.

***Individual Requirements:** For undergraduate programs, individual candidates must have at least a 2.75 GPA and meet rising percentile-based thresholds by meeting the threshold of at least the previous year. Individuals, who do not meet the current year's threshold, must also meet or exceed RIDE's requirements for Pre-Professional Skills Tests.*[1]

Individual candidates in post-baccalaureate must have at least a 3.0 GPA and meet rising percentile-based thresholds by meeting the threshold of at least the previous year. Individuals, who do not meet the current year's threshold, must also meet or exceed RIDE's requirements for Pre-Professional Skills Tests.[1]

Note: These requirements do not apply to the following certificate areas: School Psychologist, School Social Worker, Speech-Language Pathologist, Administrator of Special Education, Administrator of Curriculum and Superintendent as the requirements have either been met previously or are not applicable to the specialized area.

1 For example, in 2018-19, programs must ensure the mean score of their admitted candidate cohorts meets or exceeds the 40th percentile on nationally normed admissions assessments, while individual candidates must score in at least the 50th percentile.

The Board of Education does not discriminate on the basis of age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity/expression, race, color, religion, national origin, or disability.

These requirements would also not apply to reading specialists, math specialists, principal candidates, school counselor candidates or other graduate program candidates if they hold or have held a teaching certificate since these requirements would have been met previously.

Note: Assessment scores from SAT, ACT, GRE and other approved national assessments may be used for up to 10 years after the test date. Guidance issued in 2009 allowed the use of assessment scores for up to only 5 years after the test date.

Waiver: In rare instances, programs may offer a conditional acceptance for a candidate not meeting all entrance requirements. These candidates must be provided with appropriate support to successfully remediate the area of need prior to program completion, including successfully completing all admission requirements. Programs may determine waiver protocols with RIDE to meet this expectation. The number of waivers granted and other relevant data will be reported to RIDE annually.

Rhode Island Standards for Educator Preparation

STANDARD ONE: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE

Approved programs ensure that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts, principles, and practices of their field and, by program completion, are able to use practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward college and career readiness by achieving Rhode Island student standards.

1.1 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions: *Approved programs ensure that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions encompassed in the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards and the Rhode Island Standards for Educational Leaders.*

1.2 Knowledge of Content and Content Pedagogy (Teachers)/Field of Study (Administrators and Support Professionals): *Approved programs ensure that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the critical concepts, principles, and practices in their area of certification as identified in appropriate professional association standards.*

1.3 Standards-Driven Instruction: *Approved programs ensure that candidates develop and demonstrate the ability to design, implement, and assess learning experiences that provide all students the opportunity to achieve Rhode Island student standards.*

1.4 Data-Driven Instruction: *Approved programs ensure that candidates develop and demonstrate the ability to collect, analyze, and use data from multiple sources- including research, student work and other school-based and classroom-based sources- to inform instructional and professional practice.*

1.5 Technology: *Approved programs ensure that candidates model and integrate into instructional practice technologies to engage students and improve learning as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences; as well as technologies designed to enrich professional practice.*

1.6 Equity: *Approved programs ensure that candidates develop and demonstrate the cultural competence and culturally responsive skills that assure they can be effective with a diverse student population, parents, and the community.*

1.7 Rhode Island Educational Expectations: *Approved programs integrate current Rhode Island initiatives and other Rhode Island educational law and policies into preparation and ensure that candidates are able to demonstrate these in their practice.*

STANDARD TWO: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

Approved programs ensure that high-quality clinical practice and effective partnerships are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning and development.

2.1 Clinical Preparation: *Approved programs include clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to enable candidates to develop and demonstrate proficiency of the appropriate professional standards identified in Standard 1. Approved programs work with program-based and district/school-based clinical educators to maintain continuity and coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation.*

2.2 Impact on Student Learning: *Approved programs and their clinical partners structure coherent clinical experiences that enable candidates to increasingly demonstrate positive impact on PK-12 students' learning.*

2.3 Clinical Partnerships for Preparation: *Approved programs form mutually beneficial PK-12 and community partnership arrangements for clinical preparation. Expectations for candidate entry, growth, improvement, and exit are shared between programs and PK-12 and community partners and link theory and practice. Approved programs and partners utilize multiple indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of the partnerships and ensure that data drives improvement.*

2.4 Clinical Educators: *Approved programs share responsibility with partners to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both program and school-based, who demonstrate school or classroom effectiveness, including a positive impact on PK-12 students' learning, and have the coaching and supervision skills to effectively support the development of candidate knowledge and skills.*

STANDARD THREE: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND ASSESSMENT

Approved programs demonstrate responsibility for the quality of candidates by ensuring that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program- from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences- and in decisions that program completers are prepared to be effective educators and are recommended for certification.

3.1 Diversity of Candidates: *Approved programs recruit, admit, and support high-quality candidates who reflect the diversity of Rhode Island's PK-12 students.*

3.2 Response to Employment Needs: *Approved programs demonstrate efforts to know and be responsive to community, state, regional, and/or national educator employment needs, including needs in hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields.*

3.3 Admission Standards for Academic Achievement and Ability: *Approved programs set admissions requirements that meet or exceed Rhode Island Department of Education expectations as set forth in documented guidance and gather data to monitor applicants and admitted candidates.*

3.4 Assessment throughout Preparation: *Approved programs establish criteria for candidate monitoring and progression throughout the program and use performance-based assessments to determine readiness prior to advancing to student teaching/internship (or educator of record status). Approved programs assess candidate ability to impact student learning during their student teaching/internship (or educator of record experience). Approved programs use assessment results throughout preparation to support candidate growth and to determine candidates' professional proficiency and ability to impact student learning, or to counsel ineffective candidates out of the program prior to completion.*

3.5 Recommendation for Certification: *Approved programs establish criteria for recommendation for certification and use valid and reliable performance-based assessments in alignment with RI's educator evaluation standards to document that candidates demonstrate proficiency in the critical concepts, principles, and practices in their area of certification as identified in appropriate professional standards, codes of professional responsibility and relevant laws and policies.*

3.6 Additional Selectivity Criteria: *Approved programs define, monitor, and assess, at entry and throughout the program, evidence of candidates' professional dispositions, and other research-based traits, such as leadership abilities, resilience, and perseverance, that are critical to educator effectiveness.*

STANDARD FOUR: PROGRAM IMPACT

Approved programs produce educators who are effective in PK-12 schools and classrooms, including demonstrating professional practice and responsibilities and improving PK-12 student learning and development.

4.1 Evaluation Outcomes: *Approved programs produce effective educators, as evidenced through performance on approved LEA evaluations. Educators demonstrate a positive impact on student learning on all applicable measures and demonstrate strong ratings on measures of professional practice and responsibilities.*

4.2 Employment Outcomes: *Approved programs demonstrate that educators are prepared to work effectively in PK-12 schools, as evidenced by measures that include employment milestones such as placement, retention, and promotion and data from recent program completers that report perceptions of their preparation to become effective educators and successfully manage the responsibilities they confront on the job.*

STANDARD FIVE: PROGRAM QUALITY AND IMPROVEMENT

Approved programs collect and analyze data on multiple measures of program and program completer performance and use this data to for continuous improvement. Approved programs and their institutions assure that programs are adequately resourced, including personnel and physical resources, to meet these program standards and to address needs identified to maintain program quality and continuous improvement.

5.1 Collection of Data to Evaluate Program Quality: *Approved programs regularly and systematically collect data, including candidate and completer performance and completer impact on PK-12 students' learning, from multiple sources to monitor program quality. Approved programs rely on relevant, representative, and cumulative measures that have been demonstrated to provide valid and consistent interpretation of data.*

5.2 Analysis and Use of Data for Continuous Improvement: *Approved programs regularly and systematically analyze data on program performance and candidate outcomes; track results over time; and test the effects of program practices and candidate assessment criteria on subsequent progress, completion, and outcomes. Approved Programs use the findings to modify program elements and processes and inform decisions related to programs, resource allocation and future direction.*

5.3 Reporting and Sharing of Data: *Approved programs publicly report and widely share information and analysis on candidates successfully meeting program milestones, those candidates who do not meet milestones, and candidates recommended for certification. Approved programs publicly report and widely share measures of completer impact, including employment status, available outcome data on PK-12 student growth, and, to the extent available, data that benchmarks the program's performance against that of similar programs.*

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement: *Approved programs involve appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and school and community partners in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.*

5.5 Diversity and Quality of Faculty: *Approved programs ensure that candidates are prepared by a diverse faculty composed of educators who demonstrate current, exceptional expertise in their respective fields, and model the qualities of effective instruction and leadership. Approved programs maintain plans, activities, and data on results in the selection of diverse program-based and district-based faculty.*

5.6 Other Resources: *Approved programs and their institutions provide adequate resources to assure that programs meet the expectations for quality programs that are identified in these standards.*

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Shepard Building
255 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3400

Deborah A. Gist
Commissioner

Rhode Island Educator Preparation Program Standards Glossary

Standard One

- **Candidate**: an individual enrolled in an educator preparation program.
- **Content Pedagogy**: depth of understanding of the strategies to advance students' learning through the presentation of content in a variety of ways that are appropriate to different situations so that it can be grasped by students and are research based to improve that acquisition of knowledge in ways effective for the particular subject.
- **Data-Driven Instruction**: the practice in which educators use multiple sources of evidence, including student work and assessments, as tools to enhance learning. Examples of these sources include: formative and summative assessments, and student work.
- **Diversity**: differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender identity, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area.
- **Field of Study**: For administrators and support professionals the "field of study" is the specific knowledge discipline associated with their certification areas.
- **Knowledge of Content**: depth of understanding of critical concepts, theories, skills, processes, principles, and structures that connect and organize ideas within a field.
- **Professional Educator Standards**: standards that provide expectations about knowledge, skills, and practices educators should have and learn in each field. Examples of these standards include: Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards and Code of Professional Responsibilities, and the Rhode Island Standards for Educational Leadership.
- **Professional Association Standards**: standards adopted by the national organizations that represent teachers, professional education faculty, and other school professionals who teach a specific subject matter (e.g., mathematics or social studies), teach students at a specific developmental level (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle level, or secondary), teach students with specific needs (e.g., bilingual education or special education), administer schools (e.g., principals or superintendents), or provide services to students (e.g., school counselors or school psychologists).
- **Professional Disposition:** professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development. Examples include: resilience, perseverance, fairness, collaboration, and leadership abilities.
- **Rhode Island Educational Expectations:** are connected to the most current RIDE Strategic Plan which outlines the educator performance and requirements and student achievement expectations. Current examples include: Educator Evaluation, Common Core, and the Early Learning Challenge.

DRAFT

- **Rhode Island Student Standards:** standards that provide expectations about what knowledge, skills, and practices students should have access to and opportunities to achieve at each grade level. Examples include: Common Core State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards, and the Early Learning Standards. Please note that these standards change over time.

Standard Two

- **Clinical Educator**: a program-based or LEA-based practitioner who assesses, supports, and develops candidates during his/her clinical experiences.
- **Clinical Partnership:** A "clinical partnership" can take a range of forms with the end goal of engaging in and contributing to the goals for the preparation of education professionals. Clinical partners may include schools, school districts, or community based organizations serving PK-12 students.

Standard Three

- **Admission Cohort:** group of candidates admitted at the same time, e.g., a class entering in a fall semester.
- **Educator of Record:** a certified teacher, administrator, or support professional in Rhode Island public schools. Teachers of record are responsible for providing instruction and determining student grades. Administrators of record are responsible for the supervision and management of schools, school programs, and school districts. Support professionals of record are responsible for instructional leadership or serving as a specialist/consultant or a related service provider. *Please note that individuals undergoing an alternative route program serve as a teacher of record while enrolled in the program.*
- **Mean GPA:** the average locally determined Grade Point Average.
- **Mean Score of Nationally Normed Assessments:** the average actual/raw score of a nationally normed assessment.
- **Program Completer**: an individual who has completed all requirements of a preparation program including recommendation for licensure inclusive of higher education programs and programs provided by private preparation providers.

Standard Five

- **Data**: signifies both qualitative and quantitative information collected by an educator preparation program in an effort to maintain continuous improvement.
- **Faculty**: for this component faculty may be either based in the preparation program or may be partners in PK-12 schools and districts who are supporting the development of candidates.

DRAFT